

## **The Emergence of Communism**

**Murray N. Rothbard**

The second in a series of six lectures on The History of Economic Thought.

Transcribed and Donated – Thomas Topp

**Rothbard:**

Communism starts as a doctrine as far as I can see. By the way, there's a great book on it, a marvelously written book, a famous book by Norman Cohn called *Pursuit Of The Millennium*, it's in paperback. He writes about these guys in "loving detail." He obviously has a proper attitude of contempt and hatred, sardonic hatred, *Pursuit of the Millennium*.

It starts apparently with an extremely influential, extraordinarily influential, evil, or earlier than that, heretic, late 12<sup>th</sup> century Italian mystic, Joachim of Fiore, born and lived in Calabria in southern Italy, became an abbot and also a hermit. 1135-1201—late 12<sup>th</sup> century. The thing about Joachim of Fiore, you have to realize, he's not just a lone nut.

He's extremely influential. He almost converted a couple of popes. In other words, he was just this close to translating this to orthodox Catholic doctrine. Basically, what he said was—well, first of all, he launched apparently the idea of the prophesy, that you have to look at the bible to find out the prophesy of the end of the world, etc., concentrating of course on the Book of Revelation.

And he came to the conclusion that history was destined to move through three successive stages—always three, by the way, in all these things. It's very much, again, like the Platonist thing. The first stage of humanly regard, the second stage is alienation and all that. This is a different version, and more advanced, so to speak.

The first age was the age of the Old Testament. So you have age one, Old Testament. This was the age of the Father in the Holy Trinity. It was the era of the Father or the age of the Law. You have the Father and the Law. [unintelligible] Also ruled by fear and servitude. The second age, ushered in by Jesus, was the age of the Son. So this is the New

Testament, the age of the Son, Christian era, which is the age of faith and submission.

And then this coming inevitably and soon, the third age—this is always the age to watch out for, the age of the Holy Spirit, which is when all hell breaks loose, so to speak. [laughs] Age of the Holy Spirit. The era of perfect joy, love and freedom and the end of human history, and of course the era of perfect joy and freedom also the end of property, and nobody has any property, nobody works.

When we envision a kingdom of God on earth, very few people talk about working—it's never part of anybody's real utopian vision. So nobody works. Norman Cohn puts it, paraphrasing Joachim of Fiore, "The world will become one vast monastery in which all men will be contemplative monks, wrapped continuously in mystical ecstasy until the day of the last judgment."

The interesting thing, the reason why this would "work," as the first thing you talk about Communist utopia, is who works, how do they allocate economic resources and all that stuff? Who does all these things? The answer is they don't have to do any of it because all men would be pure spirit. The body will have withered away or disappeared, so everybody's pure spirit.

If you're pure spirit, you don't have to worry about economics—don't have to worry about labor, property, food. All these things disappear and everybody's pure spirit, chanting praise to God. That sort of solves the economic problem. There's no economic problem because there's no bodies.

Unfortunately, the other communism that came later—Marx, for example, obviously did not believe in pure spirit. He faced the economic problem which Joachim avoided. So you have the whole pre-Marxist, so to

speak, era. The first age is the age of primitive communism, and then you have the second age, the age of the Son is the age of class conflict and class separation, and then finally you have the realm of perfect freedom, total communism and no division of labor and the end of human history. You don't have to have any labor at all, obviously.

As with many [chileastes] or messianic types, Joachim was sure of the date of the advent of the third age, the final age. It was going to be soon, but not too soon. He didn't make the mistake of the Milarites of saying it's going to be October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1844. "It's going to be about 50 years from now." 50 years is a good time because it makes everybody [hopped] up, and yet it's not soon enough to be tested quickly by empirical reality.

So he said, "Around 1250 will be the ushering in of the third age." The third age will be ushered in by a cadre, a vanguard, order of people who will usher in this third age, will prepare the way and sort of lead the path here. And when the Franciscan movement, Franciscan order started around the early 13<sup>th</sup>, the rigorous Franciscans, a wing, the rigorous wing—I mentioned this last night—the anti-property wing or the pro-poverty wing—many of them felt that they were the Fiori, they were the Joachimites, they were the people destined to usher in the final age.

A new ingredient comes into this whole witch's brew, and I call it that—around the same time, the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, a little bit later than Joachim, the University of Paris, which in those days was the great center for theological studies, a learned professor of theology, a favorite of the French Royal Court, at least until he came up with this doctrine, was a fellow named Emeric, whose followers became the Emorians, the Emorian movement. Emeric doctrines were condemned by the pope. He did not almost convert the pope, and forced a public recantation, and died shortly thereafter.

The Emorians were students of theology in Paris. Usually his students or students of his students, and he influenced many people and distributed many popular works of theology in the vernacular, since most people couldn't read Latin, it was difficult to influence them. So they were propagandizing in the vernacular.

Their leader was Father William [Orofex]. In other words, he was the Emorian, which means gold in Latin. Apparently, he was either an alchemist or a goldsmith, it's not clear. He had some professional connection with gold. At any rate, the Emorians believed, they had a very similar doctrine, they added some more spice to this. They said each age had its own incarnation, where God is incarnated in man.

The first age, Abraham was the incarnate, first incarnation. The second age, of course, Jesus was the incarnation. The question is who would be the incarnation of God in the third age? Obviously, it was them, the Emorians, they were the incarnation of God in the third age. It usually is, by the way, with third age types, they become the prophet, the messiah, fulfill human history, end it and fulfill it. Fulfill it and end it, I should say.

So they considered themselves the incarnation—they proclaim themselves as living gods, the embodiment of the holy spirit. And of course, they start as a define elite, but eventually everybody becomes—eventually, after various tribulations or whatever, everybody would become the Holy Spirit, living gods.

In the current period they were the only ones, they were the elect. In the early 14<sup>th</sup> century, 100 years later, there comes another group. Various groups were decentralized, continuing this tradition called the Brethren of the Free Spirit. The Emorians, by the way, were wiped out. The Emorians were mostly wiped out. But anyway, it continues on, bubbles underneath.

The Germans call luftmenschen; in other words, people of the wind. They're sort of like hippy types, sort of wandering around, no fixed abode. No fixed needs of support. So there are a whole bunch of brethren of the free spirit, and they added another important ingredient, the ingredient which we mentioned called [tynus], the reabsorption into God on the final stage.

We have the communism stuff, and then you have a reabsorption, the final unity. They also added a new elitist twist. The brotherhood of the free spirit had two types of people, of their brethren: the crude in spirit, who have to die first, and the glorious minority, namely themselves and the leadership, were subtle in spirit, who could and did become reabsorbed, and therefore living gods in their own lifetime.

In other words, they already had their own individual reabsorption, and therefore they were eternal and gods. This minority was of course the brotherhood themselves and their leadership—would achieve the status of divinity by years of training self-torture, visions, so forth and so on. Became perfect gods, and more perfect and more godlike than even Christ himself, you see, because Christ was back in the second stage; they're in the final stage. They're even more divine.

And they also proclaim themselves greater than God himself. For example, a group of female free spirit at [Schweidnitz] in Germany claim to be able to dominate the Holy Trinity, such that they could ride it as in a saddle, and one of the women declared that, "When God created all things, I created all things with him; I'm more than God."

Anyway, also, of course along with this, being living gods, we have an extreme form of the anti-[Nomian] heresy, namely that some people are gods and it's impossible for them to sin. Anything they do can't be sin,

by definition, because they're already divine, and whatever they do is necessarily moral and perfect.

And of course, the free spirits, like other anti-Nomians, attempted to demonstrate their freedom from sin by doing all sorts of sinful things. [laughs] There's a catch with the free spirits: Only a minority, as I said, were divine. These were the leadership of the free spirits. The rank and file was destined to become gods, they were striving to make it, they'll make it eventually.

