

Pamphlet

No.3 The False Religion Marxianity

“Kirk defined the ideologue as one who “thinks of politics as a revolutionary instrument for transforming society and even transforming human nature.” Unleashed during the most radical phase of the French Revolution, the spirit of ideology has metastasized over the past two centuries, wreaking horrors. Jacobinism, Anarchism, Marxism, Leninism, Fascism, Stalinism, Nazism, Maoism—all shared the fatal attraction to “political messianism”; all were “inverted religions.” Each of these ideologies preached a dogmatic approach to politics, economics, and culture. Each in its own way endeavored “to substitute secular goals and doctrines for religious goals and doctrines.” Thus did the ideologue promise “salvation in this world, hotly declaring that there exists no other realm of being.”

Editor’s introduction to *The American Cause* by Russell Kirk

The final confrontation is fully engaged pitting 1) the false religion of human intellectual arrogance Marxianity, posing as a political ideology, in alliance with 2) a political ideology, Islam, posing as a religion...against those who adhere to the “Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”. Both are identified as evil incarnate as is an ideology posing as a theology; Trinitarians. Two seek the destruction of Israel and the Jews...the other supersessionism. All are slated for destruction if they fail the test of reason that is the Convergence Matrix.

The test of reason is a quest for the truth and as it concerns the nature of evil there comes a time when it is wiser to learn from the lessons of history. Because there is but four years remaining before the end of human history as it is understood, it is best to select a few writings to teach the necessary lesson as it concerns the truth about God and Marxianity. Of the hundreds of writings I have read in my journey there is one in particular to critical to the lesson; *How the Great Truth Dawned* by Gary Saul Morson for the New Criterion; *On the Soviet Virtue of Cruelty* (Features, September 2019). The following is first and only time the entire text of a writing by another will be included...a writing that may well determine the difference between an eternity of possibilities versus endlessness separated from God for hundreds of millions.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn’s three-volume opus, *The Gulag Archipelago*, which some have called the most important masterpiece of the twentieth century, is subtitled: “An Experiment in Literary Investigation.” Consider how odd that is. No Westerner would call such a work “literary,” lest someone discount its documentary value. Literature is one thing, truth another, isn’t that correct? But Solzhenitsyn insists that absolutely everything included is strictly factual, a claim validated when the Soviet Union fell and archives were opened. What, then, is literary about the book? It is worth noting that Russia’s most recent winner of the Nobel Prize for literature, Svetlana Alexievich, also produced literary works that were purely factual. With these two writers we encounter something essential to the Russian tradition.

Russians revere literature more than anyone else in the world. When Tolstoy's novel *Anna Karenina* was being serialized, Dostoevsky, in a review of its latest installment, opined that "at last the existence of the Russian people has been justified." It is hard to imagine Frenchmen or Englishmen, let alone Americans, even supposing that their existence required justification; but if they did, they would surely not point to a novel. Would we mention the iPhone? But to Russians Dostoevsky's comment appeared unremarkable.

We usually assume that literature exists to depict life, but Russians often speak as if life exists to provide material for literature. Russians, of course, excel in ballet, chess, theater, and mathematics. They invented the periodic table and non-Euclidian geometry. Nevertheless, for Russians literature is in a class by itself. The very phrase "Russian literature" carries a sacramental aura. The closest analogy may be the status of the Bible for ancient Hebrews when it was still possible to add books to it.

The "canon," a term originally applied to authoritative Biblical books, still carries sacred significance for Russians, and even the Soviets did not challenge the status of nineteenth-century classics. Anyone who denigrates Russia's greatest poet, Alexander Pushkin, is likely to be called, without irony, a blasphemer. We think of Stalin as a thug, but he read literary manuscripts and sometimes decided what should be published. His phone call to Mikhail Bulgakov, which allowed the politically suspect writer to keep working, achieved mythic status. The poet Osip Mandelstam observed that only in Russia is literature so important that one can be shot for a poem.

If Americans want the truth about a historical period, we turn to historians, not novelists, but in Russia it is novelists who are presumed to have a deeper understanding. Tolstoy's *War and Peace* contradicted existing evidence, but for over a century now it is his version that has been taken as correct. The reason is that great writers, like prophets, see into the essence of things. And so Solzhenitsyn undertook to reach a proper understanding of the Russian Revolution by writing a series of novels about it, *The Red Wheel*. He made extensive use of archives, as any historian would, and his representation of historical events never contradicts the documents. His fictional characters are often based on real people and are always historically plausible. From a Russian perspective, he expressed what even the best of historians could not: the truth. In his view, postmodern, relativist denial of truth betrayed the whole Russian literary tradition.

Solzhenitsyn claimed in his Nobel Prize speech: "Writers . . . can vanquish lies! In the struggle against lies, art has always won and always will. . . . Lies can stand up against much in the world but not against art. . . . *One word of truth outweighs the world* [according to the Russian proverb]." Proclaimed by a writer who survived seven years in the Gulag, such statements were not mere rhetoric, as they would be if uttered by an American writer—that is, if an American writer could do so with a straight face. They derive from a tradition in which great writers enjoy an almost mystical access to truth and bear the enormous responsibility of using their gift to discover and express it.

Nikolai Dobrolyubov, a disciple of Nikolai Chernyshevsky, Russia's most influential nineteenth-century critic, justified interpreting "the phenomena of life on the basis of a literary production" by arguing that great writers are, consciously or not, the greatest sociologists.

We have no other way of knowing...what is beginning to permeate and predominate in the moral life of society but literature....The author-artist, although not troubling to draw any general conclusions about the state of public thought and morality, is always able to grasp their most essential features. . . . As soon as it is recognized that an author-artist possesses talent, that is, the ability to feel and depict the phenomena with lifelike truth, this very recognition creates legitimate grounds for taking his productions as a basis for the discussion of . . . the epoch.

To be sure, a writer cannot begin with a thesis; he must rather use his writerly sensitivity to intuit what is going on, even if he cannot understand its implications. It is that sensitivity, and not any technical skill, that *makes* him a great writer. Though they hated the radical Dobrolyubov, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy would surely have agreed.

