

# CHAPTER IX

## KARL MARX: A RED HORSEMAN FOR COMMUNIST REVOLUTION

We saw in Chapter VIII how Hegel's theories gave rise to great social movements that picked up where the French Revolution ended. Those movements briefly fortified themselves behind the barricades of Dresden and became known as the Revolution of 1848. However, as the ongoing industrial revolution unfolded, many of the hardships previously suffered by the masses also began to soften. So too did the common peoples' complaints. Prosperity began to trickle down to those beneath and a true middle class developed across Europe. No longer were the masses huddled but rapidly advancing. The tinder fuel once so explosive began to dampen and by the 1890s, Europe was relatively at peace. Nevertheless, the assault upon Christianity continued unabated. The masses still were solidly Christian. But social termites were busy destroying moral underpinnings.

The Revolution of 1848 threw fresh enemy forces into the fray. By 1900, these managed to reignite Hegel, now dead for more than two generations. The anti-Christian cadre that developed during the French Revolution would not be silenced by progress. Nor would they leave town silently. Their ranks had swollen during the Revolution of 1848, to include newcomers—among whom were greater numbers of Sabbatians.<sup>82</sup>

---

82. "Sabbatians" are renegade followers of Sabbatai Zevi, who, in 1666 A.D. was proclaimed "Messiah" by Nathan of Gazu in Palestine. His arrival was celebrated worldwide by many who were deceived. This false Messiah was a "Son of Perdition" because he married a prostitute and preached that Israel could be redeemed through the commission of evil deeds and abominable, blasphemous sacrilege. Later, leaders claiming to be "reincarnated" from

Marvin H. Clark, Jr.

These Sabbatians had been affected by the social “Enlightenment” much later than other Europeans. Determined as never before, these fresh anti-Christianite troops sought to make the 20th century their own. We still contend with them today.

## STANDING HEGEL ON HIS HEAD: SOCIALIST LEFT VS. SOCIALIST RIGHT

Following Hegel, there developed in his ideological camp two opposing views, both of which were totally anti-Christian. These are known as the Hegel “left” wing and the Hegel “right” wing. The Hegel left originated when Karl Marx declared that he would “stand Hegel on his head.”

Today, we know the Hegel left as the Communists, and the Hegel right as the Nazis. Both are competing versions of the same socialist totalitarian premise that individual liberty must be sacrificed for the benefit of a centralized dictatorship.

The originator of the Hegel left, Karl Marx, also appears to have been the first of what has since become a long line of Sabbatian theorists that have forever dominated that wing of the totalitarian movement. The Hegel right that flowered under the guise of Hitler was soundly defeated by the allies at the end of World War II. The Hegel left has never been defeated, even with the demise of the Soviet Union. The Hegel socialist left has continued in a constant state of slow metamorphosis.

By the last half of the twentieth century, economic theories of the Hegel right were being reconsidered by the left. By the mid-1960s, a strong contingent of the left appeared to have decided that the old Nazi corporate cartels offered a better solution for collectivization in the American and European west. This group seems to have accepted the

---

this man included the need to act proactively against non-Jewish governmental authority and gentile societies, to weaken their nations. The idea was that Israel “must amend itself and become its own Messiah” in order to achieve the promised kingdom. The entire history of this movement is available from strictly Jewish sources. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, by Gershom (Professor of Jewish Mysticism at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem), Schocken Books, New York (1971); *Sabbatai Zevi: The Mystical Messiah*, (1000 pages long), by Gershom Scholem, Princeton University Press, (1973); *To Eliminate the Opiate*, by Rabbi Marvin S. Antelman, Zahavia, Ltd, New York and Tel Aviv, 1974; *Politics of Bad Faith*, by David Horowitz, The Free Press, New York 1998; *America’s Real War*, by Rabbi Daniel Lapin, Multnomah Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Nazi economic model, to the delight of our own corporate and banking elites. As a result, communist radicals like Jerry Rubin literally turned to careers on Wall Street. Our corporate elites never have had any real problem with tyranny so long as they can share the power. This is why a man like Nelson Rockefeller was shipping oil from South America to Hitler throughout World War II, even while our soldiers were dying in Europe. This alliance between elite American capitalists and the communist left now appears to be marching toward a consolidated New World Order under the mere guise of “globalization.”

Nevertheless, we must not forget to underpin our survey with an understanding of the ideological building blocks that have resulted in our current regime. Therefore, we start with Karl Marx.

