

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:**

Speechwriting: Research Office

**Folder Title:**

04/16/1985 Dropby: Conference on Religious Liberty  
(1 of 7)

**Box:** 202

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

# WITHDRAWAL SHEET

## Ronald Reagan Library

**Collection Name** SPEECHWRITING, OFFICE OF: RESEARCH OFFICE RECORDS

**Withdrawer**

MJD 6/15/2007

**File Folder** 04/16/1985 DROPBY: CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY (1)

**FOIA**

S07-069

**Box Number** 202

10

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
37353	CABLE	032318Z APR 85	1	4/3/1985	B1
37354	CABLE	SAME AS #37352	1	4/3/1985	B1

### Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

(NOONAN)

APRIL 16, 1985

EP

DROPBY CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

I AM DEEPLY HONORED TO ADDRESS THIS CONFERENCE. I KNOW THAT A GOOD MANY OF YOU HAVE COME A LONG WAY TO BE HERE TODAY, AND I KNOW YOU HAVE GIVEN GREATLY OF YOUR TIME, ENERGY AND CONCERN. AND I CAN ONLY HOPE, AS YOU DO, THAT THOSE NOW SUFFERING AROUND THE WORLD FOR THEIR BELIEFS WILL DRAW RENEWED COURAGE FROM YOUR WORK.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGION AND ITS IMPACT ON CIVILIZATION CANNOT BE SUMMARIZED IN A FEW DAYS, NEVER MIND MINUTES. BUT ONE OF THE GREAT SHARED CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL RELIGIONS IS THE DISTINCTION THEY DRAW BETWEEN THE TEMPORAL WORLD AND THE SPIRITUAL WORLD.

ALL RELIGIONS, IN EFFECT, ECHO THE WORDS OF THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW:

"RENDER THEREFORE UNTO CAESAR THE THINGS WHICH ARE CAESAR'S; AND UNTO GOD THE THINGS THAT ARE GOD'S." WHAT THIS INJUNCTION TEACHES US IS THAT THE INDIVIDUAL CANNOT BE ENTIRELY SUBORDINATE TO THE STATE, THAT THERE EXISTS A WHOLE OTHER REALM, AN ALMOST MYSTERIOUS REALM OF INDIVIDUAL THOUGHT AND ACTION WHICH IS SACRED, AND WHICH IS TOTALLY BEYOND AND OUTSIDE OF STATE CONTROL.

THIS IDEA HAS BEEN CENTRAL TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

ONLY IN AN INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE WHICH DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN THE CITY OF GOD AND THE CITY OF MAN -- AND WHICH EXPLICITLY AFFIRMS THE INDEPENDENCE OF GOD'S REALM, AND FORBIDS ANY INFRINGEMENT BY THE STATE ON ITS PREROGATIVES -- ONLY IN SUCH A CLIMATE COULD THE IDEA OF INDIVIDUAL HUMAN RIGHTS TAKE ROOT, GROW, AND EVENTUALLY FLOURISH.

WE SEE THIS CLIMATE IN ALL DEMOCRACIES, AND IN OUR OWN POLITICAL TRADITION. THE FOUNDERS OF OUR REPUBLIC ROOTED THEIR DEMOCRATIC COMMITMENT IN THE BELIEF THAT ALL MEN ARE ENDOWED BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN INALIENABLE RIGHTS. AND SO THEY CREATED A SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT WHOSE AVOWED PURPOSE WAS -- AND IS -- THE PROTECTION OF THOSE GOD-GIVEN RIGHTS.

