Pierre Ramus
The false doctrine and sciencelessness of Marxism
Karl Marx the true capitalist traitor of socialism
Why Marxism can not be socialist and never was, but can always only lead to state-capitalism.
1919

https://www.anarchismus.at/texte-anarchismus/anarchismus-und-marxismus/6227-ramus-die-irrlehre-und-wissenschaftslosigkeit-des-marxismus
Translator Michael Schreiber - This text is my translation from Pierre Ramus and Franz Barwich, there is obviously no English version of this book available. I really don't know if it ever was translated before? I've translated it around summer 2010 for the first time into English. This is only the small book, there is also a big book with the same title by the same author Pierre Ramus. That Marx and Engels were not dangerous revolutionarists but harmful anti-socialists state-capitalist ideologists is not an exciting discovery, but an old hat. here's the original german source of this text, if anyone wants to read it in the german original: Pierre Ramus / Franz Barwich — Die Irrlehre und Wissenschaftslosigkeit des Marxismus in English translation: "The false doctrine and sciencelessness of Marxism"
https://www.anarchismus.at/texte-anarchismus/anarchismus-und-marxismus/6227-ramus-die-irrlehre-und-wissenschaftslosigkeit-des-marxismus
http://www.syndikalismusforschung.info/barwichmarx.htm

theanarchistlibrary.org

The false doctrine and sciencelessness of Marxism

Karl Marx the true capitalist traitor of socialism
Why Marxism can not be socialist and never was, but can always only lead to state-capitalism.

Pierre Ramus

1919

Contents

Our task in the 21st century is to accelerate this process as much as possible.

— Franz Barwich

versely, to rendering society powerless against the omnipotence of the state. But socialism means socialization. The liberation of mankind from the state and capitalism can only be hoped for by the increasing intelligence, the maturing feeling of justice, the growing feeling of mankind of the individual and stronger minority groups that, as far as possible, deprive the state and capitalism of their spirit and their work. These new people must help to found a new social organization that vigorously detaches itself from capitalism by all means. Communism will not be a natural consequence of accumulation, as Marx claimed, but only people who want to be socialist and constructive in this sense can create communism. At the same time, this justifies the necessity of the union organizers who have to form the cells for the new society.

In order to overcome state rule through a united proletariat and to be able to bring the proletariat to a uniform economic front, the overcoming of Marxist heresies is the prerequisite for this.

Marxist state socialism could only attain its importance because of the Prussian-German victory over France in 1870, whereby state centralism, in its strictest expression, had apparently proven to be the superior and victorious form of organization. After the collapse of Prussian militarism at the end of the First World War, this appearance appeared as a fallacy and should have ended the dominance of Marxist pseudo-socialism. **The workers should have returned to the views of the 1st International, to the libertarian socialism that Bakunin, unlike Marx, advocated. But that did not happen and since then a hundred years have passed uselessly in which these false Marxist theories have been chewed through, broken out and chewed through again. We anarchists must return to the libertarian socialism that Bakunin represented in opposition to Marx and that the wrong Marxian theories finally knock into the bin.**

Part I — Marx, the reactionary capitalist

Social democracy is based on the teachings of Marx and always describes its views as the only correct ones, its theory as scientific socialism. Now it has its own meaning with the term "science." We can often see that much that is given as a new knowledge by a scientific direction is quickly replaced by another explanation inheritance and a. think. Basically, only a few narrowly defined areas of exact research in astronomy, mathematics, physics and chemistry, as well as some general so-called natural laws can be called science. But it is nothing more than a vain presumption to refer to studies of human social life as a science, especially if this is done in a purely abstract form, as Marx did.