Karl Marx was the son of an enlightened well-to-do Jewish attorney, who introduced his son to the writings of Hegel and philosophers of the French Revolution. Karl’s parents had converted to Christianity in order to obtain positions in Prussia, as was the custom for many Jews in those days. Otherwise, Jews were given few civil rights in Prussia.

Young Karl seems to have received sound Christian training as a child. Early on, he wrote beautiful poetry, praising Jesus. It appears, however, that his parents never were more than nominal Christians and were perhaps Sabbatians. This also would have been commonplace in Prussia at that time.

Shortly after leaving high school (the German equivalent), history records strange changes in young Marx. His poetry changed dramatically and he wrote,

*“I wish to avenge myself against the One who rules  
above.”*<sup>83</sup>

He also wrote a piece entitled, *Invocation of One in Despair?*, which is quoted in part below:

*“So a god has snatched from me my all  
In the curse and rack of destiny.*

---

83. *Was Karl Marx a Satanist?*, by Richard Wurmbrand, Diane Books Publishing Co., 1976, p. 9.

Marvin H. Clark, Jr.

*All his worlds are gone beyond recall  
Nothing but revenge is left to me*

....

*I shall build my throne high overhead  
Cold, tremendous shall its summit be.  
For its bulwark—superstitious dread.  
For its Marshall—blackest agony.*

....

*Who looks on it with a healthy eye,  
Shall turn back, deathly pale and dumb,  
Clutched by blind and chill mortality.  
May his happiness prepare its tomb.”<sup>84</sup>*

In this piece, Marx seems to be fulfilling “Lucifer’s” declaration that, “I will ascend into heaven and exalt my throne above the stars of God.”<sup>85</sup> Of course, *Lucifer* merely was the ancient name of Venus, the “Morning Star.”

Eventually, Marx wrote,

*“The hellish vapors rise and fill the brain,  
Till I go mad and my heart is utterly changed.  
See this sword?  
The prince of darkness  
Sold it to me.  
For me beats the time and gives the signs.  
Ever more boldly I play the dance of death.”<sup>86</sup>*

“See this sword? The prince of Darkness sold it to me.” What price did Marx pay for that sword? Considering the 250 millions of humanity who have been slaughtered as a result of his writings, was this the “great sword” that was given to the “Red Horseman” in the Book of Revelations?

Elsewhere, young Marx wrote,

---

84. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

85. Isaiah 14:12-15; “Lucifer” is the ancient name of the planet Venus, commonly known as the “Morning Star.” This seems to denote those who would be rising to some position of power and dominance in the world system. Thus, “Lucifer” would denote one who is a “rising star” in the last days, just before “son” rise of a new day in God’s plan for mankind.

86. *Was Karl Marx a Satanist?*, by Richard Wurmbrand, Diane Books Publishing Co., 1976, p. 12.

*“And they are also Oulanem, Oulanem.  
The name rings forth like death, rings forth  
Until it dies away in a wretched crawl.  
Stop, I’ve got it now! It rises from my soul  
As clear as air, as strong as my own bones.”*

....

*“Yet I have power within my youthful arms  
To clench and crush you with tempestuous force,  
While for us both the abyss yawns in darkness  
You will sink down and I shall follow laughing,  
Whispering in your ears, “Descend,  
come with me, friend.”<sup>87</sup>*

Here Marx is clearly writing about going to hell and forcing others to go with him.

Marx apparently desired to get even with God, and seemingly secured a great sword in some pact with “the prince of darkness” before setting about to crush mankind. Marx wanted to pull as many people into hell with himself as possible. All of this is contained in poetry by the man who supposedly cared most for the masses.

In any event, the elder Marx frequently quarreled with young Karl, mostly over his waste of money. But at one point, there were some rather cryptic writings in their letters. Karl wrote to his father,

*“A curtain had fallen. My holy of holies was rent asunder  
and new gods had to be installed.”<sup>88</sup>*

“A curtain had fallen?” Did Karl become disillusioned with the Christian faith? New gods? Did he become initiated into a new religion? His father also responded strangely,

*“I refrained from insisting on explanation about a very  
mysterious matter although it seemed highly dubious.”<sup>89</sup>*

---

87. Ibid.

88. Ibid.

89. Ibid., p. 16.

Marvin H. Clark, Jr.