And there was only one sin for all these people. In other words, all the other sins were out because they're living gods and so forth and so on. For example, Nicholas of Basel, who's one of the top free spirits, had his own cult, for the rank and file there's only one sin, ever—that's disobeying Nicholas of Basel. [laughter]

Because Nicholas of Basel is God, that's it. Any disobedience of course is sinful, and should be met by immediate punishment. So each disciple took an oath of absolute obedience to Nicholas of Basel being a living God. This is, I guess, true of most of the other free spiriters. So every member of the Nicholas of Basel group took an oath of complete obedience to Nicholas of Basel, in turn for which he granted them freedom from all sin, since he was God.

A neatly packaged circle. What about the rest of mankind outside the cult? Their role is to be exploited, used and exploited by the elect. So along with this came an assault on the institution of private property. In other words, for them, communism was essentially theft. In other words, the idea was the elect could steal property and money from anybody because they were the elect, they were divine, and therefore, for them communism essentially meant everybody, "Your goods are my goods."

So as the Bishop of Strasbourg summed it up in 1317, summed up their doctrines, “They believe all things are common once they conclude that such is lawful for them,” of course. I think other people stealing from them they wouldn’t look on very benignly. For example, Johann [Hauton] was a free spirit [adapt from Erfurt] in Germany, said, “The truly free man is king and lord of all creatures. All things belong to him and he has the right to use whatever pleases him. If anyone tries to prevent him, the free man may kill him and take his goods,” free man being one of the elect.

And one of the favorite sayings of the free spirit was, “Whatever the eye sees and covets, let the hand grasp it.” [laughter] Great moral theory. Then we have, in the early 15<sup>th</sup> century we have the final ingredient for all this—the extreme wing of the [Taborite] movement, which is itself the left wing or the radical wing of the Hussite Movement, which bubbled up in Bohemia. They were a pre-Protestant group in 15th century Czechia, I guess [unintelligible] describe it, which blended, by the way, a religious struggle against the Catholic Church, nationality—Czechs versus German—class, artisan versus the patrician, so it sort of blended all three of these things, the Taborite movement.

The extreme wing, the Taborites added something else—a divine duty to exterminate all heretics, which means everybody except themselves. So the last days are coming soon, the final days, and the elect must go out and stamp out sin by exterminating all the sinners. The easiest way to stamp out sin, of course, is to exterminate the sinners, which means all non-Taborites, at the very least.

So the sinners are enemies of Christ and, “[unintelligible] withholds his sword from shedding the blood of the enemies of Christ. Every believer must wash his hands in that blood.” Having that mindset, of course, they didn’t stop at intellectual destruction. In addition to killing all the heretics,



they would burn all heretical things, like books, images, paintings, libraries, and so forth and so on.

Besides, the elect have no need for books. When the kingdom of God on earth arrived, there would no longer be “need for anyone to teach another. There’d be no need for books or scriptures, and all worldly wisdom will perish.” I guess all people too. The general destruction of everything, theft and general destruction.

And of course, again, the Taborites were going to return to a lost age, [unintelligible] early communism, [unintelligible] great society with no private property. And of course, in order to do that, you have to exterminate the cities, which are centers of sin and avarice and luxury and greed, [unintelligible] the landlord, virtually everybody else.

And after the elect had established their communist kingdom of God on earth in Bohemia by revolutionary means, they would then spread it to the rest of the world. Today Bohemia; tomorrow, the world. In addition to that, they were very consistent, the communists—this is true, by the way, of communists in general, it’s been sort of dropped out of the literature—also, communism of women—personal bodies.

The Taborite preachers, left wing preachers taught that everything be common, including wives—there’d be no marriage, etc. The first thing’s the Hussite revolution breaks out in 1419, the same year the left-wing Taborites got together and captured a town called Usti in northern Bohemia. They renamed it Tabor, which I guess means [unintelligible] or something. There’s some biblical, there’s a New Testament reference with Tabor.

They renamed this town Tabor, and they installed Taborite communism, so to speak, and engaged in a communism experiment. Only everything in common, dedicated to the proposition “that whoever owns private

property commits mortal sin.” All women were owned in common, true to their doctrines, and if husband and wife were even seen together, they were beaten to death or otherwise executed.

The form of execution, I can leave to your imagination. They also believed in the unlimited right to consume from a common storehouse. They had a common storehouse. Nobody gets paid, everybody sort of takes what they need. Except the Taborites, of course probably were exempt from all work, since they were divine.

As a result of nobody working and everybody taking from the common store, there's not much production left. Very early the common store disappears, who's going to contribute to it? That's one of the great communist problems. So then, since the common store of the Taborites in Usti was gone, they decided, “Well, now we take, rob and exterminate everybody outside of Tabor. We externalize the movement,” so to speak.

The moderate Taborites were very much against this. They said that the many communities never think of earning their own living by the work of their hands, but only willing to live on other people's property, they undertake unjust campaigns with the sole purpose of robbing. Anyway, with [unintelligible] everybody around them—the peasants and everybody else—the Taborite, the Usti experiment quickly collapsed.

But again, it keeps bubbling on. The idea is picked up by other groups. One group are the Bohemia Adomites, who added another special—each one of these groups adds their own special contribution to this great movement. The Adomites, again, like the free spirits, believed they were living gods, superior to Christ. And one of the reasons—get this—as a reason why they were superior to Christ—because Christ is dead and they're still alive.

I think it's one of the least convincing reasons I've ever heard. [laughs] At least short-sighted, certainly. Again, not only are all goods strictly owned in common by the Adomite, but marriage is considered a heinous sin. Promiscuity is compulsory for the Adomites, since the chaste were unwilling to enter the messianic kingdom. Any man could choose any woman at will and would have to be obeyed.

Also, the Adomites went around naked most of the time, imitating the original state of Adam and Eve, the alleged original state. Also, another peculiar thing—the government, there's a famous quip, "The 20<sup>th</sup> century whatever is not prohibited; it's compulsory." Well, the Adomites both made promiscuity compulsory and restricted, because it was compulsory, but only with the permission of the Adomite leader, his name's Adam Moses.

So in order to engage in compulsory promiscuity, you had to have his permission. Again, like all these other guys, the Adomites regarded it as sacred divine mission to exterminate all the unbelievers in the world, wielding a sword—it's a marvelous image, I think—wielding a sword until blood floods the world at the height of a horse's bridle.

[unintelligible] like that. They were God's scythes sent to cut down and eradicate the unrighteous. These groups began to use the agricultural image of a scythe. "I am God's scythe." At any rate, they were crushed by the moderate Hussites, moderate Taborites, as you might expect. They were robbing and killing everybody they could. [unintelligible] commando raids that rob and kill the unrighteous.

They were finally smashed. But again, it keeps popping up, and we get now to the Anabaptists. This is after the Reformation comes and lets loose a lot more of these people. I could easily spend the rest of the hour talking about the Anabaptists. It's rich in narrative and examples. It

really starts with Thomas Müntzer, who was the first coercive Anabaptist, a communist Anabaptist.

He starts off as a young priest and then becomes a Lutheran. He's quite learned in the scriptures and the writing of the German mystics. He becomes a Lutheran as soon as Lutheran launches the Reformation in 1520, he's there, and Luther recommends him for one of the top pastorates.

He then continues on. As a matter of fact, he meets a Bohemian, one of the Bohemians, had been influenced by the old Bohemian movement—a weaver named Nicholas Storch, and Storch converts him to the Taborite doctrine. Müntzer picks it up and says, “Okay, I’m the prophet.” He gives from one city in Germany to another, usually getting kicked out, but getting more and more followers. And one time, it’s kind of funny, kind of amusing, he goes to Czechia, the heartland, “I’ve got to meet the Czechs,” and he starts preaching to them.

Unfortunately, he didn’t know Czech and they didn’t know German. It was a preaching failure, as you might imagine. At any rate, but he keeps finding more and more support, goes to more and more towns, gets kicked out, forms a revolutionary organization called the League of the Elect.