The following remarks will prove that all of Marx's teachings are not merely unscientific, but even wrong. There is only one yardstick for knowing the truth, that is our logic, that is, we can only recognize something as true as far as we can determine cause and effect in being or what is happening. From this point of view, one could rather call the worldview of syndicalism, which is based, among other things, on the teachings of Bakunin and Kropotkin, as a scientific one, because it endeavors everywhere to investigate cause and effect and to know as much as possible about real life. However, we still have to reject this scientific name because we are of the opinion that there is no inevitable development of cause and effect in social life, since both are constantly influenced on the one hand by the intellectual will and ability of the individual, and on the other hand by this the social conditions.

But no effect without a cause. So the collapse of social democracy is no accident, not due to the failure of individuals, but the effect of the content of Marxism, the nature of social democracy. It is undoubtedly true that the people at the top of social democracy do not feel genuine freedom and love for the cause of the people, neither in their ethical characteristics nor in their wealth of knowledge. They are politicians, and they are always people who indulge

in the idealless self-interest at the expense of popular interest. People who find their acquisition in the infatuation of the people.

But not only the leaders failed, but also the masses, the led. It must also be recognized that not all crimes have been committed deliberately, but that most supporters of social democracy have acted in good faith. **But that all Social Democrats act in a reactionary manner is due to the principles of Marxism:**

1. **the wrong theories of state socialism and state dictatorship,**
2. **the misguided methods of parliamentary politics and centralism,**
3. **The senseless tactics of bourgeois democracy and military discipline.**

It would be wrong to assume that social democracy will gradually disappear on its own. It will be as long as there will be capitalism. Because as long as the state and capitalism exist, there will always be people who do not want to overcome the existing state of violence and economic robbery, but only adapt to it and want to get along with it as tolerably as possible. You just want to change this state, but you don't want to abolish it. The union of these people is the party of social democracy. Social democracy is just a party movement and not a cultural movement. It lives through capitalism, is flesh from its flesh and only dies with the death of capitalism itself. But in one respect, social democracy will have to stop much earlier, namely as an organization of ideas that supposedly has a scientific basis, the represents true ideals! While parts of Social Democracy continue to splinter because they see their tactics as pernicious, all of these groups, with the exception of individuals who join us, still remain under the spell of their ideas. These groups have to be warned, they have to be shown the right way.

ogy. The desirable goal is a free, independent rural and industrial people instead of the Marxist industrial and agricultural armies.

The final part of the breakdown theory is the crisis theory

Marx's prediction that the approximately 10-year crises of capitalist production would have to occur more and more frequently and violently was also not fulfilled. Rather, capitalism understood how to reduce this crisis by forming cartels and trusts. But it is also not the case that the crises that begin to weaken the capitalist system until the entire capitalist mode of production is ultimately impossible, but the crises prove to be events that have always regenerated the capitalist relations of production, if the lack of planning in capitalist production had taken over. If the capitalist economy has reached the end of its Latin, this will not take place in the form provided by Marx, but capitalism has become bankrupt precisely because of the lack of capital, raw materials and overindebtedness. **And only in the impossibility of suddenly depressing the living standards of the modern workforce and impoverishing large masses without resistance, is the driving factor for the change in social conditions. So now, according to Bakunin's teachings, it depends on the revolutionary will and the energy of the proletariat's ability whether socialism will become a reality.**

The negation of Marxism

Even the exact capitalism-analyzes were already written years before Marx from Fourier and Proudhon, Marx must have known these correct analyzes, and he filled these correct analyzes with authoritarian mistakes.

In all of his investigations, Marx overlooked the fact that, at all times, a violent mechanism made the difference between poverty and wealth possible. So the capitalism of our time is only guaranteed the possibility of its activity through the modern state mechanism. Marx did not recognize the difference between the state and society, and that is why Marxism is already reactionary in the light of socialism, because it does not amount to strengthening society vis-à-vis the state but, con-

a secondary phenomenon, but agricultural production is the elementary form of all production. First of all, people have to eat, that is, have agricultural products, only then can they weave, build machines, produce. And in the end, all means of production, such as houses, machines, raw products, have their origins in agriculture. Marx made things very easy for himself; he transferred the alleged capitalist tendency to agriculture without being overlooked. In agriculture, however, it is much clearer than in industry that this alleged tendency is a fable. The development shows us that in agriculture the large enterprise is constantly declining, while the small enterprise is flourishing and flourishing, and this is true in the same way for all countries.