A couple of years later, in 1839, Karl Marx finally met his political mentor, a man named Moses Hess. Hess was a Jewish socialist and founder of the German Social Democrat Party. Hess introduced Marx to “class struggle” and principles of socialism. He wrote of Marx,

*“Dr. Marx—my idol, who will give the last kick to medieval religion and politics.”<sup>90</sup>*

Moses Hess most likely was a Sabbatian cultist. He declared both the Jewish and Christian religions to be “dead,”<sup>91</sup> while also writing about “our holy writings,” “the holy language of our fathers,” “our cult,” “the divine laws,” “the ways of Providence,” and “godly life.”<sup>92</sup> He declared himself a champion of class struggle. But then he wrote,

*“Race struggle is primary; class struggle is secondary.”<sup>93</sup>*

The only way to reconcile Hess’ writings and also to allow them to appear entirely consistent is to assume that Hess was a Sabbatian cultist. Sabbatians are virulent racists and caustic anti-Christianites. They have abandoned true Judaism and were soundly denounced by the most renowned rabbis during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>94</sup> As we shall see in a later chapter, the Sabbatian cult is steeped in the occult and is clearly linked with the origins of communism.<sup>95</sup>

What Karl Marx got from Moses Hess, he shared with another Hess protégée, Mikhail Bakunin, a renowned Russian anarchist, who penned these words,

*“... here steps in Satan, the eternal rebel, the first free-thinker and the emancipator of worlds. He makes man ashamed of his bestial ignorance and obedience; he*

---

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid., p. 20.

92. Ibid., pp. 55-67.

93. Ibid.

94. *The Messianic Idea In Judaism*, by Gershom Scholem, Schocken Books, New York, 1971; *To Eliminate The Opiate*, by Rabbi Marvin S. Antelman, Zahavia LTD., New York - Tel Aviv, 1974.

95. Ibid.

*emancipates him, stamps upon his brow the seal of liberty and humanity, in urging him to disobey and eat of the fruit of knowledge.*<sup>96</sup>

Again, Bakunin wrote,

*“In this revolution we will have to awaken the devil in the people, to stir up the basest passions.”*<sup>97</sup>

Marx and Bakunin both were introduced by Hess to Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, another major socialist thinker. According to Bakunin, Proudhon was a Satanist.<sup>98</sup>

Proudhon wrote,

*“We reach knowledge in spite of him, we reach society in spite of him. Every step forward is a victory in which we overcome the Divine. God is stupidity and cowardice; God is hypocrisy and falsehood; God is tyranny and poverty; God is evil. Where humanity bows before an altar, humanity, the slave of kings and priests, will be condemned... I swear, God, with my hand stretched out towards the heavens, that you are nothing more than the executioner of my reason, the sceptre of my conscience... God is essentially anti-civilized, anti-liberal, anti-human.”*<sup>99</sup>

Proudhon wore the same hair style that was normal for members of the nineteenth century Satanist cult of Joanna Southcott—long bushy hair and great bushy beard. Perhaps not surprisingly, it is this same hair and beard style that today makes people think of Karl Marx. Karl Marx adopted this image from his mentor, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.

Finally, after Marx died, his former housemaid revealed that,

---

96. *Was Karl Marx a Satanist?*, by Richard Wurmbrand, Diane Books Publishing Co., 1976 pp. 55-67.

97. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

98. *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

99. *Ibid.*

*“He was a God-fearing man. When very sick, he prayed alone in his room before a row of lighted candles, tying a sort of tape measure around his forehead.”<sup>100</sup>*

Jews often wear phylacteries around their heads during morning prayers. But these also have a little leather box approximately 3 inches square attached containing prayers. Marx never openly practiced Judaism, and the housemaid apparently never mentioned any little “leatherbox.” Marx did, however, write diatribes condemning *all* God-worship. Jews would not use such a “row” of candles, although other religions and even satanic cultists would.

The Marx housemaid described a “sort of tape measure around his forehead” which implies that it may have had the inscriptions of a ruler on it. Freemasons use a 24 inch ruler to remind themselves that there are 24 hours in each day, during which they are to be busy. A typical man’s head has about 24 inches circumference. Perhaps Marx had connections with French freemasonry through the Grand Orient of Paris, since his great “falling away” from Christianity occurred while he was a student in Paris. The Grand Orient was known to have been well salted with Sabbatians in its ranks, too.

Needless to say, no historian of Marx ever has fully researched this obscure but profound part of the man’s private life. There is more than enough evidence at present to confirm that Marx was no atheist and that he had strong connections with the occult. The evidence clearly implies that he was a Sabbatian occultist.

And so, Karl Marx, founder of the Communist Party and author of the Communist Manifesto, the chief promoter of a system for “avowed” *atheists*, was himself *not an atheist*. He was an associate of Satanists and devil worshipers. This obvious paradox can be explained if Marx was a Sabbatian cultist. While Sabbatians believe in the existence of God, they angrily renounce God the Father, and seek to become gods unto themselves. Sabbatians are self-Messiahs. They are nihilists. They seek to destroy all that is, because they do not believe anything that is to be worth saving. Leading the world into hell through atheism and destruction of faith in God would accomplish this goal on a grand scale. Communism did all of this to its victims who succumbed to its teachings.