BUT, AS ALL OF YOU KNOW ONLY TOO WELL, THERE ARE MANY POLITICAL REGIMES TODAY THAT COMPLETELY REJECT THE NOTION THAT A MAN OR A WOMAN CAN HAVE A GREATER LOYALTY TO GOD THAN TO THE STATE. MARX'S CENTRAL INSIGHT, WHEN HE WAS CREATING HIS POLITICAL SYSTEM, WAS THAT RELIGIOUS BELIEF WOULD SUBVERT HIS INTENTIONS. UNDER THE COMMUNIST SYSTEM, THE RULING PARTY WOULD CLAIM FOR ITSELF THE ATTRIBUTES WHICH RELIGIOUS FAITH ASCRIBES TO GOD ALONE -- AND THE STATE WOULD BE FINAL ARBITER OF TRUTH, JUSTICE, AND MORALITY. MARX DECLARED RELIGION AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE -- A DRUG, AN OPIATE OF THE MASSES. AND LENIN SAID, "RELIGION AND COMMUNISM ARE INCOMPATIBLE IN THEORY AS WELL AS IN PRACTICE... WE MUST FIGHT RELIGION."

ALL OF THIS ILLUSTRATES A TRUTH THAT I BELIEVE MUST BE RE-UNDERSTOOD: ATHEISM IS NOT AN INCIDENTAL ELEMENT OF COMMUNISM, NOT JUST PART OF THE PACKAGE -- IT IS THE PACKAGE.

IN COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE FALLEN UNDER COMMUNIST RULE, IT IS OFTEN THE CHURCH WHICH FORMS THE MOST POWERFUL BARRIER AGAINST A COMPLETELY TOTALITARIAN SYSTEM, AND SO, TOTALITARIAN REGIMES ALWAYS SEEK EITHER TO DESTROY THE CHURCH OR, WHEN THAT IS IMPOSSIBLE, TO SUBVERT IT.

IN THE SOVIET UNION, THE CHURCH WAS IMMEDIATELY ATTACKED BY THE COMMUNIST REVOLUTION. BUT THE SOVIETS, BOWING TO WESTERN "SQUEAMISHNESS" ABOUT THE DENIAL OF LIBERTIES, OFTEN CHARACTERIZED THEIR ACTIONS AS MERELY DEFENSIVE.

IN 1945, JOSEF STALIN MET WITH HARRY HOPKINS, WHO HAD BEEN SENT BY HARRY TRUMAN TO DISCUSS VARIOUS EAST/WEST PROBLEMS. IN THE MIDDLE OF A TALK ABOUT POLITICS, STALIN INTERJECTED THE FOLLOWING: IN 1917, HE SAID, THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY HAD PROCLAIMED THE RIGHT OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AS PART OF THEIR POLITICAL PROGRAM. BUT, HE SAID, THE CHURCHES OF RUSSIA HAD DECLARED THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT ANATHEMA, AND HAD CALLED ON CHURCH MEMBERS TO RESIST THE CALL OF THE RED ARMY. NOW WHAT COULD WE DO, SAID STALIN, BUT DECLARE WAR ON THE CHURCH! HE ASSURED HOPKINS, HOWEVER, THAT WORLD WAR TWO HAD ENDED THE CHURCH-STATE ANTAGONISM AND NOW FREEDOM OF RELIGION COULD BE GRANTED TO THE CHURCH.

BUT THAT, AS YOU KNOW, NEVER HAPPENED.

HISTORY HAS TAUGHT US THAT YOU CAN BULLDOZE A CHURCH BUT YOU CAN'T EXTINGUISH ALL THAT IS GOOD IN EVERY HUMAN HEART.

AND SO, IN SPITE OF THE DANGERS INVOLVED,  
THERE ARE CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, AND MUSLIMS  
AND OTHERS THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNIST WORLD  
WHO CONTINUE TO PRACTICE THEIR FAITH.  
SOME OF THEM HAVE BEEN IMPRISONED  
FOR THEIR COURAGE.

THERE IS THE LATE VALERIE MARCHENKO,  
WHO DIED IN A SOVIET PRISON HOSPITAL A FEW  
SHORT MONTHS AGO. HE WAS 37 YEARS OLD,  
A SCHOLAR AND A CHRISTIAN WHO, AT HIS MOST  
RECENT TRIAL, SPOKE OF HIS BELIEF IN GOD AND  
HIS FAITH IN HUMAN GOODNESS.