For example, the occupational census for Germany in 1907 shows us that the number of parcels and small businesses (that is, under 2 hectares) has increased by around 142,000 since 1895. That of small farmers (2–5 ha) lost 10,000, however, only if the actual middle class of the peasantry (5- 20 ha) increased by a full 67,000. By contrast, large-scale farms (20–100 ha) lost almost 20,000, and large-scale land holdings (over 100 ha) lost 1,500, or around 6 percent of all large-scale land holdings in Germany. This actual development of 12 years, a development that hits all Marxist theory in the face, continues in the same way. In other countries, such as Hungary, the same development is taking place to an even greater extent, agriculture in all countries is moving to small businesses.

How rationally the small business works could be seen in China in the 1920s, where the land was divided roughly equally among all families of the huge people, where field farming had become almost superfluous, so rational gardening was practiced that 1 ha of land 10 People fed.

In this way, economic development creates the preconditions for that culture of the communist future, the main features of horticulture and garden management, which will find expression in connection with our high level of electro-mechanical technol-

The way to unite the proletariat on free socialist ground will only be given when the Marxist nonsenses are overcome, when they are recognized as useless and senseless demagogy, as a kind of secular, politically underhanded, devious theology!

All socialist schools from the middle of the 18th to the middle of the 19th century followed on from the fundamental principle that had already been put forward by Thomas Campanello in the 16th century:

"All evils arise from the two opposites of wealth and poverty." All socialist thinkers up to Marx rejected bourgeois philosophy and theology. Marx, on the other hand, proceeded from the Hegelian, historical perspective, which said: "that everything in our social organization, including the bad, all the meanness and violence, are something historically determined," something necessary and in such a way that they are therefore historically conditioned " because in the past and present they have the might, force and power to maintain them. It is now self-evident that the question immediately arises with this assumption: Who is the cause of these historical necessities, that they are producing these or those results? However, only a theological answer to this question is possible. That is why Hegel's view led to the recognition of a concept of God, to the authority and sovereignty of God's favor and the Church, and in general to all the powers of the state, and to the recognition of the right of their existence.

This view is openly reactionary because it is the best excuse and justification for the capitalist system. Hegelianism recognizes what exists and justifies it. His main principle is: "What is reasonable is real, and what is real is reasonable!"

Since true science must be unconditional, this bias to recognize what already exists as reasonable and given results in the lack of knowledge of Hegelianism and thus also its economic variety of Marxism.

In such sophisties the reaction of the Prussian state from 47–48 saw the best philosophy, so it appointed Hegel as professor of phi-

losophy, as whom he then served the reaction excellently until his death. The reactionary nature of Hegel's way of thinking is particularly apparent when one considers the ideas of the current French zeitgeist against men like Rousseau and others who roughly said: "that the rationality of human knowledge has to replace the real thing of its social state — and that that Product of blind historical powers of violence, whose past still protrudes into the present and strives to become the future, is to be condemned as unreasonable."

Marx has now only reversed Hegel's reactionary views, but he had to come to the same result. While Hegel held the spiritual as the only absolute unitary motif in space and humanity, Marx explained the material as the essence of events and social history.

According to Marx, the life of mankind consists of a structure of life processes in which some are superior and subordinate to others. According to Marx, the economy forms the basis of society, while the entire intellectual life is only a kind of superstructure. The study of nature and society, on the other hand, teaches us that all life processes are next to and equal to one another! They stand and work together. All individuals are affected by this influence, but in different ways, and it is now extremely difficult to determine whether intellectual or material factors exert a determining influence. There is a constant interaction between mental and material factors. Although a spiritual process has never taken place outside of the matter of space, it is nevertheless positively correct that there have been enormous, significant events that took place and took place completely independently of the mode of production, at least without any significant influence.