---

100. Ibid.



Aside from his obvious bent towards metaphysics, Marx is best known for writing the *Communist Manifesto*, and *Capital*. Marx helped found the Communist Party and provided almost all of the ideological fuel necessary to ignite the horrendous social conflagrations of the 20th Century. Those conflagrations resulted in death to some 250 million people. Today we recognize that his economic theories are totally bankrupt because of their failure in the Soviet Union. But before the Soviet collapse, this was not obvious because of the raw power that the Soviet government wielded. We never were allowed to observe the Soviet Empire slowly rotting from within. Our ignorance of all of this provided leftists here at home with an air of credibility.

Marx failed because he neither understood society nor economics. His social theories have caused nothing but dehumanizing debauchery. His economic theories led only to wretched poverty. His *social* theories never were fully carried out by the Soviets who wisely recognized their danger. But his economic theories were practiced to the end, until the Soviet Empire finally became paralyzed by inefficiency and then imploded upon itself.

The Marxist economic theories were simple. Marx believed that ordinary workers always produce “excess value” as a result of their efforts, but that the wealthy business owner always “robs” the worker of this excess, thereby making himself a profit. Marx proposed replacing the private businessman with government bureaucrats. The government would own all means of production and would distribute the “excess value” to the workers according to their needs. Only problem was, it didn’t work. People literally starved to death because of it.

Marx believed that human culture is determined by its economic system. He wanted to change the economic system in order to change society. His thesis was exactly opposite that of Max Weber. Max Weber wrote in his book, *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, that capitalism and all of its prosperity resulted from Protestant culture. This meant that before a people can be prosperous, they first must have a culture that encourages prosperity. Thus culture determines the economic system.

People in India starve because of the Hindu religious culture. People in Africa starve because they remain nomads, or hunter-gatherers, and refuse to farm. People in crowded China usually don’t starve because they are industrious—even under communism. Protestantism

encouraged thrift and hard work—a winning combination anywhere in the world. But Marx taught that the destruction of all religion, confiscation of all property and complete government control would create utopia. Perhaps it did this—but only for the few gangsters who sat safely inside the Kremlin walls.

It was said that if the government owned all of the property, then all of the property would be owned by “the people.” Because all of the property belonged to everyone, it really belonged to no one—except the government. Since “everyone” was responsible for taking care of the property, it was maintained by no one. In the end, the Soviet infrastructure buckled from rot and decay.

Shortly after the Soviet system collapsed, I visited Moscow and personally observed that almost none of the pay phones worked. Elevators often did not work. There were no drinking fountains in town, nor any public bathrooms outside of hotels. There were restaurants but very little to eat in them. Store shelves were bare. To entertain guests, one needed to have many generous neighbors in the apartment building to help out. The public water supply was so badly contaminated that Russians avoided drinking from it. I watched people carrying water from a nearby spring in the very neighborhood where President Yeltsin and most of his deputies lived. Everything in Russia was destroyed, except items carefully preserved in museums and art galleries. Even these treasures were in constant danger of disappearing so that the employees working there could acquire money on the street to feed their families.

Karl Marx would have been very proud. As a young man, he poetically proclaimed his desire to destroy all mankind. His later political writings certainly did *that* to the Russian people, as well as to hundreds of millions around the globe.

The madness of Rousseau was fulfilled through Marx. The grand schemes envisioned by Hegel became human nightmares through Marx. Marx certainly was a descendant of Hegel, although he differed significantly. It turned out that those differences distinguished Marx’s communism from Hitler’s Nazism 100 years later.

The differences between Communism and Nazism are simple.

Whereas the Nazi Hegel “right” stressed “national” socialism based upon a world of nation-states, the Communist Hegel “left” of Karl Marx preached a one-world system of “international” socialism.

Whereas the Marxist “internationalists” touted state ownership of property, Nazi “nationalists” believed in state control of the owners of property. Instead of the government dispossessing businesses, Nazis organized their economic system using huge corporate cartels formed by massive corporate mergers.

The Marxist approach would eliminate all national sovereignty in favor of a world without national borders and a one-world government. The Nazis envisioned a system of nation states dominated by one or two big bully states. The Communists of the “Marxist” left would prefer to deal through a United Nations. The Nazis would have preferred that their big bully simply control “Rogue” nations that have different ideas and don’t blend.