THERE IS FATHER GLEB YAKUNIN,  
WHO WAS RECENTLY SENT TO SIBERIA FOR 5 YEARS  
OF INTERNAL EXILE. HE IS ANOTHER PRISONER  
OF FAITH. AND BRONISLAV BOROVSKY,  
RECENTLY SENTENCED FOR SMUGGLING BIBLES INTO  
CZECHOSLOVAKIA. THESE ARE ONLY A FEW OF  
MANY.

DR. ERNEST GORDON, THE PRESIDENT OF AN ORGANIZATION NAMED CREED -- CHRISTIAN RESCUE EFFORT FOR THE EMANCIPATION OF DISSIDENTS -- NOTED THAT ON A RECENT TRIP TO EASTERN EUROPE, HE SPOKE WITH A PRIEST WHO HAD SPENT 10 YEARS IN PRISON. THE PRIEST ASKED HIM TO DELIVER A MESSAGE TO THE WEST: THERE IS A WAR GOING ON; IT IS NOT NUCLEAR BUT SPIRITUAL. THE FALLOUT OF THE ATHEISTIC EXPLOSION IS EVERYWHERE, BUT DR. GORDON ADDED, "ALTHOUGH THE FALLOUT MAY BE EVERYWHERE, WE ARE REMINDED THAT GOD TOO IS EVERYWHERE AND NOT EVEN TYRANNIES CAN KEEP HIM OUT."

WE IN THE UNITED STATES HAVE PROTESTED THIS TERRIBLE ABUSE OF PEOPLE WHO ARE NOTHING LESS THAN HEROES OF THE CENTURY.

MOST RECENTLY, WHEN CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS MET IN MOSCOW WITH GENERAL SECRETARY GORBACHEV, THEY GAVE THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP A LIST OF BALTIC AND UKRAINIAN PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE. AND THE COUNCIL ON SOVIET JEWRY AND OTHER GROUPS WERE MAGNIFICENT IN MAKING SURE THAT THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION DID NOT LEAVE WITHOUT EXTENSIVE DATA ON REPRESSION AGAINST JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION, OF COURSE, IS NOT CONFINED TO EUROPE. WE SEE IT IN IRAN, WHOSE LEADERS HAVE VIRTUALLY DECLARED WAR ON THE BAHAIS. WE SEE IT IN AFGHANISTAN, WHERE THE SOVIET MILITARY HAS RESORTED TO INCREASINGLY CRUEL MEASURES AGAINST THE MOSLEM PEOPLE. AND WE SEE A VARIATION ON HOW TO ABUSE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE SANDINISTA REGIME OF NICARAGUA.

IN NICARAGUA, THE SANDINISTA REGIME IS FACED WITH A POLITICALLY ACTIVE CHURCH THAT -- ALTHOUGH IT SUPPORTED THE REVOLUTION -- IS NOW CONSIDERED A MAJOR OBSTACLE TO COMPLETE TOTALITARIAN CONTROL. SOME TIME BACK, NICARAGUAN BISHOP PABLO ANTONIO VEGA SAID THAT "...WE ARE LIVING WITH A TOTALITARIAN IDEOLOGY THAT NO ONE WANTS IN THIS COUNTRY." THE SANDINISTAS ARE ACTIVELY ATTEMPTING TO DISCREDIT AND SPLIT THE CHURCH HIERARCHY. AND THERE IS ONE NEW AREA TO BE WATCHED: THE SANDINISTAS, LIKE ALL COMMUNIST REGIMES, ARE INJECTING THEIR IDEOLOGY INTO THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND HAVE BEGUN WIDESPREAD CAMPAIGNS TO INDOCTRINATE CHILDREN AND ADULTS. BUT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS FIGHTING TO MAINTAIN AUTONOMY AND KEEP THIS INDOCTRINATION OUT OF THEIR CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS.

THIS HAS NOT BEEN RESOLVED.  
CUBA SOLVED THE PROBLEM BY CLOSING ALL  
PRIVATE SCHOOLS, INCLUDING RELIGIOUS  
SCHOOLS.