In assuming the role of "Russian writer," Solzhenitsyn was therefore claiming a status less comparable to "American writer" than to "Hebrew prophet." One of his characters asks: "Hasn't it always been understood that a major writer in our country . . . is a sort of second government?" In Russia, Boris Pasternak explained, "a book is a squarish chunk of hot, smoking conscience—and nothing else!" As conscience, literature demanded loyalty transcending all others. It was one's identity, even one's nationality. When the writer Vladimir Korolenko, who was half- Ukrainian, was asked his nationality, he famously replied: "My homeland is Russian literature." In her 2015 Nobel Prize address, Alexievich echoed Korolenko by claiming three homelands: her mother's Ukraine, her father's Belarus, and—"Russia's great culture, without which I cannot imagine myself." By culture she meant, above all, literature.

In principle, the relation of literature to history, with the former having greater access to the truth, applied to all disciplines concerned with human affairs. Chernyshevsky explained:

In those countries where intellectual and social life has attained a high level of development, one can speak of a "division of labor" among the various branches of intellectual activity. Only one of those branches is known to us: literature. For that reason . . . literature plays a greater role in our intellectual life than French, German, and English literature play in the intellectual life of their respective countries, and it bears greater responsibility than the literature of any other nation. Russian literature ... has the direct duty of taking an interest in the kind of subject matter that has elsewhere passed into the special competence of other fields of intellectual activity.

Chernyshevsky wrote when Russian achievements in numerous fields were just getting underway, but his view that literature must “take an interest” in all cultural areas explains why characters in Russian novels engage in long arguments about everything from the philosophy of language to the philosophy of history, as in Pasternak’s *Doctor Zhivago*, and from ethics and politics to theology and the implications of neurology, as in Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* and Dostoevsky’s *Brothers Karamazov*.

Thus for much the same reasons, the greatest works of Russian thought, aside from literature itself, typically take the form of literary criticism. Mikhail Bakhtin’s remarkable contributions to philosophy, linguistics, psychology, folkloristics, and ethics occur in books on Dostoevsky, Rabelais, and the theory of the novel. To understand Russian theology and existential philosophy one needs to read Nicholas Berdyaev on Dostoevsky and Lev Shestov on Chekhov. Russian intellectual histories typically focus almost entirely on literary authors and critics, as none would do in England, where that would mean omitting Isaac Newton, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Adam Smith, and Charles Darwin.

Once in the West, Solzhenitsyn was understandably bewildered when Westerners were put off by his moral earnestness, which for him was essential to any significant author. They didn’t like “how closely I identified with what I was portraying. In the West nowadays, the colder and more aloof the author, and the more a literary work departs from reality, transforming it into a game . . . the higher a work is esteemed.” He had sinned against both existing literary norms and “political decency.”

The very intellectuals who had once defended Solzhenitsyn condemned him when they discovered he did not share some of their views. They could not entertain the possibility that *they* had something to learn from a very different set of experiences. No, no, it was only *his* experience that was eccentric, while theirs reflected the way things really are! Foolishly, this survivor of Communist slave labor camps revealed himself “to be an enemy of socialism.” Solzhenitsyn recalls a Canadian TV commentator who “lectured me that I presumed to judge the experience of the world from the viewpoint of my own *limited* Soviet and prison-camp experience. Indeed, how true! Life and death, imprisonment and hunger, the cultivation of the soul despite the captivity of the body: how very limited that is compared to the bright world of political parties, yesterday’s numbers on the stock exchange, amusements without end, and exotic foreign travel!”

What most disturbed Solzhenitsyn was a “surprising uniformity of opinion” that life was about individual happiness—what else *could* it be about?—and that it was somehow impolite to refer without irony to “evil.” Still worse, Solzhenitsyn traced this trivializing of human existence to “the notion that man is the center of all that exists, and that there is no Higher Power above him. And these roots of irreligious humanism are common to the current Western world and to Communism, and that is what has led the Western intelligentsia to such strong and dogged sympathy for Communism.” After the Gulag, such ostensibly sophisticated sympathy seemed at best the most hopeless naïveté.

But wasn't Solzhenitsyn himself once an atheist and a Communist? Indeed he was, and *The Gulag Archipelago* narrates how, bit by bit, he changed his view of life. The book is not only a history but also an autobiography, and because Solzhenitsyn's experience was shared by so many others, *Gulag* offers itself as a *collective* autobiography. *I* was arrested this way; here are the ways others were arrested. I suffered *this* brutal interrogation; *others* underwent these other kinds of torture. As we examine the progress of souls in extreme conditions, a story—or rather a set of closely related stories—unfolds, and these suspenseful narratives command considerable dramatic interest. One way the book works as literature is as a sort of encyclopedia of possible novels.

Stalin famously remarked: one death is a tragedy, a million is a statistic. Literature exists to make us imagine a million tragedies.

For all prisoners, the first discovery was of unprecedented evil, evil they could never have imagined and in as pure a form as possible. One way Solzhenitsyn conveys this evil is to compare it with earlier supposed embodiments of it, especially the tsarist regime, which, throughout the Western world, was regarded as the symbol of pure oppression. Solzhenitsyn reflects: From 1876 to 1904, a period when Russian terrorists killed many top officials, including Tsar Alexander II, the regime executed 486 people, or 17 per year. From 1905 to 1908—including the period of the revolution of 1905—executions “rocketed upwards” to 2,200, or 45 per month before coming to an abrupt halt. Although terrorists in those years killed more tsarist officials than that—were more sinning than sinned against—such brutality “astound[ed] Russian imaginations, calling forth tears from Tolstoy and indignation from Korolenko.” Of course, from 1917 to the death of Stalin in 1953, 2,200 was about the number of people killed on an average *day*.