One of the interesting things—the Duke, it’s kind of interesting, has heard about this guy preaching, and he goes to listen to him. This is the brother of the prince of the Kingdom of Saxony, and the duke seems like a real dimwit to me, because he’s preaching his doctrine—he lays it all out.

He tells the duke that the duke and the princes have an obligation to exterminate the unrighteous. Then he says if they don’t do it, the princes fail in this divine obligation, “Then we will have to rise up.” As he puts,

“The sword shall be taken if they resist, and let them be slaughtered without mercy.” In other words, “We will rise up and slaughter all the princes and dukes.” Somehow, the duke didn’t realize the implications of this. “This is an interesting preacher.” He imposes a communist regime, he takes over the town of [Mohausen], decrees all property to be in common, and as one contemporary observer said, he was so effective that folk no longer wanted to work.

Again, the other guys will contribute according to their ability, and we’ll take according to our needs—would be the practical implication of all that. He talked about love a lot, communism and love. Basically what it means is theft and general slaughter. At any rate, Müntzer gets wrapped up in the Peasants’ War, which was a much more general thing as to nobility, and his wing of Anabaptist peasants gets involved in that, and he gets finally chopped up.

But again, he keeps getting—his body may be [unintelligible] grave, but his spirit went marching on. He’s picking up disciples before he gets conked out. By the way, one of the things that Müntzer does, he was marching with the peasants in Heidelberg. The princes and the [unintelligible] had a huge number of cavalry and artillery, a lot of firepower; the peasants have practically nothing, and no arms.

He tells the peasants, gave his last flaming speech, holding aloft his naked sword, and he says, “Don’t worry about it, because God personally promised me victory,” and he would catch all the enemy cannonballs on the sleeves of his cloak, and God will protect them all. This is a strategic moment that he spoke, [unintelligible] a rainbow emerged in the sky, and the rainbow’s considered the symbol of his movement, sort of like an early Rainbow Coalition. [laughter]

That was it. That was a sign that he would be triumphant. Of course, the whole gang was slaughtered—the peasants, him, the whole business. At any rate, he misinterpreted the sign, I guess. And so other followers pop up, and finally they get a town—they get a real city, 10,000, which was a big city in those days.

They get a city in northwestern Germany called Munster. I have difficulty distinguishing between Müntzer and Munster, but anyway, Müntzer was dead by this time, and Munster was the final, I think a year's experiment in compulsory communism. This is the 1530s, I think 1532, three, four, in that period, sort of the climax of the compulsory Anabaptist movement.

And when they capture Munster, all the good guys, so to speak, leave. They have to leave—as a matter of fact, are expelled. First of all, some of the hopped up theoreticians said, "Let's kill them all, kill all Lutherans, all Catholics," and a gleam of rationality entered the head of it. There are two heads of it, once named Mathis, and the other one named Bokelson. After Mathis dies, Bokelson takes over, Mathis's assistant. Bokelson is also known in history as Jan of Weiden, also called himself King Bokelson. So rationality takes over among these people, they say, "No, we won't kill them, it might anger everybody else in Germany and Europe. Let's just drive them out."

They expel them in the middle of a snowstorm, forcing them to leave all their clothes, property and money behind—very reminiscent of Cambodia and the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia. Compulsory expulsion during a snowstorm. So the good guys—every nut in northern Europe, every coercive Anabaptist flocks to Munster. "This is it, this is the new Jerusalem," and the idea was that [unintelligible] Munster will flow outward, and everything else will be destroyed, and all the world will become one great Munster. So they all flocked in there, the whole different followers of different groups—the Bokulites and the

Rothmanities and a whole bunch of people, they all flock to this great center.

At any rate, so first there's compulsory communism. There's also, one of the extreme things they did immediately, Bokelson and Mathis, they compulsorily outlawed money, the use of money, which was also done in Cambodia. The best way to get control over a population is to outlaw money. In other words, they confiscated all the money.

From then on, anything which you receive, you receive by the ration in kind of the beloved elect—namely, equality. It's equality enforced, but some are more equal than others, as you well know. And the elect were running everything. The elect decides who gets how much food, and whatever, you can imagine the situation.

You can't really have total totalitarianism unless you abolish money, and the state then provides you with every according to their wisdom and largesse and benevolence, right? The money, by the way, was all confiscated and used for Bokelson and his cadre to buy stuff in the outside world.

So first they [unintelligible] any Catholics, Lutherans, or whoever else was around. There was also, for a while there was compulsory marriage among the elect, and then there was a little bit of rebellion against that. So they finally said, "Okay," and swung to the other side. For about three months they moved from compulsory marriage to compulsory promiscuity for everybody. Communism of women again came in. Which he took to like a duck takes to a water, as a matter of fact—he immediately, very quickly had 13 wives, thereby unifying theory and practice. [laughter]

Anyway, Mathis, by the way, we know Mathis was the original absolute leader of this group, he got filled with too much hubris, and was

convinced that Easter, that got had ordered him and a few people to rush out and defeat the Bishop's armies, and he rushed out, and of course they were all hacked to pieces. Bokelson then becomes the king. He had himself proclaimed, by the way. So Bokelson says, "Don't worry, people, God will give you another prophet, who will be more powerful," which of course was himself.

One time, by the way, when he instituted his new rule, Bokelson, he ran through the streets of Munster naked in a frenzy, falling then into a silent three-day ecstasy, and he rose on the third day, as some certain other person did, and announced to the populous a new dispensation had been arrived at, which was that he, God had revealed to him that he's not going to take over.

He abolished the previous town offices and had himself proclaimed elder and king and all that, and he would pick all the elders, and all the rest of it. By the way, for any act, disagreeing any act whatsoever, I mean a litany of stuff, goes on and on, any act of disobedience to the Bokelson—using money, disobeying any kind of edict, including, by the way, lying, avarice and quarreling—death penalty, immediate death. Death penalty for everything.

Death penalty for anything—quarreling, nagging, anything was the death penalty. It was the great age of capital punishment. There was also compulsory polygamy because most of the men had left, leaving the wives and children behind, so there was about a three-to-one ratio of women to men. So compulsory polygamy was at least technologically feasible.

And by the way, here's a great thing—I'll wind up on Bokelson on this note: It starts with equality and poverty and all that. He winds up, he takes all the confiscated money, transforms it into gold and jewelry, and



he and his court, he and his queen and his nobles, as they call themselves, the elect, all have fantastic luxury stuff, living in fantastic luxury while everybody else was literally starving—totally desperate.

And his reason for this—because a few people I guess were a little bit edgy about this—how do you explain absolute equality and absolute communism? How come these guys are living in luxury? That question was very interesting. “Since we are now gods, we’re now pure spirit. Therefore, none of this means anything to us. We’ve risen above pure material objects, so we’re not really enjoying it,” or whatever. If you can buy that line, I got a Brooklyn Bridge to sell you too. [laughter]

So at any rate, the bishop and everybody, the siege was, although it lasted until the very end—it was only betrayed by a few informers, and they finally got into the town and slaughtered, of course, the whole Bokelson movement without too much ado. So that was, I guess, the end of the compulsory communist experiment.

The thing you have to remember is that left liberal historians and Marxist historians dealing with this issue, how do you react to these people? It seems like any rational person would react in total horror to the Bokelson Movement. They love them. They’re great people. Why do they love them? One, they were communists, no question about that, they believe in communism and carried it out.

Two, it was a mass movement, a movement of the people, no question about that either. Most of the people were real life’s losers, no question about the fact it was a lower-class movement, a working-class movement, peasant movement, whatever you want to call it, and Marx would call, I guess, should’ve called a lumpenproletariat movement, movement of marginal types, and it was a communist movement—therefore, it’s great.

It's really kind of interesting to read historians, left wing historians talking about these people. They love them. They're setting the stage for the rest of history. Communism pops up again—this sort of discredited compulsory communism, Anabaptism for most people by this time. It pops up in the French Revolution or just before the French Revolution, when things are being overturned in general.