THE GENERAL STATE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY  
IN NICARAGUA IS SUGGESTED BY TESTIMONY FROM  
VARIOUS SOURCES, BUT MOST VIVIDLY BY THOSE  
WHO HAVE FLED THIS BRUTAL REGIME.  
WE RECENTLY LEARNED OF A PASTOR OF THE  
EVANGELICAL CHURCH IN A NICARAGUAN TOWN WHO  
TOLD THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS THAT THE  
SANDINISTAS HAD THREATENED TO SEND THE  
3,000 MEMBERS OF HIS CHURCH TO RELOCATION  
CAMPS. THE PASTOR AND HIS CHURCH MEMBERS  
ARE NOW HIDING OUT IN CAVES AND TEMPORARY  
SETTLEMENTS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE.

THE SANDINISTAS ALSO HARASSED JEWS.  
TWO NICARAGUAN REFUGEES, SARITA AND  
OSCAR KELLERMANN, HAVE TOLD OF THE  
FIREBOMBING OF THEIR SYNAGOGUE BY THE  
SANDINISTAS.

THE SANDINISTAS WROTE ON THE SYNAGOGUE THE WORDS "WHAT HITLER STARTED, WE WILL FINISH." AND THEY WROTE ON THE KELLERMANN'S HOME; "JEWS -- OUT OF NICARAGUA."

MAY I INTERJECT HERE THAT STORIES LIKE THESE, OF ORGANIZED COERCION, AND BRUTALITY AND TERROR, ARE THE REASON WE ARE ASKING CONGRESS FOR AID TO HELP THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS, AND TO HELP THE VICTIMS OF THE SANDINISTA REGIME.

WHEN I THINK OF NICARAGUA THESE DAYS, IT OCCURS TO ME ANEW THAT YOU CAN JUDGE ANY NEW GOVERNMENT, ANY NEW REGIME, BY WHETHER OR NOT IT ALLOWS RELIGION TO FLOURISH. IF IT DOESN'T, YOU CAN BE SURE IT IS AN ENEMY OF MANKIND -- FOR IT IS ATTEMPTING TO BAN WHAT IS MOST BEAUTIFUL IN THE HUMAN HEART.

BUT WE MUST NOT FEEL DESPAIR, BECAUSE IT IS NOT APPROPRIATE TO THE TIMES. WE ARE LIVING IN A DRAMATIC AGE.

THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, THE MACHINERY OF THE STATE IS BEING USED AS NEVER BEFORE AGAINST RELIGIOUS FREEDOM -- BUT AT THE SAME TIME, THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, NEW GROUPS OF BELIEVERS KEEP SPRINGING UP. POINTS OF LIGHT FLASH OUT IN THE DARKNESS, AND GOD IS HONORED ONCE AGAIN. PERHAPS THIS IS THE GREATEST IRONY OF THE COMMUNIST EXPERIMENT: THE VERY PRESSURE THEY APPLY SEEMS TO CREATE THE FORCE, FRICTION, AND HEAT THAT ALLOW DEEP BELIEF TO ONCE AGAIN BURST INTO FLAME.

I BELIEVE THAT THE MOST ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF OUR DEFENSE OF FREEDOM IS OUR INSISTENCE ON SPEAKING OUT FOR THE CAUSE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS COUNTRY REDEDICATE ITSELF WHOLEHEARTEDLY TO THIS CAUSE.

I JOIN YOU IN YOUR DESIRE THAT THE  
PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF AMERICA,  
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, AND THE JEWISH  
ORGANIZATIONS REMEMBER THE MEMBERS OF THEIR  
FLOCK WHO ARE IN PRISON OR IN JEOPARDY IN  
OTHER COUNTRIES.

WE ARE OUR BROTHERS' KEEPERS,  
ALL OF US. AND I HOPE THE MESSAGE WILL GO  
FORTH, FROM THIS CONFERENCE TO PRISONERS OF  
CONSCIENCE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD:

"TAKE HEART, YOU HAVE NOT BEEN FORGOTTEN.  
WE, YOUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN GOD,  
HAVE MADE YOUR CAUSE OUR CAUSE, AND WE VOW  
NEVER TO RELENT UNTIL YOU HAVE REGAINED THE  
FREEDOM THAT IS YOUR BIRTHRIGHT AS A CHILD  
OF GOD."