Marxism is based on the theory of Hegelianism that things and conditions constantly change in such a way that the thesis, the existing in the opposite, turns into the antithesis, from which form the synthesis, a form of unification of the first two, emerges, whereupon development begins again with the first form. This theory is just a strange construction of ideas, a fantasy. Science and history prove to us that it is wrong. Science teaches us that lower species

> Marx also adopted his centralist tendencies for the socialist state. **So these tendencies are just as wrong as the whole theory**. As a logical consequence of his erroneous views, Marx considers the annihilation of all middle classes a necessity, although he admits that these middle classes live more freely and better in the capitalist economy than the working class. From these views it follows that social democracy in parliaments favored large capitalism. In the end, advocating for world war is due to the delusion that world war means a natural stage in the necessary concentration of capital. **So terrible are the consequences of Marx's theories, which are entirely wrong. In fact, the opposite is true: the middle class and capitalists are constantly multiplying, the number of exploiters is not decreasing, but increasing**. The Russian scholar Tscherkeseff has demonstrated this in a wonderful way, especially for England, the same country from which Marx had drawn all his "sciences."

According to this, only 39,569 people in England had an income of over 3,000 marks in 1815, but 568092 in 1907, which is 14.3 times as much, while the population had only doubled during this time. In 1907, small capitalists had 16.8 times as much as in 1815, and large capitalists had 11.03 times as much. Developments are similar in all countries, with the number of millionaires in Prussia increasing from 5306 to 9431 from 1895 to 1911. In America, the number of millionaires had increased from 4,000 to 20,000 from the beginning of the war in 1914 to 1924. With these facts, the theory of concentration has been refuted, and Marx's theory of collapse has actually collapsed.

The unscientific nature of Marxism in relation to the concentration theory becomes even more obvious because Marx did not take agriculture into account in all of his studies. In doing so, **Marx has just ignored the main side of the economy, for which reason all his hypotheses would be null and void, industrial capital is only**

right, but it is not right, it is wrong. **Such a consolation, however, is suitable to keep the workers from the class struggle, it leads to fatalism, and is therefore a crime. The breakdown theory breaks down into two main parts, the first is**

The theory of impoverishment This means that as capitalism develops, the situation of the worker must deteriorate more and more, and at the same time the industrial reserve army, that is, the army of the unemployed, will grow. According to this theory, the industrial reserve army should have formed the majority of the people in the 50 to 60 years of industrial development according to Marx, but in reality it has not grown, its number fluctuates in a wavy manner by a certain percentage. **Marx overlooked the fact that capitalism uses a means when there is a danger that the army of the unemployed will become too big, namely war. It is the means of reducing the industrial reserve army. But even if impoverishment theory were true, which, as proven, is not the case, these phenomena could never lead to socialism, but only further away from it. A proletariat so impoverished could perhaps bring about a breakdown of the capitalist system, but could never accomplish socialist construction.** So it is good that this impoverishment theory is also an imaginary haunt, by the way, this theory also directly contradicts Marx's own views about the possibility of being able to mitigate capitalist exploitation by means of a statutory normal working day.

The second part of the breakdown theory is concentration theory According to that, Marx claims that capital is concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, that the middle class is gradually disappearing, is being absorbed by the capitalists, and that, ultimately, the capitalist class is decimating itself more and more among themselves. From this concentration theory,

slowly develop into higher ones, but never has a species changed to its opposite, never does a lion become a lamb-like sheep, never a good-natured goat from a wolf. So capitalism will never automatically change to its opposite, socialism. Every mode of production is based on mathematics, geometry, in short, general technology. However, these are based on human intellectual abilities. So at the beginning of every production there is the human spirit. First, man had to invent and manufacture the tools. The tools could only influence people to a limited extent after they existed. This proves the interaction between the world and the will.