Solzhenitsyn often cites the memoirs of the revolutionary R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, who compared his imprisonment under tsars and Soviets. Under the tsars, interrogation never involved torture, while under the Soviets it was routine. The tsars never thought of arresting relatives of criminals: Lenin remained free and was accepted to higher education although his brother had been hanged for his role in a conspiracy to murder Tsar Alexander III. The Soviets built camps for “the wives of the accused,” and “member of the family of a traitor to the motherland” became a criminal category. In some periods, the children of these traitors were put in orphanages, where most died, while in others they were simply executed. The tsars never conducted arrests at random, but Stalin issued quotas for each district, and Lenin explicitly called for the arbitrary execution of innocent people, since killing the innocent, he explained, would create a terrorized, therefore submissive, population.

Solzhenitsyn's comment about “the tears of Tolstoy” exhibits the peculiar irony with which *Gulag* is narrated. Indeed, the book's closest literary relative is probably Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, which is also a masterpiece of history as irony. But even Gibbon never produced passages as savage as this one:

If the intellectuals in the plays of Chekhov who spent all their time guessing what would happen in twenty, thirty, or forty years had been told that in forty years interrogation by torture would be practiced in Russia; that prisoners would have their skulls squeezed within iron rings; that a human being would be lowered into an acid bath; that they would be trussed up naked to be bitten by ants and bedbugs; that a ramrod heated over a primus stove would be thrust up their anal canal (the “secret brand”); that a man’s genitals would be slowly crushed beneath the toe of a jackboot; and that, in the luckiest possible circumstances, prisoners would be tortured by being kept from sleeping for a week, by thirst, and by being beaten to a bloody pulp, not one of Chekhov’s plays would have gotten to its end because all the heroes would have gone off to insane asylums.

What sort of people were these interrogators and those who directed them?

What went through their minds? To understand evil one must probe the souls of evil-doers, and Russian history offered ample material. That question arises frequently in a literary genre Russians invented, the prison-camp novel, beginning with Dostoevsky’s harrowing *Notes from the House of the Dead* (1860–1862). But even this experience seems positively balmy compared to Stalin’s slave labor camps. The unprecedented Soviet experience prompted memoirists to ask how people could do these things, although the Nazi, Maoist, Khmer Rouge, and other totalitarian regimes that followed did so again.

Compared to Soviet interrogators, Solzhenitsyn observes, the villains of Shakespeare, Schiller, and Dickens seem “somewhat farcical and clumsy to our contemporary perception.” The problem is, these villains recognize themselves as evil, and say to themselves, I cannot live unless I do evil. But that is not at all the way things are, Solzhenitsyn explains: “To do evil a human being must first of all believe that what he’s doing is good, or else that it’s a well-considered act in conformity with natural law. . . . it is in the nature of a human being to seek a *justification* for his actions.”

Why is it, Solzhenitsyn asks, that Macbeth, Iago, and other Shakespearean evildoers stopped short at a dozen corpses, while Lenin and Stalin did in millions? The answer is that Macbeth and Iago “had no *ideology*.” Ideology makes the killer and torturer an agent of good, “so that he won’t hear reproaches and curses but will receive praise and honors.” Ideology never achieved such power and scale before the twentieth century.

Anyone can succumb to ideology. All it takes is a sense of one’s own moral superiority for being on the right side; a theory that purports to explain everything; and—this is crucial—a principled refusal to see things from the point of view of one’s opponents or victims, lest one be tainted by their evil viewpoint.

If we remember that totalitarians and terrorists think of themselves as warriors for justice, we can appreciate how good people can join them. Lev Kopelev, the model for Solzhenitsyn's character Rubin, describes how, as a young man, he went to the countryside to help enforce the collectivization of agriculture. Bolshevik policy included the enforced starvation of several million peasants, and Kopelev describes how he was able to take morsels of food "from women and children with distended bellies, turning blue, still breathing but with vacant, lifeless eyes," in the ardent conviction that he was building socialism. Other memoirs of this period also describe how a loyal communist at last awoke to what he (or she) did. In this way, the Soviet experience inspired a rebirth of conversion literature, and Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag*, which details his own change from Bolshevik to Christian, is a prime example.

Each conversion memoir reports that change was immensely hard. For one thing, as Arthur Koestler's novel *Darkness at Noon* (1941) correctly divined, the Party was one's purpose in life and constituted one's whole family. Challenging it was as unthinkable as simultaneously renouncing one's education and all one's friends and relatives. For another, one was taught that Marxist theory was a hard science, and so rejecting it was like denying evolution. This science had purportedly proven that human sacrifice was as inevitable to saving humanity as surgical cutting is to an operation. To build communism for innumerable future generations of perfect people, the sacrifice of the relatively few, imperfect homunculi of the present was a small price to pay. For that matter, compared to the infinite future, every one alive would be a trivial number. In any case, as it was often phrased, the deaths were caused not by us but by History.

What is more, the people killed were class enemies, which meant that even if they had not committed counter-revolutionary crimes, they were *potential* criminals. Vasily Grossman, the first significant writer to report the Holocaust when he saw it unfolding on Nazi-occupied Soviet territory, was not unique in pointing out that the exact equivalent of the Nazi category of "race" was the Soviet category of "class." Social class, like race, was inherited, not chosen, and could not be changed. In the newspaper *Red Terror*, Feliks Dzerzhinsky, the founder of the secret police, explained in 1918:

We are not fighting against single individuals. We are exterminating the bourgeoisie as a *class*. It is *not* necessary during the interrogation to look for evidence proving that the accused opposed the Soviets by word or action. The first question which you should ask him is what class does he belong to, what is his origin, his education and his profession. These are the questions which will determine the fate of the accused. Such is the sense and the essence of red terror.

Or, as one of Grossman's characters observes, "the concept of innocence is a holdover from the Middle Ages."

Solzhenitsyn reports how it was mere chance that *he* did not become supremely evil. When he was finishing his education, he and his classmates were offered the opportunity to do something nobler than physics, a job of great moral importance which also entailed social prestige and material reward: they could attend the nkvd training school. These students had been raised to regard the nkvd as a supremely moral organization. Realizing how close he came to becoming an interrogator himself, Solzhenitsyn reflects: "And just so we don't go around flaunting too proudly the white mantle of the just, let everyone ask himself: 'If my life had turned out differently, might I myself not have become just such an executioner?' It is a dreadful question if one answers it honestly."

