

Capitalism vs. Communism - blue notebook - 26.11.09 - Wiesbaden  
A H.A.L.O. document  
©RFSN 2010

Communism, as presented in the Communist Manifesto, sounds good, many of the points are astoundingly as true today as they were in 1872, when first published, but it is a drawn out whine, and that is its downfall. It is actually the death-whine of the crushed aristocracy masked behind new terminology. It is absurd to believe, for whatever criteria, that communism will do away with human avarice and vice. It is not a moral code, but a political one. His virulent vilification of the bourgeoisie is not misplaced, but his argument simply leaves out the weakness of man in general. There shall be no Utopia on Earth, except for the one we build for ourselves individually, if we are clever, or intelligent enough.

Capitalism as we know it today is an abuse and a corruption of a perfectly sound theory. Communism is the same thing in different words, and we must accept the only conclusion to which we can come: that it is not the theory, but the man who is at fault. Both capitalism and communism, at their highest ideal, are conducive to world peace. In the end, they are not mutually exclusive, and it is a political misunderstanding and a semantic stubbornness which has led to the great political debate of the 20<sup>th</sup> century between capitalism and communism. As Marx clearly stated in his manifesto, America plays a key role in this debate. Let us study America and her role in this major world drama.

At the onset of his manifesto, that is, part one, Marx shows himself hysterically afraid of the coming of a new world, a new era. He compares it terribly unfavourably against how it used to be. It used to be aristocracy! Tremendously powerful philosophers, such as Marx and Ortega y Gasset, modern social critics, refer to a recent aristocratic past to support their arguments. Despite their assertions that history has always been unkind to the lower classes, neither of these two philosophers will deny that the masses require a head, a leader class to organize the human resources into a functional and productive unit. They thereby pledge their allegiance, albeit unknowingly, to the outgoing world order,

the aristocratic order. Is it not because of the very abuses of the aristocrats that society was changed?

Does man not have a direction, a duty to himself to progress? But no, capitalism is as well diseased, for the accusations of Marx are accurate, and the weakness of man has negated the nominal progress we have experienced over the last 200 years or so, since the advent of the industrial revolution, which can really be dated back 500 years, to the discovery of America. Where would we be with world communism? Communism in its conception is not a politically viable establishment in a globalized world. The arguments of Marx demonstrate this, when he laments universal interdependence. However, it is true that in order to have peace, all must benefit, which is not the case today. The US and western world hegemony will not allow it.

Five hundred years of exploitation of the South American continent have not succeeded in reducing the massive, noble continent. Noble because it powered the whole of western civilization to the giddy heights at which it finds itself today. Native Americans have never wanted to have anything to do with capitalism as such. Their own culture was based on an unknown sort of social communism, subservient to the elite as anywhere else, without even the use of money or salaries as we know them. Communism, as an imposed, re-veiled form of aristocracy which it denies itself to be can only survive through militant imposition. As such, it has no future on the world stage. As Marx clearly states, capitalism is doomed to failure, but so is communism.

Together, they could solve a great big part of the world's problems, yet naturally, they will never be able to crack the avarice and vice of men. If, however, they can provide the most of humanity with satisfactory living conditions, then the need for warfare is reduced. There are many huge questions which must be additionally addressed, such as religion, high culture, government, society, etc...

Marx, like a crying child who has had his toy taken away, denounces the takers. But he forgets the smaller child from whom he originally took the toy himself. It is in

itself human nature to conveniently forget or overlook ones own transgressions. It is a human phenomenon, the vicious cycle in which we live, and the state of denial we ourselves inhabit when we exempt ourselves from the equation. Communism is not a political party, communism is a way of life, which must happen naturally. As such communism cannot, and does not, exist in the present day of capitalistic bourgeois globalization. Globalization is for capitalism, not for communism. As such, there is no real alternative for the communist but a massive scale war against a massive scale nemesis.

Capitalism as we know it is not good for the world, but only for the ruling elite, which is only nominal and temporary, as Marx unequivocally states at the end of his first chapter. Capitalism is a voracious animal which will end up eating itself, whose own seed will only inherit chaos and destruction, for globalization as it is run today can only end in destruction on a global scale, at the very least in economic terms.

Can the world be globalized, capitalistic, and communist? What sort of government would meet the needs of a modern world? We can, of course, say that capitalism sucks, but how many of these communists are addicted to capitalistic poisons like cigarettes, TV, conspicuous consumption, etc... The man is not taken into the equation. The reason is that both arguments, both communism and capitalism, are false arguments.

Marx praises seclusion, nationalism, national one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness. Conquest of political power by the proletariat. Can there be anything more contradictory? Is it not clear than any movement that supplants some regime, simply becomes a new regime unto itself? What is so wrong with a world literature? Is the human being not one species? It seems natural for the world to come together, to get to know itself, to smash perceptions born of ignorance. How can such a thing be strictly bad? If capitalism was a means to an end, then we must re-evaluate.