Marx-Hegel's theory of thesis-antithesis synthesis is suitable to put people on self-development, to deprive them of the will to do whatever has happened. That is why it is reactionary! The reactionary theories found their expression in the "Communist Manifesto" and in "The Capital."

Part II. The Communist Manifesto

The communist manifesto is the gospel of the Social Democrat; he considers it to be the epitome of all wisdom and is convinced of its revolutionary content. However, this view does not stand up to critical scrutiny and only proves that all these Social Democrats who swear by the communist manifesto cannot distinguish the terms reactionary and revolutionary.

First of all, it should be noted that the communist manifesto is not an original work by Marx-Engel, but in terms of content and form a plagiarism of the French Fourierist Victor Considerant. Marx and Engels adopted the latter's ideas and expressed their views in their peculiar form. But it is the most concise and clearest summary of Marxism.

In the first part of the brochure, capitalist society is divided into bourgeois and proletarians, and this division is described as the result of class struggles. It is worth noting the fact that abundant half

of the first chapter actually does nothing but praise and admire the great achievements that capitalism is said to have brought! So it is praised that the cities have conquered the flat country. That is wrong, because today we can feel particularly strongly that, conversely, the cities are completely dependent on the country. It is also commended that capitalism had snatched a significant portion of the population from the idiotism of rural life. Again, this is wrong, because the idiotism of the proletarian factory slave in the city is no less than that of the poor agricultural worker. And vice versa, the narrow-mindedness of an industrial or commercial bourgeois in the city is no greater than that of a herb squire in the country. Country life is naturally preferable to city life and therefore the current situation caused by capitalism is to be regretted rather than glorified. Then it says literally: "Like the bourgeoisie, the country from the city, it has made the barbaric and semi-barbaric countries dependent on the civilized, the peasant peoples on the bourgeois peoples, the Orient on the Occident!"

This clearly justifies the imperialist politics of the capitalist states. *The two world wars in the 20th century and the numerous subsequent proxy wars up to the present day in 2020 have once again shown us that the so-called civilized peoples cannot be surpassed in terms of barbarism at all.* **The opposite of what Marx says is correct, capitalism has horribly displaced mankind**; if it continues to exist, it threatens to completely destroy the last remnants of the good natural disposition of people, mutual aid, and free solidarity. These characteristics necessary for socialism are far better developed among primitive peoples. All of Marx's views are highly reactionary.

The relatively best part of the Communist Manifesto is the second, but not because it describes the structure of Communism, of which there is no word in the whole manifesto. But in the same, with good arguments as must be recognized, the different sayings of the bourgeois and capitalist knockers rejected against commu-

freaking job, because we know that the worker is exploited from the first to the last hour of working hours. According to the Marxian theory of added value, the reduction in working hours should also have reduced exploitation. **We know, however, that the profitability of capitalism has not decreased, despite the fact that the working day has been constantly depressed by the workers; rather the reverse took place. Entrepreneurs' profits and dividends have grown steadily. The whole added value teaching has already been proven wrong.** In his chapter, Marx finally draws from the wrong theory of added value that the establishment of a normal working day should be the most important first goal of the workforce. Through participation in the parliaments, the proletariat should stand up for state laws that set a maximum working day. With such gradual reductions in working hours, the added value should be diminished more and more and capitalism should be gradually eroded. Only, fortunately, the workers did not wait for the legal standardization of working hours recommended by Marx, but took it into their own hands by continuously using the direct action. But Marx also had to admit in the capital itself that all the laws in England were either passed out or worsened for the workers, that only the workers themselves were able to improve themselves through any direct action. **We syndicalists know that fraud is not the only form of exploitation, but that the proletariat is also exploited as a consumer through trade, transport, property, and usury, as well as through the various types of taxation by the state. Marx also overlooks the fact that the added value must first be realized through export, which pushes the states towards imperialism. The exploitation of the proletariat cannot therefore be explained by the value added doctrine, it is just as wrong as all other Marxian theories.**

The breakdown theory With the same, Marx asserts that capitalism must give up its own development products on the basis of established economic laws. This would be fine if it were

This is the case in a communist society with all objects of life and production, because every monopoly economy is eliminated and the uninhibited freedom of production of everyone is ensured. With the cessation of the concept of ownership of means of production, every concept of value for the individual also ceases.