Solzhenitsyn turned down this coveted offer out of some inner intuition "not founded on rational argument. . . . It certainly didn't derive from the lectures on historical materialism we listened to: it was clear from them that the struggle against the internal enemy was a crucial battle front, and to share in it was an honorable task. . . . It was not our minds that resisted but something inside our breasts. People can shout at you from all sides: 'You must!' But inside your breast there is a sense of revulsion, repudiation. I don't want to. *It makes me feel sick*. Do what you want with me. I want no part of it." And yet, he reflects, some of us did join, and if enough pressure had been applied, perhaps all of us would have. In that case, "what would I have become?" The passage that follows is one of the book's most famous:

So let the reader who expects this book to be a political exposé slam its covers shut right now.

If only it were all so simple! If only there were evil people somewhere insidiously committing evil deeds, and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them. But the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being. And who is willing to destroy a piece of his own heart? . . . From good to evil is one quaver, says the [Russian] proverb. And correspondingly, from evil to good.

The contrary view, held by ideologues and justice warriors generally, is that our group is good, and theirs is evil. "Evil people committing evil deeds": this is the sort of thinking behind notions like class conflict or the international Zionist conspiracy. It is the opposite of the idea that makes tolerance and democracy possible: the idea that there is legitimate difference of opinion and we must not act as if God or History had blessed our side as always right. If you think that way, there is no reason *not* to have a one-party state. The man who taught me Russian history, the late Firuz Kazemzadeh, used to say: remember, there are always as many swine on your side as on the other.

A heart is not good or evil once and for all. Sometimes a heart "is squeezed by exuberant evil[;] and sometimes it shifts to allow space for good to flourish. One and the same human being is, at various ages, under various circumstances . . . close to being a devil, at times to sainthood." We are never closer to evil than when we think that the line between good and evil passes between groups and not through each human heart.

Let me return to the passage in which Solzhenitsyn imagines Chekhov's characters learning about "the secret brand." Beginning in mid-1937, every interrogated prisoner was subject to torture. Such Soviet practices raise a question that Solzhenitsyn, along with Grossman, Nadezhda Mandelstam, Varlam Shalamov, and other writers have sought to answer: *Why* engage in such practices? What purpose could they possibly serve?

And why make people confess to absurd crimes that the interrogators knew were fabrications? Apart from the few who confessed during show trials, none of these extracted confessions would ever be made public. Think of the manpower and the cost expended for no evident purpose. The question has puzzled many scholars.

Consider Solzhenitsyn's chapter on how prisoners were transported to camps. Typically, they were loaded into cattle cars—unheated in winter, unventilated in summer—packed as densely as possible, meaning that sometimes there was so little space that some prisoners *hung* between others without their legs reaching the floor. They were barely fed—or fed on salt herring, and not given water. Some days they weren't fed at all. Soon the prisoners "started to die off—and the guards hauled the corpses out from under their feet. (Not right away, true, only on the second day.) In this way a trip from Moscow to Petropavlovsk took *three weeks*."

With his trademark irony, Solzhenitsyn repeats that none of this was done to torture the prisoners! What he means, we soon understand, is that such treatment was so routine it did not count as torture. Why treat people like this? If the point was to kill them, it was a lot easier to shoot them straight off, as, in fact, was done to millions. If the point was to provide manpower for the slave labor camps, as Anne Applebaum has suggested, then why let so many laborers die en route? To answer this question, one must first grasp Bolshevik ethics. So far as I know, it has no precedent in world history.

Bolshevik ethics explicitly began and ended with atheism. Only someone who rejected all religious or quasi-religious morals could be a Bolshevik because, as Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and other Bolshevik leaders insisted, the *only* standard of right and wrong was success for the Party. The bourgeoisie falsely claim we have no ethics, Lenin explained in a 1920 speech. But what we reject is any ethics based on God's commandments or anything resembling them, such as abstract principles, timeless values, universal human rights, or any tenet of philosophical idealism. For a true materialist, Lenin maintained, there can be no Kantian categorical imperative to regard others only as ends, not as means. By the same token, the materialist does not acknowledge the supposed sanctity of human life. All such notions, Lenin insisted, are "based on extra human and extra class concepts" and so are simply religion in disguise. "That is why we say that to us there is no such thing as a morality that stands outside human society; that is a fraud. To us morality is subordinated to the interests of the proletariat's class struggle," which means to the Party. Aron Solts, known as "the conscience of the Party," explained: "We . . . can say openly and frankly: yes, we hold in prison those who interfere with the establishment of our order, and we do not stop before other such actions because we do not believe in the existence of abstractly unethical actions."

Until recently, I supposed such statements meant that *if* it should be necessary to kill people, then it is permissible to do so. That is what the anarchist Peter Kropotkin had maintained, but the Bolsheviks rejected this formulation as sheer sentimentality.

Kropotkin's way of thinking suggests that revolutionaries must meet a burden of proof to overcome the moral law against killing: no more killing than *necessary*. For the Bolsheviks, there was no such moral law. The *only* moral criterion was the interests of the Party, and so they trained followers to overcome their instinctive compassion. Reluctance to kill reflected an essentially religious (or "abstract humanist") belief in the sanctity of human life.

In short, all things equal, violent means were *preferable*. Mercy, kindness, compassion: these were all anti-Bolshevik emotions, and schoolchildren were taught to reject them. I know of no previous society where children were taught that compassion and mercy are vices. Do unto class enemies what you would not want them to do unto you. That is why, starting in mid-1937, torture became mandatory. What objection could be raised? It was positively good to arrest the innocent. When Stalin assigned arrest quotas, local nkvd branches asked to arrest even more.

Kopelev accepted that hesitation to kill showed "intellectual squeamishness" and "stupid liberalism." In her memoir *Hope Against Hope*, Mandelstam reflects that "the word 'conscience' . . . had gone out of ordinary use—it was not current in newspapers, books or in the schools, since its function had been taken over . . . by 'class feeling.' 'Kindness' became something to be ashamed of, and its exponents were as extinct as the mammoth." *Positive* words now included "merciless" and "ruthless." A good Bolshevik spied on his friends, and children were taught to denounce their parents. A speaker at the Party Congress in 1925, held a year after Lenin's death, reminisced: "Lenin used to teach us that every Party member should be a Cheka agent—that is, he should watch and inform . . . if we suffer from one thing, it is that we do not do *enough* informing."