You had a secularized version of this, but not all secularized. We know, of course, that Marx was an atheist, but there was a real conflict, a real dispute until the very end, until 1848, really, the time of the Communist Manifesto, a real dispute between Christian communists and atheist communists.

They both really agree on everything except the groundwork. The atheist version, the secularized version, which of course we know about, called secular, and the communism version, which was, the Christian version, which was that they are the prophet, the same stuff we're talking about. Just a little bit on that:

One problem, of course, the atheist communists had, what we call the agency of social change. How was this brought about? How is communism being brought about? For post-millennial types, it's easy—God brings it about through history, it's inevitable. The messiah returns or the prophet returns and brings it about.

For atheists, however, we have a real problem. How is this brought about? Since we can't rely on God of the third age anymore, who's going to bring it about? And most socialists and communists—by the way, socialism and communism was boiling all throughout Europe in the 1830s and '40s, all sorts of socialist groups—Owenites, Fourierites, a whole bunch of stuff.

But anyway, all these people said, “Well, we educate the public,” essentially educationists. That, of course, was not suitable for Marx. Marx wanted to show it was inevitable, “scientific.” It’s got to come about, it’s inevitably decreed by history. And of course, bringing in Hegelianism, [alienation] of the dialectic, allowed to do it. He found his alleged inevitability, which gave him a leg up on everybody else, who rely on people’s will.

There were also communist groups in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the civil war in England passed them by quickly. [Monarchy men] and the Diggers and so forth. The two big philosophic communists, so to speak, before the French Revolution, Mabli and Morelli—Mabli was an aristocrat, and interestingly enough, the brother of a great laissez-faire utility theorist, [Kungelac], his name was Mabli de Kungelac or something. Mabli was an aristocrat, and spent most of his time, I guess 1709 to ’85, he wrote in the 1750s, I believe, and he wrote a lot of stuff [as Alexander Grey].

By the way, now we get to socialism, and there’s a whole bunch of books I can recommend. One of the great works is by Alexander Grey. Witty, perceptive, sardonic for a socialist position. He’s also very good on Ricardo and so forth in his other book, his two books—one is called *Development of Economic Thought*, which is a short book by Grey, which deals very well with Ricardo, etc., and a larger book called *The Socialist Tradition*. He wrote from the 1930s to ’50s.

What he says about Mabli was he says Mabli’s works are “deplorably numerous and extensive.” Extremely prolific, tangled kind of stuff. He wrote his collected works—he was very popular at the time—collected works range from 12 to 26 volumes, depending on the edition, which came out in four different editions after he died.

In other words, he died in 1785. By this time, the French Revolution was coming up. Four different editions of a 30-volume work, it was extremely popular. Mably believes—he's an egalitarian, believed all men are perfectly equal and uniform. All men are one and the same everywhere, totally uniform.

He professed [unintelligible] laws of nature, and he advocated communism. His problem was, of course, the problem of who does the work? It used to be said in my day, under socialism who carries out the garbage? If property's owned in common and each person is equal, who's going to contribute to the common store?

He had some solutions to it. One solution was quite prominent in the New Left period. For those who did recognize the economic problem, that is you tighten your belt, reduce your desires and wants. The big gap of communism, it's producing very little, you'll just desire less, call it the mystic or the Indian solution or whatever, Buddhist solution.

It's not a solution that appeals to me, I'll tell you that. The other solution was a solution of Mably. He went through, logically, all these possible solutions of the economic problem under communism. Of course, we're not talking about calculation of data, this was [unintelligible]'s contribution much later.

The other line was, "Well, we give them ribbons or medals." This is the Che Guevara/Mao Tse-Tung solution. You don't give them more money because everybody's equal, but you give them a lot of ribbons—hero of the socialist revolution medal, things like that. That would provide the incentive to do the work.

[unintelligible] magnificent critique of that. So the idea that the world may find its driving force in a birthday honors list, in other words the king's

birthday honor list—the king, and if necessary, 365 official birthdays in the year.

It occurs with pathetic frequency in the more utopian forms of socialist literature, although perhaps few are so badly bitten with the notion as is Mabli. Mabli calls them distinctions. You give bigger medals for more work and so forth. Grey said, “But obviously if anyone [unintelligible] enough to say that they preferred indolence to a ribbon—there would be many such—they would have to be allowed to continue to lead idle lives, sponging on their neighbors. Perhaps someone who at last obtained a ribbon might burst into a blaze of laziness in order they might, without distraction [unintelligible] pleasure which accompanies this consideration.

“Mabli’s world, in short, is one, it’s expected that work will be done by all without intermission in the hope of a distinction to come or in gratitude for distinction already received.” He then goes on to say that, “As you hand out more and more distinctions, the value of each distinction becomes less.” Every third guy down the block has a medal; what good is it?

Then he says, “Further, Mabli does not say how or by whom his distinction ought to be conferred. It always is assumed,” says Grey, “there will be universal, unquestioning belief of a fountain of honor has sprayed its refreshing waters on all the most deserving, and are none but the most deserving. This naively innocent faith does not exist in the world, as we know, nor is it likely to exist in any earthly paradise that many may imagine.”

Then he says, “A general or a civil servant kept waiting [unintelligible] in the queue for a night of the bath, they find [unintelligible] replaced by [unintelligible] zeal may flag.” In other words, you might start resenting the fact that this guy down the block’s got his ribbon, I ain’t got my ribbon; to hell with it.

And Mably does not consider these natural human traits. Anyway, at bottom Mably was a realist and he says, "It's not going to work." He says, "I love communism," basically he said, "But there's no hope for its victory because man is not good enough to solve this problem," and be a new socialist man, as the Marxists will later say.

Basically, he's a pessimist, and therefore that really inspires something like the revolutionary communist movement. Then you had Morelli. We don't know his first name. An unknown figure writing in 1755, a Frenchman who, again, [unintelligible] five editions in a few years. Morelli was an optimist—"No, no, we can establish, man will be good enough to establish communism because man," this is of course a Rousseauan or [unintelligible] Rousseau-ization thing.

"All men are good and beautiful and benevolent, will work hard with direction," so forth. "Only institutions are evil," especially, of course, the institution of private property. [unintelligible] institutions are created by good men, how they can be evil is something none of these guys ever talk about—inner contradiction.

So for Morelli, the administration of communists he thought would also be easy. This is the beginning, by the way, of Lenin's famous statement, "All you have to do to administer resources is be a record-keeper." You don't need entrepreneurs, you don't need to allocate; all you have to do is list stuff, like a bookkeeper, and Morelli I guess originated this idea.

You just have a minister of labor and he enumerates everything—lists things and lists person, that's it, that's all you need. But then he says, "Being a pessimist on human nature," even though an optimist on, alleged optimist, "it's chiefly [unintelligible] prepare to employ [unintelligible] methods," to people, the so-called good citizens in line.

He recognizes the fact that most of these good people aren't going to do the proper amount of work.

So coercion comes in very heavily with Morelli. There's no private property, of course. Every person is maintained and employed by the public. Every man will be forced to work to contribute to the public storehouse, work according to his talents. Marriages are compulsory, and once again we have this whole thing, compulsory personal life.

Children will be brought up not only communally, but absolutely identically—identically in food, clothing and training. That assumes, of course, that all people are identical before you can really do this. All nurses, all governesses, whatever, are identical. And also, no differences in doctrine will be tolerated. Philosophic and religious doctrine is absolutely proscribed, no difference is tolerated, and children are not to be corrupted by any "fable, story or ridiculous fictions."

No fairy tales, no fiction at all. Fiction might be unsound. All trade or barter is to be forbidden by inviolable law. Everything's going to be the same. He goes into this whole architectural thing. Everybody's got to live in the same barracks, grouped in equal [unintelligible], all clothing will be made out of the same fabric, etc.

All occupations assigned by the state. Anybody attempting to change these laws, they're all sacred and inviolable forever, eternal. Anybody trying to change them or advocating change will be isolated and incarcerated for life. Again, I'm going to quote Grey as summing up, talking about all these guys—Mabli, Morelli, all the socialist and communist utopians, including Marxism.