If you want to prove the injustice of capitalist exploitation, you don't need the wrong and harmful play of ideas of Marxian value theory! The simple fact that any product is sold at a much higher price than its real producer got for it is probably a sufficiently clear assessment of the exploitation and scope of fraud to which the proletarian is subject.

All other heresies of Marxism now follow from the erroneous theory of values.

Part IV. Value added teaching

With this theory we come to the most important side of Marxism. With it, Marx believed he had discovered the secret of capitalist exploitation. In the meantime, the bourgeois national economists have long since refuted this doctrine of added value by providing evidence (from a capitalist point of view, of course) that added value is justified because it represents remuneration for entrepreneurial work, for the surrender of capital and for risk.

In this theory, Marx again only started from industry; he saw in it that the worker had to work for a daily wage, not yet wrong for the capitalist Marx. However, the entrepreneur does not dismiss the worker after 5 or 6 hours if he has created value for the amount of the daily wages, but employs him for longer, 10 to 12 hours. The difference is the "added value," which the entrepreneur takes, and only then has the exploitation taken place. According to this Marxian theory, exploitation increases with longer working hours. — We can only call this whole construction of thought a ridiculous

nism. but that is all. Nowhere, on the other hand, is there any hint or goal.

First of all it is said that the next purpose of the communists is: formation of the proletariat into a class, (so it was not a class before), overthrow of the bourgeois rule, conquest of political power by the proletariat. Later, however, it is said that the "communist revolution is the most radical break with the traditional ownership structure." But instead of going on to explain what this means, it is suddenly told again that the first step towards the workers' revolution is to raise the proletariat to the ruling class, that is "to fight for democracy." Firstly, the use of democracy means using a hitherto bourgeois medium; secondly, the history of previous revolutions also teaches us and the experiences under the German Social Democratic government have confirmed to us that the recognition of democracy after a revolution always leads to its abdication. So just a mess of ambiguities. Contradictions and self-denials are contained in these only guiding sentences, but no trace of communism. This is understandable because "communism" as Marx-Engels sees it is not communism at all, but state socialism, or rather state collectivism.

While today the producers of commodities are dependent on private capitalists in the use of the production instruments, in the Marx-Engels state this would be the state, the power that would have to rule over the life and death of the people. The proletariat would remain the proletariat, because it would still not be in possession of the means of production. The Communist Manifesto assumes that the state will gradually "die off", dissolve itself. This assumption stands against all experiences in nature and society. A species never turns into its opposite, which is why the state — a means of oppression and exploitation — will never become a society of the free. A state has never committed suicide! Rather, it will increasingly become a factor of power and oppression! A thousand proofs can be given that every form of government fights with tremendous tenacity for its maintenance and against its abolition.

Noskevism and Bolshevism, too, held and abused all ministerial, political and legal offices in exactly the same way as any other form of government. The party and trade union bigwigs are the state powers, the dictators, in the socialist state. But already in the present, under the capitalist form, they form a class of their own that works against the interests of the proletariat, at least permanently inhibiting its vigor — they admit that themselves! So they will not work for the "death of the state" in the state socialist economy, because the death of the state would definitely take away their privileges and rule posts!