We in the west see the world through western eyes. That is bad. But as victors on the stage of world politics, who will deny us our spoils? The adversaries have been defeated, their agendas trampled, their heroes humiliated, their weakness exposed, their dis-unity exploited. There is no one to protect the fort. Communism as an economic infrastructure is not powerful enough to contend with capitalism. And truly, part of the arguments of the Marxists are the whines of a child. It is simply not serious, nor does it address the serious, all-too-real, true concerns of people, of man and woman. The reason that the Communist Manifesto cannot and does not address the fundamental problems of man, which would create of it a power truly strong enough to rival capitalism, is because it is an impostor, a wolf masquerading in sheep's clothing.

Communism is the death rattle of the old aristocratic elite, longing for the olden feudal hierarchy of existence. Communism is not able to compete economically with capitalism on any front. And yet, as the main players on the world stage, the possessors of the torch of human existence, what is the vested interest in the ideal of ultimately dismantling and discarding national industrial and economic treasures? The fleeting profit, the instant yet temporary gratification. As is society in general, so is the individual. The west has provided the impetus for globalization, at the stated cost of the very state. Why this suicidal activity, to what end?

Drawing barbarians to civilization. Another word for education. Ideally, it would be education, and not indoctrination. That is to say, education should be sciences, mathematics, nature, arts, sport, etiquette, belief. Capitalism must enslave the world through indoctrination. The indoctrination is to keep those powerful in power. In this respect, it is no different than communism, just more covert, as it must be done under the banner of freedom. Let us say that power has the ability to seriously cloud judgment. Should not the whole world be educated? But of course, who is educating them? It is merely the interested parties who set the trap for the corruption of the nature of man, whoever they be, under any name of their choosing, throughout all time, as clearly stated by Marx.

Rural life is equal to idiocy, is the postulation. If Marx did not mean it quite literally, then he is guilty of sarcasm, which is not an admirable trait in a politician, a leader of men morally, under ideal circumstances.

It is true, we have made the smaller, weaker nations dependent, and we directly cause their poverty. For now, with machinery, we no longer need slaves. So many slaves anyway. We put them out of the business of their own land. The reason that this condition came about was the cosmic passivity of all the subject peoples of the world when confronted by the White Conqueror. The White Conqueror is legendary, and every nation awaits him. Some say it is the end, others proclaim him as the greatest of civilizers. The White race, like the Jews, the chosen race. What is the White Covenant, to which god do we pray? Is there a world religion? Well, there ought to be a Religion of Man, negating Marx's hatred toward a world people.

The conquest of the White man is complete. The sovereign Yellow people are alive, awake. The world stage has been set. India will remain seated. She is the wisest, and the saddest. The Americans are backed politically by all of western Europe, though western Europe begins to feel the Imperial pressure that America long felt. Elite Americans are also Occidental, though that will soon change. Islam has millions upon millions. China, South, Central America, all will feel the Imperial bloodlust of the capitalists.

The bourgeois class is prominent in Western Europe and in America. It is interesting to think that a few short generations ago, they were the downtrodden serfs, in few cases the celebrated Freeman, in honor of his own former enslavement. It is the same peasants who now own houses and cars, are industrialists, captains of corporation. They can do it, but hey turn a blind eye to what allows it. What allows it is the exploitation of the world's resource lands and peoples, like Colombia, torn asunder by the massive lust for the consumption of cocaine in America and Europe. Our wealth is based on their poverty, and capitalism is the vehicle.

“Take the money and run” is the cry of the capitalist. “I don’t care where it comes from”. I will kill my neighbour for the common good of man. It makes perfect sense nevertheless, the smear campaign communism has received from capitalism, which is also not able to touch upon the true concerns of man for the reason of its interest in the outcome. Therefore it can be said that these ideologies take on a life of their own as the ideologies of legions of men. We today are mortally afraid of the thinking man, as has always been the case in times of injustice, and therefore take our ideological references only from the past. Even Marx, a aristocratic apologist under another guise is guilty of the same offense. Free trade does not need an enemy, it needs modifications. So, who then is driving this whole machinery that they should shun reform so?

To find a culprit, look for who has an interest in the current status quo, that is, who wins, that is, who is rich from this whole scheme. Marxism is an attempt at the mass programming of society, just as capitalism is its enslavement. It is a covenant with an ideology, which is the real god.

For Marx, too much civilization is like throwing pearls to the pigs. The old aristocrat line. Capitalism has put the whole world at the fingertip of the masses. Now more than ever are the masses truly empowered, more than in an artificially enforced communist society imposed by law, such as all communist societies heretofore. Only in a state of balance can ideological communism succeed as a doctrine, and not in a globalized mega-world of mega-problems, as the one created by capitalism.