THANK YOU. GOD BLESS ALL OF YOU.

# # #

**MARXISM**, a political and social doctrine developed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels and officially maintained by the Communist parties. See COMMUNISM; COMMUNIST PARTIES.

**Essential Features.** Marxism is a theory of the nature of history and politics as well as a prescription for revolutionary action to bring the industrial working class to power and create a classless society. The basic propositions of Marxism are that the economic forces of production determine the form of social classes, the state, and the religious and intellectual superstructure of society; that society has been dominated by a ruling class of property owners who exploit the lower class; and that according to the laws of the "dialectic," each social system generates the forces that will destroy it and create a new system, with political revolution and the emergence of a new ruling class marking each transition.

According to Marxism, mankind has experienced five types of society—primitive communism, Asiatic society, ancient slave-holding society, feudalism, and capitalism. The expected breakdown of capitalism will set the stage for a proletarian revolution and the establishment of a classless communist society with the "withering away" of the state.

Different schools of Marxism—revisionist (moderate), orthodox, and revolutionary (Bolshevik, Communist)—have differed mainly over questions of methods: democratic or violent, gradual or abrupt. Wherever Communist parties have come to power, Marxism has been made the official philosophy, but its interpretation has been controlled by each Communist government to justify its own policies. The Marxist prophecies of the classless society and the withering away of the state have not come true; instead, the characteristic pattern of the officially Marxist societies is a bureaucratic dictatorship.

**Development of Marxist Theory.** The theory of Marxism was worked out by Marx and Engels over an extended period of time in the 19th century, and the different stages of their thought show different emphases and even contradictions. By 1845, when he was 27, Marx had assimilated the three main intellectual sources of his theory—German philosophy (Hegel), French utopian socialism, and British classical economic theory. In his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844, Marx concluded that man was alienated from his own true nature by the class system and the exploitation of the lower class by the upper. In 1845, in *The German Ideology*, he formulated his materialist conception of history, and in 1847, in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, he produced his first systematic statement of the dialectical breakdown of capitalism as well as the predicted triumph of the proletarian revolution.

Beginning with the publication of their fiery summation, the *Communist Manifesto*, in January 1848, Marx and Engels devoted the next five years to revolutionary political agitation and to journalistic comments on Europe's unsuccessful revolutions of 1848–1849. From 1852 until the mid-1860's, Marx concentrated on the scholarly elaboration of his economic theory of capitalism, publishing his *Critique of Political Economy* in 1859 and the first volume of *Das Kapital* (*Capital*) in 1867. In 1864, with the organization of the International Workingmen's Association (see INTERNATIONAL), Marx renewed his interest in

practical political activity. Much of his energy from that time, until illness (and possibly doubt) sapped his powers in the mid-1870's, was devoted to political programs, especially the *Civil War in France* (1871), on the model of the Paris Commune, and *The Critique of the Gotha Program* (1875), on the future of communist society.

After 1875 the extension of Marxism was mostly the work of Engels, in his writings on philosophy (*Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution and Science*, or "Anti-Dühring," in 1878), on dialectics (*Dialectics of Nature*, not published until 1925), on sociology (*The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, 1884); and on the laws of history (mainly in letters).

**Marx's Social Theory.** Marx's theory is termed by Engels "historical materialism" and attributes fundamental importance to the economic aspect of life. According to Marx, the material conditions of producing and exchanging goods (the "forces of production"), together with the system of property ownership ("relations of production"), determine the development of society into two classes and the mental nature of government, religion, and art in any given epoch. Marxism is thus a theory of economic determinism, in which the social system, and political, legal, and religious institutions are the "superstructure," which is substantially governed by the economic base.

Together with its superstructure each society develops an "ideology," a set of official religious doctrines justifying the power of the ruling class. Marx once defined ideology as "conscience," in other words a view of the world distorted by the class interests of the exploiters and upheld in order to justify their interests.