Finally, the Communist Manifesto recommends some measures to apply, but they are all reactionary, including:

1. **Expropriation of real estate and use of basic rent for government expenditure. The starving proletarians would have none of this — according to Marx, they should pay a basic pension for the cultivation of the land to meet the high government expenditures.**

2. **Strong progressive tax. So money and tax systems should be maintained, which is capitalist but not socialist.**

3. **Abolition of inheritance law in favor of the state! So everything for the Moloch state, nothing for the people**

4. **Confiscation of property from all emigrants and rebels. Anyone who does not agree with the measures of the state dictators will be robbed of their property, of course in favor of the state!**

5. **Centralization of credit in the hands of the state through a national bank with an exclusive monopoly. No banks are necessary in socialist society, only in capitalist! But the monopoly is the biggest evil there too! Monopoly is the opposite of the common economy, the opposite of socialism.**

So one can read that the average price of removing a full-grown tree is $650 to $1,100 depending on the type of tree and it's height. An old Oak tree costs $950 to remove on average, a Pine tree costs $1,100, and the cost to cut down a Palm tree is around $650, , although first of all it took about the same work to cut down and cut all these trees, but secondly only a few men only had to do a few hours with the cutting and trimming. So the value of the human labor contained in the tree is at most a handful of dozen dollars, but in practice capitalist speculation pays a far higher value. The value of a commodity is also influenced by the exchange relationships, not just by the production relationships, as Marx assumes. Furthermore, the intellectual work can never be measured, especially never in a commodity the measure of the intellectual work contained therein. **Not a single commodity is bought or sold by the capitalist according to the objectified work in it, but only according to the costs necessary for its production including profit, so that in reality only the price is the only real value of a thing, everything else that Marx has in it poetry, has no existence in real reality.**

Marx's claim that work determines the value of all things is, however, a flattering concession to capitalism, to which he basically wants to give a communist content. Because if social work is the yardstick for the value of all goods, then the value is justified and the same for all members of society. The Marxian theory of value is thus suitable to serve capitalist ideology, to put a pardon of apology on exploitation.

The worst thing now is that Marx wanted to transfer his concept of value to state socialist society. For communism, Marx's statements about value are absolutely useless and even inappropriate. All concepts of value as we know them today are all capitalist terms. Air, sunlight, rain, earth moisture, humus, in short, many of the most important factors of production, because they could not be monopolized, are now capitalistically worthless. And yet they are of the highest real value to society.

society — the state — can exploitation take place through possession of the means of production. It was only this institution of violence that created conditions that made slavery possible in antiquity, serfdom in the Middle Ages, and in the modern era it enabled wages to be paid. All of these are forms of exploitation, only of different types, the former not capitalist. But none of this concerns Marx. **For him, exploitation only begins with the production process. Before that he praised the wrong view that the worker was free to sell his goods. This misconception explains why Marx and the Marxists have such a wrong view of freedom. We know that the worker is not free, not equal to the entrepreneur, but that from birth he was made the economic slave of the hunger whip. He has to sell his goods to labor. Here is a fundamental error of Marxist ideas clearly.**

The basic tenet of "capital" is "value theory." Marx also claims that the measure of human labor determines the value of all things. Marx initially overlooked the fact that the costs of manufacturing and obtaining the permission to produce must be acquired from capital before the work begins, and that the value of great preparatory work of past generations is included in everything. Some examples make it easy to see how wrong value theory is. A piece of land does not become worthless because it is unused, that is, no human work is embodied in it. Rather, a piece of undeveloped land is often far more expensive in value than another piece of built-up land elsewhere. Here the local conditions, capitalist speculation, played the decisive role. Things or objects often have a higher value the less they are. Caviar would not be more expensive than herring roe if only the human labor contained in it determined the value. The production of an artificial gemstone usually does more work than grinding a gemstone, and yet the real stone is incomparably more valuable than the artificial one. Today one can observe daily how little in the capitalist economy the value of a commodity is in any relation to the work contained in it.