He says, "Viewing them as a group, you have here writers who set out to describe the ideal state and reveal its functioning through ideal institutions, and in all cases they assure there never was such a happy

population. Yet in fact, no utopia has ever been described in which any sane man without any conditions consent to live, where you could possibly escape.”

The beginning of the French Revolution, [unintelligible] movement comes down, a key thing, as an organized movement to achieve a revolutionary communist movement, to achieve these ideals. [Talus Gracus Babouef], the conspiracy of the equals. By the way, in all this stuff, there’s an exciting book on the history of the movement, the socialist movement, the interconnections and ramifications.

He’s not totally sound on all the theories he’s talking about, but he’s excellent on the history of all these things. His footnotes are in about eight different languages. That’s James Billington, called *Fire In The Minds of Men*. Huge book, massive work, and he shows how each of these people influence each other and pops up in different places, sets up a revolutionary movement. Excellent stuff, and it has some very obscure, but important communist characters in the 1830s and ‘40s.

Babouef, as I say, was an organized leader. Babouef was the organizer, the Lenin, so to speak, of this movement during the French Revolution, 1790-93, that whole period. Perfect equality, perfect communism, etc., abolition of property, communal storehouses, all the rest of it. And by the way, there’d be a cadre of superiors because they’d have to be running everything, obviously, in this equal set up, which he admits, everybody’s controlled from birth to death.

And he’s very strong on punishments. All the punishments were described in loving detail by Babouef, what’s going to be done to the dissenters and heretics and people that disobey orders. All meals will be eaten in public in every commune, compulsory attendance for



everybody, for all community members, and you can't travel without permission of the administration, etc.

He was also against private entertainment, be strictly forbidden, "lest imagination, released from the supervision of a strict judge, should engender abominable vices contrary to the common wheel." That takes care of that. "All divine revelation," he was an atheist communist, would be banned by law, belief in it.

Anyway, he added to, as an organizer of the movement, rather than the theoretician so much, he said that we have to complete the French Revolution by total upheaval, [bouversement] total, total upheaval and total destruction of all existing things, so that a new and perfect world can then rise up out of this total rubble.

As usual with these guys, destruction was fairly clear, the new and perfect world was kind of cloudy that emerged eventually. Babouef wrote *The Plebeian Manifesto*, which is sort of the ancestor of the first manifesto [unintelligible] or *The Communist Manifesto* by 50 years. He winds up in his *Plebeian Manifesto*, he says, "May everything return to chaos, and out of chaos may there emerge a new and regenerated world."

As [unintelligible] comments on this, he says, "What is desired is the annihilation of all things, trusting that out of the dust of the destruction, a fair city may arise, and buoyed by such a hope, how blithely would Babouef bide the storm."

The key to Marx was—I discovered that—I was trying to read through Marxism and working in my book, [unintelligible] ten million words have been written on Marx, [unintelligible] Marx was all about. I finally came to the conclusion that he, as in Marx, was a commie. This you might think is a fairly trivial conclusion, but it isn't, because I haven't the Sowell book

which has been highly touted, but I understand that he doesn't even mention the fact that Marx was a commie, which is a key—tells something about the book.

Marx starts as a millenarian communist, atheist version, and then he tries to find the handle. He's not interested in convincing people and all the rest of it. He wants to come to the conclusion it's inevitable. Nature is the creed or whatever, it's going to come inevitably. That's the so-called scientific aspect, scientific socialism, against utopian—"scientific" because the inevitable laws of history decree it will come about.

And morality then becomes swinging in the inevitable. It's not that Marx was anti-morality. "Moral" meant anything which furthered the communist revolution, inevitable revolution, and the immoral is that which blocks it or stops it, restrains it, I should say. So the idea of mankind is to help along the inevitable. Marx's famous metaphor, "Become the midwife of history." Alexander [unintelligible] points out a lot of obstetrical metaphors in Marx.

So Marx starts off as a commie, then he tries to find the handle of why it's inevitable, and [unintelligible]. The handle consists of an integration, I think a very interesting integration of Hegelian, the alienation stuff, he starts off in life as a left Hegelian. The dialectic, alienation and all the rest of it, and later on trying to find the economic, and he gets to the class struggle and alienation and the proletariat and class conflict.

And then at the class conflict stage, why does capitalism inevitably emerge in a socialist revolution, communist revolution? And then the labor theory of value comes in very late in this thing as part of a handle on the theory of crisis and all that, the impoverishment of the proletariat, to show why it is the proletariat will rise up and smash the capitalist class.

[unintelligible] capitalists become fewer and fewer, and workers become larger and larger, then it becomes fairly easy to use it. The key was that he was a communist, and his vision was how do you achieve ultimate communism?

An interesting thing is that Marx didn't publish the economic and philosophical manuscripts of 1844, much of this was in, did not get published in his lifetime, and also Engels didn't publish it. Engels lived on for 12 years or so after Marx, and tried to publish *Das Kapital*, which was also unfinished, he never published this stuff.

In fact, it never got published until, I think the 1930s. So Marxism grew up in Europe not knowing anything about the communist stuff, about so-called humanist aspects of Marx or Hegelian aspects. [Kausky], who became Engels' anointed as leading the cycle, Karl Kausky in Germany didn't know that Marx had any moral theory at all; he just thought that Marx was scientific and an economist, and tried to bring in some morality, I think Darwin or something like that.

He didn't know anything about this. So the question is why did Marx and Engels suppress the publication of this material, so-called early Marx? The humanist, I think he said with a certain amount of sardonic aspect to it. And we'll see I think why this is true, because I don't think anybody would've bought it. Not too many communists or proletarians would've bought the whole package if they knew about it. After the humanist stuff came out in the 1930s, etc., and Marxists began to look at it, then it became sort of a conflict between the so-called humanist Marxists—by that time the labor theory of value was becoming discredited—very few Marxists now believe in the labor theory of value.

Even Joan Robinson and people like that have abandoned it. Then they started latching onto the alleged humanist early Marx—alienation, it all

sounds very trendy, etc. Not quite realizing it's even more totalitarian than the so-called scientific economist Marx, or maybe realizing it. At any rate, so there was a split, that [Altousei and Sweasie] and these people said, "No, the early stuff was irrelevant, he wasn't really a humanist."

Basically, there was only one Marx, and the one Marx is pretty monstrous, and it's a combination of the communist vision and humanist vision, plus the later stuff, economic stuff, which is essentially trying to find a route to the inevitable communism. Books on all this, I'll suggest one of them which I think is a brilliant work by Robert C. Tucker called *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx*.

Deals with the communist part and how Marx arrived at it and Hegel, Hegelianism and so forth and so on. There's some other pretty good stuff. Bruce [Maxlich] of all people, who's sort of a Freudian psychobabble historian, has a very good book on the meaning of Karl Marx—came out a year or two ago.

But I'm going to start even earlier with Karl Marx because I think it's just important, which has been neglected even by Tucker, some of this. It's not realized that early early Marx, before the humanist, before the economic [unintelligible] manuscript, before even official communism in 1843-44, Marx begins life as a messianic Christian.

This has been totally overlooked, and we all know that Marx was of Jewish descent, and his father converted to Lutheranism, a very modest form of Lutheranism, as sort of compulsory conversion shortly before Marx was born. What's not realized is that Marx in high school was a Christian, a dedicated Christian of some sort, and also his graduation essay in high school in 1835 was on an assigned topic that he was quite ardent about, called *The Union of the Faithful with Christ*.

And in this union, he talks about, I think there's certain hints of the Hegelian messianic stuff, the unity of the blob. Talks about the mystical necessity for union of Christ, and God's rejection of man. This is not really orthodox Christian as far as I'm concerned. It's beginning this whole alienation-reunion stuff, very early. He was 17 years old at that point.