The industrial revolution created a need for vast numbers of workers to man the machines in massive factories that polluted the environment in unimaginable, unspeakable, horrible and unprecedented ways. We introduced all sorts of poisons into our bodies, water sources, land, atmosphere and anywhere else we could. Everywhere. We began the suicidal phase of poisoning ourselves completely, inside and out. Then we discovered that the Chinese could produce anything we could, at a fraction of the cost, thereby polluting their own atmosphere and not ours. Better them than us. Only we put

ourselves out of work. Capitalism took all industry to China and Asia. Our forests were spared, but not our jobs.

The “Yellow Menace” is going to take over the world!!! It was western money that established their industrial base. It was western money that brought business to their shores. It was their huge amounts of human resources that possibilitated this transfer of work from us to them, but it was us who did it. As usual the spin on the reality has misled the average person to think that Asia is an industrial powerhouse. Why do we want our own people to think this? Because we want them to think that we are powerless against the march of the “Yellow Menace”. We claim that the world is free, as the Spanish claimed that the Indian was free after his near total decimation. As the US claims Iraq has been liberated, so does capitalism claim for itself to be the liberator of men. It is no such thing; it is the opposite.

Marx is correct about the treatment of the working class by the elite, there is no denying this. But no one has said capitalism is perfect. How would the communist treatment of the proletariat be? Let us ask the victims of Lenin, or Stalin, or Mao, or Castro. It is true, war is war, but let us not claim innocence in war. If it is true, what Marx says about history, and the whole of it being class struggles, then who is he to change it? Utopic dreams that unfortunately ignore the very real realities of human existence. What is man as an animal, an entity? What is our stated goal?

Artisanship is dead, it is true, and a sad thing too. Capitalism killed it with her mega-industry. There is no way around it, no denying it. Communism would do the same, nailing man to the basest necessities for lack of competitiveness. Communism as a form of ur-aristocracy would nail man to rigid stratification, while a new running elite was formed, without accountability, due to lack of competition. Competition is an innate human trait, but capitalism exaggerates it while communism squashes it. Scylla and Charybdis.

Marx states that the proletariat are the result of capitalism and the bourgeoisie. If this is the case, and capitalism and the bourgeoisie are defeated, then there is no more proletariat, no more Communist Party. But no, Marx envisions the union of the proletariat, an unnatural entity forced into existence by the injustice of capitalism. To unify the proletariat against the bourgeoisie implies the existence of capitalism over communism. It is a cry for permanent revolution, which is also necessary, as made clear by Thomas Jefferson. A ruling class, BY DEFINITION, implies a ruled class. And the rule of the masses is BY DEFINITION, not a possible reality. Political structures require heads. The heads require other body parts, just as a human head requires other body parts. Is the irony, and contradiction, here not clear?

The bourgeoisie furnishes the proletariat with the means to destroy the proletariat thus destroying the bourgeoisie. That sounds fair to me. The downtrodden, the “dangerous class”, are then the truest enemy of any established regime, for they are best prepared to bite off the head of the wounded lion that was his previous master. Has it not been promised to us that the meek shall inherit the earth? Those that fall through the cracks and belong to no category then become the dangerous class in that they have no allegiance, don’t buy into the hype of the regime, are rogues, uncontrolled, uncontrollable, dangerous. Many that defend the oppressors do so because they have been indoctrinated to do so, but not the dangerous class.

The masses, as observes Ortega y Gasset, are not able to govern themselves. Marx must also know this, as this is the standard aristocratic line. After all, if a society is a body, then the body needs a head. What is the job of the shepherd, if not to lead the sheep? If this is the case, then Marx’s call for a government of the proletariat is a call for a headless body. In the end, of course, he knows that a governing elite class must again arise for the survival of communism to be insured, party leaders becoming the new elite, only reduced in number, concentrated in power, unopposed, the new kingly class, under a different name, different guise, new cloths.



Man is a political animal, but not exclusively. Man needs other insecurities addressed as well, such as morals, emotions, lusts, deviances, questions and doubts, and so on. Man struggles with himself, and that is about the only true generalization that can be made of man. After this, we develop individual needs and complexes which need to be addressed. Man needs to feel free to truly explore these issues, for they are the essence of life. Controlling man by force only succeeds in disturbing his progression towards knowing himself. It is of no use to interfere with his trajectory, for every man must necessarily walk his own path. Marxism is too simplified, acting as if it were the only one, true Truth. Human life is more complex. Let us remember other heroes and create a new one for our times.