We sought an explanation for those prisoner cattle cars, but it should now be clear that it is not cruelty that requires explanation but the reverse. To ask the reason for cruelty is to ask the wrong question. People sometimes ask the reason for slavery, but since slavery was practiced everywhere for most of human history, the right question is the opposite one: why was slavery eventually abolished in many places? In the Bolshevik context, it is mercy and compassion that require explanation.

Is it any wonder that many Russians began to accept absolute standards of right and wrong? This was the great conversion. They discovered what Solzhenitsyn calls "conscience" (*sovest'*), by which he means the conviction that good and evil are one thing and effectiveness is quite another. Kopelev, Solzhenitsyn, and others describe the key event of their life as the discovery that just as the universe contains causal laws it also contains moral laws. Bolshevik horror derived from the opposite view: that there is nothing inexplicable in materialist terms and that the only moral standard is political success.

In her celebrated memoir *Into the Whirlwind* (1967), Evgeniya Ginzburg describes how her NKVD interrogator tempted her to implicate another person who, he said, had already denounced her. "That's between him and his conscience," she demurred, thereby appealing to a moral standard independent of consequences. "What are you, a gospel Christian or something?," the interrogator replied. "Just honest," she said, an answer that provoked him to give her "a lecture on the Marxist-Leninist view of ethics. 'Honest' meant useful to the proletariat and to the state." As a good Leninist herself, she must agree. She has invoked standards that a Christian, but not a committed atheist, would accept.

Gleb Nerzhin, the autobiographical hero of Solzhenitsyn's novel *In the First Circle*, declares: "An objective moral order is built into the universe." A friend agrees: "We ought to spell Good and Evil not just with capitals but with letters five stories high!"

Many, including Solzhenitsyn, took the next step and accepted God. Why not remain an atheist who believes in an absolute moral law? Here again we must understand the thought-shaping power of Russian literature, particularly Russia's specialty, the great realist fiction of ideas. Great novels test ideas not by their logical coherence, as in academic philosophy, but by the consequences of believing them. Novels of ideas—whether by George Eliot or Tolstoy, Joseph Conrad or Dostoevsky, Henry James or Turgenev—exhibit a masterplot: a hero or heroine devoted to an idea discovers that reality is much more complex than the idea allows. For example, a materialist believes that love is nothing but physiology and that individual people differ no more than frogs, yet he falls deeply in love with a particular woman (the plot of Turgenev's *Fathers and Children*). A moralist asserts that only actions, not wishes, have moral value, yet winds up consumed by guilt for a murder he has fostered only by his wish for it (the plot of Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*). For Innokenty Volodin, the Epicurean hero of *In the First Circle*, the experience of arrest shows the limitations of his favorite philosopher's ideas. Epicurus, the great materialist of the ancient world, had said: "'You should not fear physical suffering. Prolonged suffering is always insignificant; significant suffering is of short duration.' But what if you are deprived for days of sleep in a box without air? What about ten years of solitary confinement in a cell where you cannot stretch your legs? Is that significant or insignificant?"

Volodin recalls Epicurus's words: "Our inner feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are the highest criteria of good and evil," and only now does he understand them. "Now it was clear: Whatever gives me pleasure is good; what displeases me is bad. Stalin, for instance, enjoyed killing people—so that, for him, was good?"

How wise such philosophy seems to a free person! But for Volodin, good and evil are now distinct entities. "His struggle and suffering had raised him to a height from which the great materialist's wisdom seemed like the prattle of a child."

Thinking novelistically, Solzhenitsyn asks: how well does morality without God pass the test of Soviet experience? Every camp prisoner sooner or later faced a choice: whether or not to resolve to survive *at any price*. Do you take the food or shoes of a weaker prisoner? "This is the great *fork* of camp life. From this point the roads go to the right and to the left. . . . If you go to the right—you lose your life; and if you go to the left—you lose your conscience." Memoirist after memoirist, including atheists like Evgeniya Ginzburg, report that those who denied anything beyond the material world were the first to choose survival. They may have insisted that high moral ideals do not require belief in God, but when it came down to it, morals grounded in nothing but one's own conviction and reasoning, however cogent, proved woefully inadequate under experiential, rather than logical, pressure. In Shalamov's *Kolyma Tales*—I regard these stories, which first became known in the late 1960s, as the greatest since Chekhov—a narrator observes: "The intellectual becomes a coward, and his own brain provides a 'justification' of his own actions. He can persuade himself of anything" as needed.

Among Gulag memoirists, even the atheists acknowledge that the only people who did not succumb morally were the believers. Which religion they professed did not seem to matter. Ginzburg describes how a group of semi-literate believers refused to go out to work on Easter Sunday. In the Siberian cold, they were made to stand barefoot on an ice-covered pond, where they continued to chant their prayers. Later that night, the rest of us argued about the believers' behavior. "Was this fanaticism, or fortitude in defense of the rights of conscience? Were we to admire or regard them as mad? And, most troubling of all, should we have had the courage to act as they did?" The recognition that they would not would often transform people into believers.

Read as autobiography, the key moment of *Gulag* may be Solzhenitsyn's conversation with "a pale, yellowish youth, with a Jewish tenderness of face," named Boris Gammerov. Solzhenitsyn happened to mention a prayer by President Roosevelt and "expressed what seemed to me a self-evident evaluation of it: 'Well, that's hypocrisy, of course.' " Gammerov replied: "Why do you not admit the possibility that a political leader might sincerely believe in God?"

And that was all he said! But what a direction that attack had come from! To hear such words from someone born in 1923! I could have replied to him very firmly, but prison had already undermined my certainty, and the principal thing was that some kind of clean, pure feeling does live within us, existing apart from all our convictions, and then it dawned on me that I had not spoken out of conviction but because the idea had been implanted in me from outside. And because of this . . . I merely asked him: "Do you believe in God?" "Of course," he answered tranquilly. . . . Was it not here, in these prison cells, that the great truth dawned?