6. **Centralization of transportation! Workers and the public have become sufficiently familiar with the anti-people effects of this system at the railway and post office — and are getting to know it better every day.**

7. **Compulsory work for all through the establishment of industrial and agricultural armies. Militarization of all economic life.**

According to the communist manifesto in the socialist state it would look like this: They, the chosen leaders, command, rule, but are free from productive work, the masses work on command, under force of arms, similar to what is already done today in prisons, barracks and Monasteries is the case. These reactionary ideas are not even new and original! The management of the Latifundia by huge hordes of slaves was already the predominant agricultural activity of the ruined large property in ancient Rome over three centuries before Christ! **So a turning back to prehistoric, horrific conditions would mean Marxism, and as Rome had to perish in those conditions at the time, the introduction of this system would only mean the enslavement of mankind and again the downfall.**

There is no word in the entire Communist Manifesto about the abolition of the wage system; Marx-Engels does not touch the question of remuneration for human labor at all. This is understandable again, because examining this question would only have given them two options, which neither of them suited. Either the remuneration is based on the work performed. That would not be possible because a state can never grant producers the full return of their labor because they have to collect a large part of the labor income to maintain it. Or all members of society are given food, clothing, and the need for what communism is. **In the latter case, however, the compulsory state is an absurdity, because without economic means of coercion, i.e. without the threat of starvation or the like,**

no communist state could enforce its will against unruly minorities. But if he can do this, he ceases to be communist and is again a present state with exploitation. In order not to clarify these facts, Marx-Engels had to remain silent about it and leave everything to the course of development! **So we see that Marx-Engels in the Communist Manifesto falsified a fake Communism for the real one.** As communist ideas became more and more widespread at the time, Marx-Engels provided their reactionary state capitalist ideas with the false coin heading: "Communist Manifesto!"

Because social democracy has accepted these ideas, true communism has been forgotten by the workers, and the necessary transformation of the capitalist economy into the communist one is now proving to be extremely difficult.

Part III. The capital

"Capital" is generally considered the bible of the genuine Social Democrat and not without reason, because it is obese, difficult to understand and can also be interpreted in all possible directions; it is also very dogmatic and unscientific. Marx calls it "Critique of Political Economy," with which he follows the method of the English who avoid the term "national economy" that is common in Germany. **There is a great hoax in the very word, this economy is not, as one tries to make it appear with the word, the interests of the entire people, but those of a small privileged minority, a political clique. National economics is to be seen as an attempt to justify the capitalist system of exploitation.** While communism denies all the basic elements of bourgeois society and its productive material form of existence and conditions, the national economy explains them, justifies them and, from this point of view, endeavors to systematically develop them.

This is the intellectual activity of all national economists, they are, so to speak, the bookkeepers of the ruling system with

all its fake credit and debit pages. If Marxism is a tremendous stumbling block in the development of socialism by depressing it to the level of authority and violence of the state dictatorship that is contrary to culture, it shows perhaps an even greater step backwards in the fact that instead of overcoming any national economy through capitalism, it to emphasize communism, which has incorporated communism into the national economy. In this way, Marx based the idea of social liberation on the commercial jargon of capitalist commercialism, on its speculation and reasons. One can admit that it is often right to seek out and beat the enemy in one's own camp, and Marx did that too, but he got stuck in the national economy. His teachings are limited to reforms from the point of view of national economy compared to the previously thoughtless luminaries in this field. But this had been done by other scholars long before Marx and therefore nothing new. Marx did not build on the great intellectual work of many socialists that already existed; he was and remained just a great economist. **Existing communism had already disproved bourgeois national economy before Marx; it was primarily done by Proudhon and Fourier. At that time it would have been important to further develop the existing communist ideas, but Marx thoroughly failed to do so. Bakunin was the only one who practiced this task, Bakunin, who was fiercely fought by Marx for this.**

In "Capital" Marx fails to address the preconditions for the emergence of the concept of money, he simply reckons with this concept. With this method, of course, he did not have to come to the conclusion that the ruling institutions and the monopolies of individuals are the preconditions for the creation of capital.

According to Marx, the capitalist class already has the possibility of an exploitation and enslavement function because it possesses the means of production. But this is thought too short-sighted! **Possession alone would not suffice if there were no power to guarantee the capitalist his immense claim to property; Only if there is an organization of power and violence within**