The exploitation of the many by the few is closer to the reality. But the few have always been the most motivated, the hardest working, the best prepared and the longest suffering. The avarice of man is not an easy thing to control, for lord or slave. The humble man is not offered the temptations of the potent man. If a man cannot control himself, he will attempt to control others. The proletariat are not better human beings by virtue of being the proletariat, but because they are not confronted with the same temptations as their superiors. Confronted with these temptations, they have as good a chance of succumbing to weakness as any other. Who are the elite, if not humans with the same needs and weaknesses as any other. Power, once obtained, is not freely let go. Of course this theoretical communism could never come to pass, ignoring so many human realities as it does, and in effect, we have seen only tyrannical regimes represent its principles, as must be the case. Leadership by the proletariat is so naïve politically as to seem unreal that such an erudite, learned man such as Marx should propose it so seriously.

Abolition of private property for state property. State property is private property, property of the runners of the state. Communism cannot live in a state, communism must be locally governed. Local government does not require mass government. Mass government is a function of capitalism and not communism, and yet Marx proposed it as a competitor with a mass function to the mass function of capitalism. The proletariat is

dependent upon, created by, the bourgeoisie. The fall of the bourgeois government dissolves the need for communism, therefore the whole argument for communism is a false one, a wide eyed attempt at usurping power from incumbents based on a natural human tendency towards being good to his neighbor, but founded on faulty reasoning. Governments will always claim to be benevolent, for the simple reason that political power lies in the consent of the ruled peoples.

He speaks of the laborer as if he could subsist without the bourgeois, as if sheep could herd themselves without the shepherd. Truly, mega-government leads to mega-problems, and capitalism here is not defended. This is not an apology for capitalism, just a treatise to explore the falsity of the argument, capitalism vs. communism. Only the fallacies of both exposed as the fallacies of man. Everything is fluid and dynamic. The discovery of America changed the world, for better or for worse, but change was effected, and an alternative to feudalism and aristocracy was created. It is not perfect, nor would be communism, if it were to work on a global scale. It is a question of scale. All “pre-political” societies, based on clans and tribes, were all communist in nature, the clan working for the benefit of the clan, but they were family and friends, and I cannot believe the party actually has my best interests in mind. History has shown that this has never been the case, and reason confirms the expectation.

Culturo-centrism, racism and ignorance are not endemic to any one gender, race, age, group, anything or anyone. Corruption is a generalized condition in human affairs, let us not deny them and thereby prove ourselves hypocrites. We are blind when we do not see the harm that is caused by our unabated avarice, vanity and vice; in short, our human weaknesses. Regimented communism however, is this the answer? Who would be the new leaders? They would be the same as ever, the most motivated, or worse, the not prepared put in place through nepotism, not merit. A man may not squash another man forcefully. In other words, you can't keep a good man down, and that is what Marx neglects. He has an a priori acceptance of the mere speculation, fantasy I would say, that communism will do away with political, or even human corruption.

It is true that button-pushers do no physical work, and are the best compensated. It is the problem of capitalism, the centralization of all production, property and individuality in capital. But it is a sick and diseased part of capitalism, teamed with democracy, supported by the church, the pillars of western civilization. It is we through our own avarice and greed that drive the world to doom and destruction.

If not communism and capitalism in a globalized world, then what else? A combination of the two, disbanding of nations, opening of borders, fluid trade of knowledge and goods without the use of capital, free travel of work force, local ownership, local government. Government must be run locally, in the community ideally, and ownership should not be by foreigners, but by locals. National borders should be abolished, cultures should intermingle without restriction, races should mix, and also be strained naturally. Cosmic truths will never be deleted, so fear of losing your racial identity is unfounded.

But today, the trajectory of our society is short, for reasons that Marx saw all too well, for we are approaching a certain kind of end-times, which will be accompanied by a new beginning. Something big this way comes, and Marx was correct in his assessment of capitalism. Despite the tremendous effort of study, superhuman, his theory was still too simplistic. With all due respect, it would be better to ask a native American about the finer points of communism than an intellectual. Mass communism sounds more like a cult or religion than a political possibility.

Capitalism vs. Communism in the Promised Land of America. Either way, they are designed as ways of moving vast labor forces. In America, despite the rhetoric, the lifestyle is communist, or communal, by another name. The point is, community comes first, despite the nominal capitalistic title. Despite the political fear-mongering and fire breathing, America lives with a communist philosophy with support groups of every imaginable type, welfare, worker's unions (in the past), etc...

Marx speaks of women as if men controlled them. Oh how wrong he is. Woman has always ruled, and will always rule the earth, despite apparent evidence to the contrary. The Earth is the domain of woman. She is Mother Earth, our Mother, one half of our entire Godhead. Man has profaned himself. Those persons of self-control, of whatever race, nationality, creed, religion, class, those are the true Humans. Financial class has nothing to do with the class of human that you are. The kind of human that you are must count for something. But reality is another thing; only the visibly wealthy receive the status. Look around you, who benefits from this status?