The Great Truth Dawned: unexpectedly, astonishingly, this harrowing story of cattle cars and the secret brand has a redemptive ending. A person—not a hero, just a flawed person—finds faith. Everybody has been indoctrinated with the slogan that, in a material world where nothing beyond the laws of nature exists, “The result is all that counts.” But camp experience taught that that was a lie. “It is not the result that counts . . . but *the spirit!*” Once you realize this, “then imprisonment begins to transform your character in an astonishing way.” You begin to appreciate friendship differently. Recognizing your own weakness, you understand the weakness of others. When another prisoner relates how he became a Christian, Solzhenitsyn recognizes that when he had been most certain he was doing good he was actually doing evil. He understands “the truths of all the religions of the world: They struggle with the *evil inside a human being* (every human being).” He reflects on prison and on literature:

Leo Tolstoy was right when he *dreamed* of being put in prison. . . . I . . . have served enough time there. I nourished my soul there, and I say without hesitation:

Bless you, prison, for having been in my life!

The Great Truth Requires Wide Open Eyes

“The times in which our generation lives are not ordinary times. We dwell on the interface between two worlds —a world as it was and a world as it is meant to be. Everything is in place, all the infrastructure to bind the world together as one, the technology by which all of humanity can share deep wisdom; all that is needed so that the secret of oneness can be grasped within the human mind. The stage is set. All that’s left is for us to open our eyes.”

Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, *Likkutei Sichot* 13

Every road taken by the false religion of human intellectual arrogance since 1917 leads to the graveyard of over 100 million people...and it can happen in the United States if Americans fail to confront the evil that is neo-Marxism. Open your eyes and accept the existence of the God of Abraham/Sinai, Yeshua and 1776 presenting as unfettered intellect and incomprehensible power sending warnings written in the ink of natural phenomenon to all mankind...He will not allow a plan 6000 years in the making to be upended by human intellectual arrogance in the form of the false religion Marxianity.

If after reading *How the Great Truth Dawned* one is still enamored with Marxianity then it is safe to say one is on the wrong side or the end of human history as it is understood and as such the penultimate decision has been made. This writing is meant for those who have been divested of meaning and purpose; those who were first divested of God and then the importance of wisdom and knowledge. Do you realize most of Generation Z cannot pass a citizenship test? Passing the final test of reason now underway will require simplicity i.e. written in the words of Jefferson’s ploughman.

Simplicity in turn requires an explanation for why far too many young people embrace neo-Marxism and as such a single article, *Why Marx continues to fascinate would-be revolutionaries*, by Kevin D. Williamson (National Review, August 2020) in combination with *How the Great Truth Dawned* suffices...to create a foundation. The first provides the ugly truth about Marxism and why it is identified in the matrices as evil incarnate. The second exposes the seductive nature of an ideology providing a false sense of meaning in the absence of God i.e. heaven on earth if one commits to the false religion of human intellectual arrogance.

Albeit difficult reads for the ploughman Thomas Jefferson knew was far better at deciding a moral issue than intellectuals, the articles are meant to provide foundation so as to fight a win a holy war declared by the false religion sixty years ago. The strategy, tactics and the planning to mount the massive retaliation required to defeat Marxianity is what I was born for; the chosen faithful emissary. While I welcome all who join the fray in one way or the other I cannot overemphasize what is at stake; a Constitution and nation bearing God's personal imprimatur...your life, your very soul and that of those you love.

The final confrontation between good and evil is now engaged and the choice must be made and once made those who choose God cannot sit back in comfortable complacency and think God will fight in your stead. Even human being on earth will have to enlist in one side or the other, but to do so will require shaking off the effects of acute Popular Culture Psychosis (PCP); Inducing Toxin Immobility.

Americans have been, for all intents and purposes, anesthetized by the Marxian idea of tolerance to the point males identifying as females are allowed to compete against females in athletic competitions in an absurd reading of Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972.

Doing so is a reflection of the Marxian standards being applied in general but in this instance like many others the offense against common sense is meant to test the water to determine how much Americans are willing to endure in anticipation of a tyranny that would put Big Brother of 1984 to shame.

Plato's *Allegory of the Cave* is analogous to the almost impossible task of having a substantive or productive debate with people whose perception of the world is created by people behind the scenes; reality as little more than shadows. Those who wanted to seek the truth had to break the chains which bound them to the cave then had to endure the pain caused by exposure to the disinfecting sunlight of truth. One might take the allegory one step further by explaining the true nature of the shadows and the chains; *Popular Culture Psychosis* (PCP) as the shadows and toxin immobility as the chains. The term is derived from two well-known definitions.

psy-cho-sis /sī'kōsəs/ *noun* **1**) a severe mental disorder in which thought and emotions are so impaired that contact is lost with external reality.

PCP/ Phencyclidine, also known as angel dust, is a drug used for its mind-altering effects. PCP may cause hallucinations, distorted perceptions and violent behavior.

Popular Culture Psychosis (PCP)-an accurate description of the psychological dysfunction plaguing America; induced by poisons manufactured and dispensed by the academy, Imaginarium, media and popular culture resulting in toxin immobility few have ever heard of yet it exists in nature.

Recently, researchers have come to a startling conclusion concerning great white sharks and killer whales as the two apex predators in the oceans; intelligence affords an advantage to killer whales and when the two come into contact the great white shark risks becoming prey. In a strategy the killer whales also uses to prey upon the closely related stingray, killer whales turn the great white shark or stingray *belly up* which triggers a flood of endorphins putting the prey into a state of "toxin immobility"; a state of blissful ignorance allowing the killer whale to consume the victim at leisure.

The word "endorphin" is a compound of the words *endogenous* and *morphine*; hormones which act as "a morphine-like substance originating from within the body"; endorphins inhibit pain signals to the brain while producing a feeling of euphoria". Popular culture is endorphins writ large.