He also wrote in the late '30s and early '40s while he was a student at the University of Berlin and learning about Hegel, he also wrote some poems, which I think is very revealing. I really think they sort of foreshadow Marx's broad system. The poems have not been stressed by historians.

Maslich talks about it, and Robert Payne in his book *The Young Karl Marx*, talks about them. I'll read you a couple stanzas from a poem, because I think they're very significant. The basic emphasis in these poems was—usually it's been dismissed by historians as just romantic trash or whatever. I don't think it's trash. I think it's really pretty revealing.

Basic themes of these early Marxian poems, were one, megalomania, a desire of Marx for total omnipotence, and two, hatred of God for being greater than he is, basically. In other words, for creating a world which he didn't. And [unintelligible] therefore for destruction of the universe.

This is from his poem, *Feelings*. The hatred of God of creation—for example, he said, "I hate all the gods." At any rate, in his poem *Feelings*, it has the following two stanzas: "Worlds I would destroy forever since I can create no world, since my [unintelligible] they notice never. Heaven, I would comprehend, I would draw the world to me, loving, hating, I intend on my stars shine brilliantly."

And by the way, Bakunin who was a communist anarchist at the time, I think is important here, the retort of Bakunin to Voltaire—Voltaire’s famous phrase—Voltaire was a skeptical atheist, I guess—there’s a difference between militant atheists and skeptical atheists, and Marx was a militant atheist, as was Bakunin.

Voltaire’s famous phrase was, “If God did not exist, it would be necessary to create him.” Bakunin’s retort to that, and I think even more interesting and revelatory, “If God did exist, it would be necessary to destroy him.” I think you should ponder that for a minute because I think that’s behind much of militant atheism.

At any rate, particularly interesting is poetic drama called [Ulanem], which Marx rate, the hero is Ulanem, and Ulanem has a soliloquy in which he pours out his hatred for the universe. “I shall howl gigantic curses on mankind, as it is having no purpose safe to happen, to be ruined, so that there should be something to ruined.

“There is a something which devours, I weep within it, and I bring the world to ruins. The world which [books] between me and the abyss, I will smash to pieces with my enduring curses. I’ll throw my arms around its harsh reality. Embracing me, the world would dumbly pass away and then sink down to utter nothingness, perish with no existence. That would be really living.”

I think an interesting inner contradiction, as the Marxists would say. You’re really living, destroy the whole world. “The leaden world holds us fast, and we are chained, shattered, empty, frightened, eternally chained to this marble block of being, and we are the apes that recall God.”

And finally, my final phrase here is in a poem called *The Fiddler*, he says, “With Satan I have struck my deal. He chalks the signs, beats time for me. I play the death march fast and free.” I like the “free” part. I

think these are very revelatory considering Marx's later doctrines and so forth—first for destruction, and a new world somehow emerging, vaguely emerging afterwards.

Just one other quote on communism before we leave it, on the idea of unity of all people, unity of God, etc. As I mentioned Chesterton's critique of [Annie Bazant] last night, and I found it—Annie was a Fabian socialist and a theosophist, sort of a neo-Buddhist. Chesterton writes, "According to Mrs. Bazant, the universal church is simply the universal self. It is the doctrine that we are really all one person, that there are no real walls of individuality between man and man.

"She does not tell us to love our neighbor; she tells us to be our neighbors. The intellectual abyss between Buddhism and Christianity is that for the Buddhist or theosophist personality," it means individual personality, "is the fall of man. For the Christian it is the purpose of God, the whole point of this cosmic idea."

I think that sets it off very nicely. As I say, I think the labor theory of value and all that stuff, this is all peripheral to Marx's basic thrust. His aim of the withering away of a state, which is attractive to I guess some libertarians, what he did is he took that, he took the phrase, even, the famous phrase of what was supposedly [unintelligible] communism, the government of men shall be replaced by the administration of things, is really a phrase coined by a French libertarian theorist called [Vimlayay].

They were talking about the withering away of the state into a laissez-faire world, a market world in which there would be no government, just administration of things. There it makes sense. It makes no sense—one of the reasons it makes no sense in the communist version of it is because instead of having private ownership, you have communal ownership.

So some kind of communist makes a decision for allocation of resources. Of course, he assumes in communism there'll be super-abundance, so you don't have to worry about it. If there isn't super-abundance, somebody's got to allocate, and the whole world then allocates some resources in some way, and of course what you inevitably have is a group of people calling themselves representatives of the proletariat or whatever, and actually doing the allocating—you're back to exploitation of man by man, etc.

So once you assume a one world communal collective ownership, you don't really wither away the state, although you can call it the People's Statistical Bureau and not a state—this is, by the way, what Colonel Qaddafi does in Libya. People don't really know it—Colonel Qaddafi, there is no government in Libya; there's also a People's Statistical Bureau, a People's Statistical Congress. You can call the thing anything you want, but a state under any other name will smell as lousily.

Another key thing of Marx's vision of communism, I can't leave without that, a key thing about communism, there is no division of labor—the division of labor is smashed. Alienation is the division of labor. A key part of alienation. The unity of man with man means that everybody does everything. Everybody's sort of an all-around dilettante.

Marx's famous phrase in the critique of [unintelligible] program, everybody will spend two hours in the morning being an artist, another two hours working in the field, another two hours doing this, becoming a critic, another two hours... Life is one big dilettante paradise, and he said, "The cattle will be [reared] for two hours in the evening," to which Alexander Grey retorts, "The cattle might have some objection to that," casual [unintelligible] two hours in the evening. So the division of labor is a key to the concept of communism, the end of the division of labor.



One of the reasons—I really can't leave this—one of the reasons why I think Marx didn't publish any of this stuff, and Engels didn't either, is because Marx admitted—I found this really interesting and surprising—after the proletarian revolution, the great, marvelous proletarian revolution—communism comes in two stages, not just the socialist and communist stage, which is the Stalinist bowdlerizing of it—the first stage, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is what he calls raw communism.

This is before you get the higher communism, the ultimate communism where there's communal ownership and everybody's happy and so forth and so on. In raw communism—there's a description of raw communism. It's pretty horrifying. In other words, it'd be difficult I think to inspire a proletarian communist movement for the first stage of raw communism, which he says is inevitable.

He says that raw communism will be the acme of human greed and envy, says everything that anti-communists talk about when you talk about communism. Envy will run rampant, universal theft, universal destruction, so forth and so on. And he says that—about raw communism—said it's egalitarian, and envy will run rampant. And again, you have communism women coming in.

He says, "The same way as women is to abandon marriage, marriage for general prostitution," in other words, universal prostitution, "so the whole world of wealth, that is the objective being of man, shall ban the relation of exclusive marriage with a private property owner for the relation of general prostitution in the community."

He sets really a monstrous setup. The personality of man will be negated, as he says general envy constituting itself as power is a disguise in which greed re-establishes itself and satisfies itself, etc. But

then, so his description of a communist world, at least the first stage, is just as horrifying as any anti-communist description of it.

But then you see, what happens is, by the [aufhebung], the magic dialectic, it's suddenly transcended, bingo, you can have a world of pure communism and harmony and all that. I don't think anybody's going to commit their lives to raw communism, and I think it's one of the reasons why he and Engels never published it.

At any rate, so there's no division of labor. In the world of Joachim of Fiore when everybody's pure spirit, you can sort of see how it might work. It would not work in a world where bodies are around, as an economic problem. By the way, poor Craig Roberts, before he became a supply sider, wrote two very good books on this—*Alienation and Marxism* and something else. He describes key to alienation becoming eradication of the division of labor. That's the key to Marxist, one of Marx's goals.

What happens is when communists took over in Russia, Roberts points out, they try to establish raw communism, eliminate money and so forth and so on, so-called raw communism, tried to establish it. It didn't work, and Lenin being a supreme pragmatist, "Uh-oh, step back, fellows," and then reestablished capitalism during the 1920s.

I'll say one thing about the theory of value here before I leave Marx. If you read *Das Kapital*, first volume. Forget—there's all the contradictions between first and third volume and all that. Just read the first volume, the first three pages will tell you all. He starts off by saying products exchange at certain prices. What determines these prices, what determines these values?