The reason that the “Nationalistic” approach was preferred by the Nazis was that it suited German aspirations. However the “International” approach suited the aspirations of the Bolshevik non-Russians who conquered Russia. The Bolsheviks mostly were stateless or lacked any national loyalties. Under the Bolshevik regime, Russians occupied only 29 of the top 545 posts. Sixty-nine others were held by those of anti-Russian European nationalities. Most of the rest were held by those who entered Russia illegally with Lenin and Trotsky to hijack the Russian revolution after the Czar already had abdicated. Those who accompanied Trotsky came with him from New York City—lower east side. They were Russian Jews who had tried to overthrow the Czar and who had recently fled Russia when the Czar defended that country.<sup>101</sup>

So, this is how the dichotomy of “left” versus “right” came to be in the Hegel camp. But all of this occurred in Europe, far from Christian America and never was explained to Americans when Hegelians of both stripes, all virulent and dangerous “socialists,” became active here in the early 20th Century.

This ignorance has allowed American conservatives to be slandered. Those controlling our flow of information *never* have explained this distinction between “left” and “right” in the socialist camp. Instead, they have lied to the people. Americans have been told that the distinction is only between “left” liberals and “right” conservatives and that the Christian “right” conservatives in America are akin to Nazis in Europe.

---

101. *World of Our Fathers*, by Irving Howe, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1976, pp. 326-328.

Most conservatives in America tend to follow Christian principles and are individualistic in their behavioral patterns. They cannot tolerate the “collectivist,” herd animal mentality akin to *both* left and right wings of socialism. Therefore, American “conservatives” have never been and *never can* be socialists. So, our government media has misled Americans for 50 years, linking Christian conservatives with “Nazis,” when Nazis actually are socialist brothers of the Communist left. The government media *never* explains *why* WWII began with Communists and Nazis both fighting *on the same side!* Most Americans don’t even realize that this occurred.

What has further confused Americans is that most media pundits never discuss the fact that Communism and Nazism are *only two* of an unlimited possible variety of socialist dictatorships. The mere fact that two *different* types of socialist organizations already have existed means that an infinite number of *other* kinds also are possible. It is a matter of mixing and matching, flavoring and trying out new psychological approaches, all aimed at “capturing” a nation’s population.

The American people know how to recognize economic Communism. They recognize racially hateful Nazism. But beyond that, most Americans have been kept entirely ignorant of the full range of possible configurations. It is possible to focus so intently only on the particular with which we are familiar that we totally miss equally dangerous forms. More simply put, we don’t see *the entire forest* because we are looking at only two trees. This is what has happened here in America. America has been subjected to its own special blend of socialist tyranny—one that gives a mere illusion of freedom.

Most Americans will admit that something is dreadfully wrong. But most of these same folks will freeze and retreat into denial as soon as they are confronted with obvious socialist tyranny. This is “*America*,” and they still haven’t admitted to themselves that it now has happened here, too. How else could we ever stomach 50 million murdered babies, with homosexuals openly teaching small children in our public schools? The situation now is so ugly that most people simply refuse to admit reality because that would be too traumatic. People are struggling to cope with the ugliness. The German people also coped with horror by retreating into denial. Now, it is America’s turn and we are doing the same.

The American people long were spared involvement in the Hegelian debate. Our revolution clearly was founded upon Christian principals. “All men are created equal” to stand before an almighty God equally. People on our side of the Atlantic never really understood that the French Revolution had a completely different idea. We were ignorant of this fact. Our fathers didn’t realize what the world’s first communist revolution in France meant for their descendants and the world as a whole. They never had witnessed one before. Our fathers were, for the most part, well-meaning. But they were ideologically ignorant Christian farmers.

It remained until the 20th Century for Hegel’s descendants, the invading hordes of Marxist zealots from East European ghettos, to transplant their poison on our side of the Atlantic and to gain social and economic high ground here. By 1900, those formerly called “Jacobins” simply were called “Socialists” or “Marxists.” In the 1920s,, these also became known as “Bolsheviks” and then as “Communists.” We still have trouble identifying them as “Nazis,” too, but they were all the same. We also have trouble recognizing corporate CEOs as anti-free enterprise Nazis. We don’t see that the National Socialism of our corporate CEOs also is akin to Communism, too.

Today, we call them all “liberals.” But those whom we formerly called liberals in the 1960s—they’re now called “neo-conservatives” by the former Communist party members who captured the Democratic party in 1972. Those who did this merely stole the liberal label from the former Democrats and started wearing it instead of their Communist badges.