The Frankfurt School theologians were obsessed with the well-worn but often misunderstood term "false consciousness" as it concerned the power of consumer advertising; using the term to describe the effect of mass advertising upon the less educate ignorant enough to let capitalism engineer a profoundly distorted reality.

That was until Herbert Marcuse and others realized popular culture could be infused with neo-Marxist theology; the sexual revolution, the most damaging neo-Marxist liberation movement in history, owes it success to "sex sells" in ever increasing doses created by Madison Avenue, the Imaginarium, popular culture and the academy.

Thereafter, the obsession with the power of mass persuasion, first perfected by propagandists using the advertising model of American consumer capitalists, has resulted in a weaponized popular culture; Americans and all of western civilization have been effectively immobilized by carefully crafted mental toxins with a common recipe...and every Marxian chef is thoroughly trained in ingredients, measures, cook time and presentation.

When watching television, movies, music or indulging in any other media created by for popular culture a dose of PCP is being administered...and in the absence of moral absolutes and objective truth actual reality fades to be replaced by a manmade reality to fill the void.

Filling the void with useless distraction leaves little room for purpose and meaning; reducing people to compliant followers searching for the next injection of PCP; addicts willing to do virtually anything for the pusher in the quest to escape reality. The lack of moral absolutes and the idea of objective truth are made worse by public schools focusing on social engineering rather than history, civics, mathematics, reading and writing.

The vast majority of people are products of public education devoid of any substantive civics instruction as to the Declaration of Independence and Constitution let alone American history and the foundational morality of the Ten Commandments...and when there is instruction it is strained through the filter of revisionism. Be that as it may, the greatest disservice to society is the lack of morality attendant to removing the Ten Commandments from schools which served as a daily reminder there is a higher authority; a disservice that will be rectified with the Convergence Matrix.

The media and academia are little more than chefs in the same kitchen as the Imaginarium; preparing dishes of PCP for public consumption designed to induce toxin immobility. The matrices are intended to remove the effects of toxin immobility to reveal the machinations of the evil that is Marxianity. One might note that after removing the letter 't' for toxin and the 'i' for immobility from the word matrix one can clearly see Marx...an actual coincidence I thoroughly enjoy.

Toxin immobility and Popular Culture Psychosis (PCP) resulting from daily doses of the toxic brew created by Madison Avenue and the Imaginarium need not be fatal; the matrices and the certitude of a Creator close and getting closer every day is not only a truth serum but an antidote. There are no blue pills, there are no red pills, there is only the truth...and the truth is that it is time to awaken from your comfortable complacency or risk losing your freedom, all you possess, your life and possibly your very soul.

"It would seem impossible that an intelligent people with the faculty of reading and right of thinking should continue much longer to slumber under the pupilage of an interested aristocracy of priests and lawyers, persuading them to distrust themselves and to let them think for them... Awaken them from this voluntary degradation of mind! Restore them to a due estimate of themselves and their fellow citizens, and a just abhorrence of the falsehoods and artifices which have seduced them!"

Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Seymour, 1807

Can there be any doubt Jefferson as one half the key has significance? Lean heavily on his quotes and you will realize he chosen to be the prophet of governance.

There are two aspects of Marxianity requiring a clear understanding as to strategy with the first being the current political scale and the second being Planned Chaos. The left right political scale originated in the madness of the French Revolution and continued to evolve over the next 100 years as republics came and went; in the National Assembly the supporters of the king sat to the president's right and supporters of the revolution to his left; the "the party of movement" on the left and the "the party of order" on the right.

That much is still true but with an evidenced God of 1776 it can be said 'Patriot' is synonymous with being well centered where the Constitution resides on the true political scale as opposed to the commonly used left right political scale created by Marxians to position the fascism created by once arch communist Benito Mussolini, and wrongly ascribed the Nazi Germany, on the far right with the Constitution in the center and Marxism on the far left. However, Marxian academics maintain the United States Constitution in the middle of the scale for a nefarious reason; any policy proposal that does not lean toward the Marxist left is labeled right wing hence leaning toward Nazism.

Very clever but not reasonable, rational or logical; the true political scale must have a place for anarchy and status societies. On the true scale, disparaged by Marxians, anarchy is on the far right and as one moves closer to the center where the Constitution rightly resides there is a succession of Maine's "status societies" until coming to the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union still to the right of the Constitution and on the far left socialist ideologies...including Nazi Germany's National Socialists.

There is no doubt the left is dominated by neo-Marxist ideology...they are not "liberals" or "progressives" or even Democrats; they are Marxians. When patriots stop using the terms preferred by Marxians and refer to them for what they really are the debates can begin and a long overdue change made to the political map; red states are Marxian and blue states are constitutionalist...not "liberal" or "conservative". Furthermore, America is not and never has been a democracy; it is a republic and when Marxians say democracy it has Marxist connotations:

"Democracy is the road to socialism." Karl Marx

When one comes to accept the evil that is Marxianity has implemented the dark strategy of what Ludwig von Mises termed "Planned Chaos" then the seeming madness that surrounds gains focus; disrupt, disturb, dislocate, distract, destroy, disorder, dislodge, demean, displace, damage, devalue, diminish and degrade every aspect of the Judeo-Christian American culture while disparaging its history...discord until dissatisfied Americans come to believe the Constitution has failed.

The Constitution has not failed but it has been stretched to the point it is unrecognizable and the institutions that undergird its application compromised by Marxianity.

Marxians have been so successful there are Americans who believe the United States and the Constitution have already been lost given there is virtually little difference between Democrats and small 'r' republicans; unwilling to admit this holy war is existential. Federalism is separation of powers writ large, dividing power between Washington DC and the states, but it is in the fine print one will recognize the founders who wrote well defined separation of powers into the Constitution to eliminate the possibility of centralized tyranny...including the 2nd Amendment in the event centralization was realized as it is now.