He says, "What is it? First of all," he says, "Values are equal." First mistake. Since the price of something is equal to something else, since

the Wonder Bread costs \$1.09 a loaf, this means that somehow the loaf and the bread are equal value, the bread and the money are equal value, or something else that's \$1.09 has equal value.

So he immediately says there's an equality of value. That's the first mistake, since we know Austrian subjectivism—the fact there's any exchange at all means there must be inequality of value. Both parties value the product unequally. In other words, if I buy a newspaper for a quarter, it's not that I value the quarter equally with a newspaper, or a newsstand doesn't value [unintelligible]; otherwise, why bother exchanging at all? What's the point of exchanging if they're both the same thing anyway?

So the point is both have a reverse inequality. I value the newspaper, getting the Washington Post or whatever higher than my quarter, and the newsstand of course values the quarter higher than keeping the Washington Post. We have a double reverse inequality of value, which creates the condition for exchange, for profitable exchange for both parties, so both parties benefit.

So there's no equality of value. Quite the opposite—there's a double inequality. That's the first problem in Marx's formulation. Then he says, "Well, you have equality of value between these two things which are the same price, so what is equal about them? What is there in these things that's equal? They're not of equal weight, that can't be it; not of equal volume, that can't be it."

Finally, he works the thing, "Must be equal quantity of labor," by certain exegesis. And at that point you really don't have to read the rest of it, because you have about four or five fallacies all piled on top of each other. And then of course there's a problem, how do you arrive at different prices and have same quantity of labor and all the rest of it?

There's a whole bunch of problems with the labor theory of value, which I need not go into. [unintelligible] the famous refutation of Marx's theory of value and theory of prices, which is available in a separation edition, I think it's called *Karl Marx and the Close of His System*, unfortunately what happens always when Marx is refuted, the Marxists have a fallback position.

It's very much like a religious cult. If Marx makes a whole bunch of predictions, a whole bunch of statements which turn out to be wrong, you then change the terms of the argument. You say, "Well, he didn't really mean that." Marx obviously meant to explain the price system by the labor theory of value.

When it turns out he couldn't explain it, the Marxists say, "He didn't really mean prices; he just meant value in some mystical inherent sense; has nothing to do with price." That's one way to wash that out—"You can't really refute it at all." The second thing, Marx's famous prediction of why it is we have an inevitable proletarian revolution, is the workers get worse and worse off, the impoverishment of the working class, and they finally rise up in desperation.

So it's obvious through history, as the 19<sup>th</sup> century and 20<sup>th</sup> century proceeded, workers are getting better and better off, so doesn't this refute Marx's key prediction about why proletarian revolution is inevitable? So the Marxists' fallback position, "Well, he didn't mean absolute impoverishment; he meant relative impoverishment. He meant the workers, even though they might be much better off than they were 50 years ago, are still less well off than Rockefeller or Bunker Hunt."

So you change the terms, I can't see anybody really engaging in bloody revolution, committing their life to bloody revolution because you only have one swimming pool instead of five. [laughter] Somehow, the so-

called relative deprivation. This is, by the way, the gimmick by which everybody's always—you always have a huge number of people under the poverty line.

We keep redefining the poverty line. "Poverty doesn't mean subsistence; it means whatever. TV sets. If you don't have a TV set, you're under the poverty line." So they keep pushing the so-called poverty line up, so you always have at least a third of the population impoverished. You can never eliminate poverty because there's always some guy with five yachts instead of one.

By the way, somebody asked me about Tom Sowell's book on Marxism. I think it's a highly inflated work. Not only doesn't he talk about communism, which is the key; he also criticizes [Bombarverk] and absolute deprivation from the same Marxist position. He takes the Marxian line that he didn't mean it, and he means relative deprivation. He wrote the book when he was still a Marxist.

If you look at Sowell's footnotes, there's nothing after about 1965, which is the key to the composition of the book. He took the book—since he's now a big shot, slapped the other book [unintelligible] and take your old notes and whatever, articles, and he slapped together and published it.

It's not unique to Sowell.

I've got to talk about 19<sup>th</sup> century America and post-millennialism. It's a short course in American history, and it's very important. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, 1820s approximately, the [pietous] movement develops. Before that, it's too extreme to say Christianity died out in the United States, but it almost did.

In other words, most Christians were a Unitarian of some sort. Christianity was sort of dying out, and I don't know if it died out in

Europe, but Europe pietism mostly begins around the same period. And in fact, the founding fathers were all deists—even George Washington. He's always held up as a great Christian; he's not a Christian at all, he was a deist.

Actually, of the founding fathers, the only ones who were really Christian were the older ones—Sam Adams and Patrick Henry, who were a little older than the rest and were still Calvinist Christians. The others were all sort of deists, which means that God is a great clockmaker, so to speak. God created the world, created natural law, and then left, and then everything runs by itself, sort of.

Christianity then is revived in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century in the United States, and also in Europe, although I'm not going to make any dramatic pronouncements about Europe, by pietism, which is a new form of Christianity, I think brand new, through the revival movements, which we're now fairly familiar with.

In those days it was a big new thing. Where you arrive at Christianity through a mystical experience or emotional, mystical conversion, with revival meetings and rolling on the floor, speaking in tongues and so forth and so on. You're born again. Not just a regular baptism, but another baptism, a baptism of the Holy Spirit.

A second baptism becomes necessary. With this new form of post-millennial pietism, swept Protestantism, taking over almost completely, especially in the north, especially Yankee country—I define Yankees as being a cultural group who originated in rural New England, not so much Boston or the cities, but rural New England, rural Connecticut, Massachusetts, etc., and then emigrating. There were big migrants.

Heading westward into upstate New York, western New York, northern Ohio, the famous Western Reserve area, northern Indiana, northern

Illinois. This is Yankee country. The Yankees were always compulsory conformists, what one historian called Yankee imperialists. They wanted to crush all dissent in one form or another.

It was the Yankee who originated the public school system in the United States, for example—force everybody into public school and teach them the correct doctrine. So the Yankees took to this like a duck takes to water, this new form of pietism. Essentially, the new form of pietism was as follows: Creeds are not important. Whether you're a Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist doesn't make any difference.

It's all interdenominational, as long as you're a Christian. Law is unimportant. The bible is unimportant. The key thing is this personal relation with God. And this is, by the way, the origin of the YMCA movement, all the interdenominational movements, because divisions between Protestant churches are unimportant.

Each individual then is sort of naked to his creator. In other words, a personal relationship with God and Man, and the church is unimportant too. Whether you're a church member is really unimportant, and which church you belong to is unimportant.

The Yankee wing, which is called Evangelical pietism, is different from the southern pietists, which became sort of quietist types. You try to achieve your born again conversion and that's it. It has no political implication. Evangelical pietists believe it's part of pietism that you can't be saved unless you maximize the salvation of everybody else—key.

It's not just you like to have a missionary thing and bring everybody else the word—more than that—it's your divine duty—otherwise you won't be saved—to try to maximize everybody else's salvation. So in order to do that, in order to maximize everybody's salvation, you have to eliminate sin—temptation, occasions for sin, so forth and so on.

So very quickly, of course, they became big statisticians, because you use the government as a shortcut to stamping out sin and trying to create the conditions for this, to save individual souls by [unintelligible] stamping out sin. So what you have from the very beginning of pietism, from 1830s until 1920s, really, the whole 19<sup>th</sup> century, you have a situation where all these guys were constantly spending their time trying to outlaw sin on the local and state level in the United States—meaning anything which interferes with your theological free will.

These were theological free willers. So that anything which clouds your mind, so to speak, and interferes with your free will, should be outlawed. This meant, in practice, demon rum, number one, liquor, liquor's evil. They broadened the definition of sin. One Catholic opponent of this said they made sin where God did not.