The federal government has become a Leviathan heavily dependent upon the Treasury printing trillions of inflationary dollars to feed Marxian causes across the nation after gaining complete control of the agencies weaponized by Obama. Few realize 35 of the 37 richest counties in the US are Democrat constituencies with 7 of the richest surrounding Washington DC. Between a presidency using the pen of executive orders and agencies exerting regulatory powers, congressional legislation is nothing more than an enabling function. Worse yet, the Marxian judiciary readily enforces a two tiered injustice system so blatant one need only know where a case will be heard and before whom to accurately determine the outcome.

Federalism is the key; federalism as the founders intended; federalism as defined by Michael Anton in his must read book *The Stakes; America at the Point of No Return*:

"Our founders sought to establish the weakest possible federal government capable of performing its essential functions, for three fundamental and intertwined reasons. First, government is inherently dangerous, so the less power it has, the better. Second, the states—being closer to the people and more responsive to regional differences and needs—are better equipped to handle most matters than a far-off centralized administration. Third, the states were prior to the federal government; the people, through their states, created the latter to serve them, not the other way around."

"According to the parchment, the federal government is supposed to field and fund an army and navy, protect the borders, make treaties, regulate foreign trade and interstate commerce, maintain a sound common currency...and that's about it."

Now is the time to go back and read again *How the Great Truth Dawned* by Gary Saul Morson and deeply consider the fanatical devotion to Marxian ideological dogma used to justify all manner of atrocities...and then compare the mindset to that of Marxians in the west today. There exists a *nomenklatura*, a ruling class of faithful intellectuals, which is transforming the United States into what is essentially a soviet style state.

These elites care nothing for the average individual and insist upon political monotheism; government as the church and power the god they worship...subordinating governmental policy, popular culture, individual expression, the economy, religious belief and society in general to ideological mandates. Worst of all is the two tiered injustice system wherein Marxians can blatantly violate the law while the utterly subservient national security apparatus and Department of Injustice looks the other way...sovereign impunity.

The reality of ideologically driven policies and institutions as opposed to common sense, empirically driven, policy decisions manifests as criminals as a protected class, high crime rates, filthy cities, homelessness, loss of energy independence, “green” policies driving inflation through the roof, open borders, endless wars, a military incapable of executing a simple orderly withdrawal and universities as indoctrination centers...all governed by diversity, inclusion and equity policies that shape shift every day to align with neo-Marxist “critical theory”.

The United States as regressed into a status society where merit counts for little and the right to speech is openly suppressed as the constitutional order is slowly but inexorably being dismantled as is traditional American society.

If it weren't bad enough an entire generation of graduates from “elite” universities are in control of the agencies of governance, the subsequent generation act as apparatchiks and Neo-Marxist nerve bundles well versed in “systemic racism” where there is none, “white supremacy” where there is none, faux colonialism and imperialism...to form the vanguard of “woke” cadres intent on coercively suppressing opposing thought and speech. Ironical that the “democracy” elites have created has proven H.L. Mencken prophetic.

“As democracy is perfected, the office of president represents, more and more closely, the inner soul of the people. On some great and glorious day the plain folks of the land will reach their heart's desire at last and the White House will be adorned by a downright moron.”
H.L. Mencken, On Politics: A Carnival of Buncombe

Look to the Biden cabinet and consider how ludicrous it was for homosexual Secretary of Transportation Pete Buttigieg to take maternity leave while the supply chain crumbled; how ludicrous for open borders advocate Alejandro Mayorkas to be named head of the Department of Homeland Security overseeing the immigration catastrophe; how ludicrous to name no experience Jennifer Granholm to head the Department of Energy; how ludicrous to name Linda Thomas-Greenfield the UN Ambassador...evidence of agenda.

The entire cabinet has three things in common; 1) lack of expertise critical to the positions, 2) all are ideologically bound to Marxianity, and 3) reparatory representation which holds that after a long history of white, Anglo-Saxon, heterosexual male representation the “marginalized” and underrepresented “victims” must now be “overrepresented”. It is the predominate theology of the false religion Marxianity and it extends into every aspect of “woke” culture.

So too George Orwell who provides perspective not only as to Marxian logic but their true aims in just two quotes. First, how does one explain the logic of fluid gender identity?

“For, after all, how do we know that two and two make four? Or that the force of gravity works? Or that the past is unchangeable? If both the past and the external world exist only in the mind, and if the mind itself is controllable – what then?”

And as to power: *"Now I will tell you the answer to my question. It is this. The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power, pure power. What pure power means you will understand presently. We are different from the oligarchies of the past in that we know what we are doing. All the others, even those who resembled ourselves, were cowards and hypocrites. The German Nazis and the Russian Communists came very close to us in their methods, but they never had the courage to recognize their own motives. They pretended, perhaps they even believed, that they had seized power unwillingly and for a limited time, and that just around the corner there lay a paradise where human beings would be free and equal. We are not like that. We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means; it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power. Now you begin to understand me."*

George Orwell, 1984

The United States is fast approaching Orwell's 1984 with a government closely resembling the classic definition of a fascist state and there are many who believe God has removed America from His presence. Such is the view from ground level...but not from the higher vantage. It makes uncommon sense to allow the Marxian evil free reign to take as much territory and gain as much power as possible before the sword falls just to make a point to mankind, now faced with the penultimate choice.

Finally, two last articles will suffice to round out the understanding: *The Human Cost of Socialism in Power* by Richard M. Ebeling and *Would You Recognize a Dystopia If You Saw One?* By Ryan J. Barilleaux

The true nature of the evil that is Marxianity has been provided in a way understandable to the average individual with the focus on the United States as God demands; for it is here the fate of the entire world will be determined...conflagration or the acceptance of peace with terms. This pamphlet is designed to provide a clear understanding of the strategy being employed by Marxian elites in control of western civilization; it is a warning there can be no room for compromise henceforth.

Pamphlet No.3 will detail the tactics employed by Marxianity, after which a new identity to buttress the word "patriot" will be provided along with a platform to launch massive retaliation so as to remove Marxian elites from Washington DC on the way to restoring a constitutional republic as the founders would have it.

Thomas Jefferson said *"If ever there was a holy war, it was that which saved our liberties and gave us independence"* and the holy war must be fought once again.

Godspeed, Adler von Pfingsten