So anything liquor is sinful, because liquor clouds your mind of theological free will. Liquor is evil. Anything on Sunday except going to church is evil and should be stamped out. So drinking liquor on Sunday is probably the ultimate evil, it's like a double-whammy. [laughter]

There's nothing more sinful than drinking liquor on Sunday. And the third thing, of course, is the Roman Catholic Church, where everybody's enslaved agents of the Vatican, and the pope is the antichrist. So the idea is to stamp out liquor, stamp out Sunday activity and stamp out Catholicism.

Now, they couldn't stamp out Catholicism exactly, directly, constitutionally. They tried their best. They tried to restrict Catholic immigration in various ways, and once the adult—they said, "Adult Catholics are doomed, but you get the kids." The famous cry of the pietists was, "Christianize the Catholics," and the way you do it is get the kids in the public school system, prevent parochial schools, outlaw



parochial schools, get the kids in the public schools and then Protestantize them, or pietize them.”

So the whole public school system, the real thrust of the public school system was pietists, was Protestant pietists. All these guys I’ve hated for years, like Horace Mann, the whole public school movement, their real motivation was pietist. “I want to crush the Catholics and Lutherans,” the German Lutherans in particular, who are formalists, liturgical Christians.

And you get them by getting the kids in the public schools and Protestantizing them. In many cases, many jurisdictions in the United States, for example, you could not be a public school teacher unless you were a Protestant church member. This is going on on the local and state level for 100 years. What happens is that the Catholics, as they come to the United States, and the German Lutherans that come to the United States, are horrified.

First of all, the Germans, both Lutheran and Catholic, have marvelous customs, charming customs. After going to church on Sunday, the whole family repairs to a beer garden with a brass band and so forth, and here they are in a beer garden minding their own business, and these WASP fanatics descend upon them, “Sin, sin, double sin, crush kill.” [laughter]

This conflict is going on for almost 100 years. These guys are hopped up. So what you have then is the party system has developed in the United States until 1896. From 1830 to 1896, the political party system has a one-to-one correlation between pietists versus liturgicals. In other words, those who believe the importance for salvation is the church—joining the church, obeying the law, the sacraments or whatever. Total conflict here.

Liturgical [unintelligible] consists of Catholics, German Lutherans and old-style Calvinists, by the way. Those who are left, who hated the

revival movement and the pietists, became allied with the Catholics. So what you have, you have a political party system with a one-to-one correlation—the Whig Party and the Republican Party were straight pietists, and the Democrat Party was liturgical, and never the 'twain met.

So what you have is a total fantastic ideological conflict in the Republicans and Democrats, everybody hating each other's guts. There were no independent voters, no floating vote. No Democrat would ever vote Republican and vice versa. What they'd do is if your guy wasn't militant enough, he just didn't vote, he just stayed home, and usually elects were very close.

So the idea in the campaign is not to sell out to the [unintelligible]. The idea is to be as militant as possible to get your guys to vote. So on the campaigns, the politicians were even more hardcore than they were the rest of the time. It must've been a wonderful world to live in. And the thing is, worse than economics says, these guys, the economic creed was sort of a generalized consciousness from a religious creed.

In other words, the Republican leadership and the Whig leadership would tell their people, "Look, just as you need big government on a local level to stamp out sin and liquor and dancing and things like that, in the same way you need government on an economic national level to stamp out cheap foreign products and cheap foreign people, and increase purchasing power by inflation, by printing more money," and so forth and so on, and high tariffs.

In other words, there was a direct relationship between the big state on a national economic level and the local level. In the same way, the Democratic leadership, all laissez-faire liberals, would tell their people, "Look, the same WASP SOBs that are trying to outlaw your liquor and your parochial schools are the people who are trying to prevent, keep out

cheap foreign products and have special privileges, and decrease the value of your savings through inflation.”

So this is how people got hopped up. This is why you have illiterates writing books and pamphlets on gold and silver and banking. I can't get my own students interested in this stuff. There's people writing pamphlets, they're all hopped up. The reason they're hopped up is because of the original religious motivation.

In this situation, unfortunately one of the black moments in American history came in the Democrat Convention of 1896, when the Democratic Party, the great liturgical, known as the party of personal liberty—by the way, the Democrats were known as the party of personal liberty, both to themselves and other people, and Republicans were known as the party of great moral ideas.

And so the Democrats in 1896 were taken over by the extreme pietists in one of the cataclysmic events, by various reasons. By that time, the South, which was always of course Democrat since the Civil War, southern pietism was transformed into Prohibitionism and Evangelicalism, which it had not been before, and the mountain states are created—you can imagine how many people were in Idaho.

There are no people in Idaho now; you can imagine how many there were in 1890. [Laughter] These phony states were all created by Republicans, they knew they were pietists. Most of these people were pietists, and they vote Republican. And within the Democratic Party there were pietists.

And so Bryant, one of the most evil people in American history, William Jennings Bryant, was able to form a coalition between the southern pietists and the mountain pietists to take over the party and kick out the liturgicals, at which point the whole laissez-faire movement drops out. In

other words, the Democratic Party had been the political embodiment of laissez-faire and libertarianism, liberalism. There was now no longer any political party to reflect this. Both parties are now pietist, more or less, and so this left a power vacuum for experts, intellectuals, progressives, etc., to take over. The results we all know.

This is a lead into a couple of these progressive intellectuals I can't ignore, both philosophers and economists. The Progressive Movement was a pure pietist movement. As a matter of fact, everybody who I detest was involved in this thing. The Progressive Party Convention, for example, in 1912, which was not the only Progressive Movement—they were the extreme versions—Teddy Roosevelt was an old-time Progressive.

He began his career as police commissioner of New York, smashing saloons. This group consisted of the following people, the Progressive Convention: Morgan Partners, who are extremely important—I can't get into all that—Morgan Partners, JP Morgan Partners, pietist ministers, social workers, intellectuals, economists, political scientists, shrinks—almost everybody you can think of was involved in this thing.

Roosevelt's acceptance speech was called a confession of faith, and in his speech was punctuated by him singing one of the pietist hymns, "Follow follow follow Jesus' way," substituted the word "Roosevelt" for the word "Jesus." "Amen," and finally Roosevelt wound up his famous [unintelligible] by saying, "As we stand at Armageddon, we battle for the Lord."

So there's fantastic religious, pietist imagery here. What you have is all these guys, all these progressive intellectuals, from John Dewey, Richard [unintelligible] and all these people, every one of them, it's bing

bing bing, they all grew up in pietist homes, they're all rural New Englanders or rural New Yorkers, whatever, all Yankees.

Usually their father was a preacher or their mother was the daughter of a preacher. They usually kept a very strict sabbatharian home—nothing was done on Sunday except praying, etc. And they wind up, they have post-millennial pietism in the gradual sense—not the sense of killing everybody immediately, which we talked about before, but gradually, sort of evolutionary.

The government takes over and the government becomes God's major instrument. The great phrase, which Eeley repeats, and all these guys repeat—Eeley was the founder of the American Economic Association, by the way, a great progressive statist intellectual. The phrase is, "Government is God's major instrument of redemption." Through government, through statism, through purging, crushing liquor and bringing about equality and statism and government regulation, everything, kingdom of God on earth is established gradually. And by the way, Eeley thought it was going to be pretty fast. It wasn't so damn gradual. He talked about in his lifetime perhaps the kingdom of God on earth will be established by this method.

John Dewey, of course, is the classic example of atheists or secular humanists. It's little known, the fact that at the beginning of his life, he was a Christian post-millennial pietist. In the 1890s he taught at the University of Michigan, Christian sociology, etc., and talked in these terms.

It's very easy for these guys to become secularist. All they said was, "To have a kingdom of God on earth, we'll establish through government." Pretty soon God sort of drops out and you've got the government, why worry about God? You have a gradual secularization. The post-

millenials sort of die out. By 1920 they all died out because they all became straight people we know and love—social gospel ministers and all the rest of it—people who are essentially non-theists.

**end of transcript.**