According to Marxism, all societies develop through a hypothetical stage of primitive communism, which has been split into two principal classes, the property-owning exploiters and the propertyless exploited workers. Social change from one system to another comes about primarily through changes in the economic base, giving rise to a new ruling class that seizes political power through revolution and causes its new ideology to prevail.

The identity of each ruling class and its respective lower class depends on the stage of development of the economic base. Ancient slave-holding society was divided into the slave and the slaveholder; the superstructure was the city-state or the empire, and the ideology was the pantheistic Greco-Roman religion. The concept of a classless society was not clearly developed by Marx and Engels, but it was intended to recognize an alternative to the slave-owning society, in which the exploiters were the class of government officials who extracted taxes from the peasants, presumably more progressive was the society of feudalism where the ruling class was the nobility which exploited the serfs; the superstructure was the monarchy; and the ideology was the Christian religion.

In elaborating his philosophy of history, Marx devoted most of his attention to the transition from feudalism to capitalism (especially in England) and the rise of a new ruling class, the bourgeoisie, deriving its power from the accumulation of monetary capital and the modern

of industrial p  
commercial developm  
the beginnings of the  
as the stage of th  
capital" and attribute  
and the French  
of the rising bo  
"Laissez-fair  
government  
workers and kept har  
Marx the ideolo  
characteristic of the

Following the sar  
lation by the clas  
exploited by the  
the workers wo  
the owners of (c  
society of social  
Marx used almo  
In some of his  
his economic  
the role of force and  
in his late 1  
of the  
the political and i  
on the econo  
however, econc  
factor both  
a limiting human a

**Marxian Philosph**  
ology as a who  
materialism" by  
because it take  
dialectic" as its mo  
in society and  
view, a given si  
opposing force  
break up th  
a new one (the  
becomes the "t  
velopment.

The Marxian the  
tical model  
by the dev  
between the class sys  
ture on the one  
the economic base  
al changes are  
relative changes  
"and" "antithe  
dialectical view  
pt and violent,  
form.

The Marxian di  
contrary to F  
of ideas as th  
material world.  
uses: first, in  
physically "idea  
second, in asser  
("dialectic") factors  
Marxism do  
guided solely by  
it extend to th  
such motives  
an impass  
rule of self-int  
al appeal of Ma  
fraternity has b  
d success.

Marx had no p  
rying the philosop  
ation of society;  
trying to represe

h of his writing  
id possibly  
mid-1870's,  
specially in  
the meaning  
Critique of the  
uture commu

of Marxism  
writings on  
s Revolution  
1875, and  
hed until  
Family, Pro  
and on the

theory of socie  
materialism  
to the econ  
Marx, the  
and exchange  
tion").  
ownership  
nine the basic  
s and the  
religion, and  
ism is thus a  
which econo  
he "base" of  
al, and religio  
ture," whose  
by the form

ture each socie  
official beliefs  
re power of  
the ideology as  
the view of  
terests of the  
justify those

societies after  
the communism  
classes, the prop  
propertyless class  
change from  
it primarily from  
giving rise to  
litical power  
eology to prev  
ng class and  
on the state of  
se. Ancient slave  
to the slaves who  
ploited them, the  
te or the ancient  
the pantheon of  
concept of Asia  
ped by Marx  
to recognize  
ng society, where  
f government  
the peasants. Pre  
as the society  
s was the nobility  
superstructure  
y was the Chri

ay of history  
to the transi  
(especially in  
ruling class, the  
from the accu  
the modern

Industrial production. He analyzed the development of the 17th century and the stages of the Industrial Revolution in the stage of the "primary accumulation of capital" and attributed the English Revolution of the French Revolution of 1789 to the rising bourgeoisie to achieve political "Laissez-faire" liberalism, with parliament that denied the vote to the poor and kept hands off business, represented the ideology and the superstructure of the capitalist society.

Following the same pattern, Marx predicted by the class of industrial workers who exploited by the capitalists. He prophesied workers would overthrow and expropriate owners of capital and establish a classless society of socialism or communism (terms used almost interchangeably).

Some of his historical writings, Marx's economic determinism and conceded of force and political action in history. In his late letters made a general acknowledgment of the possible reverse influence of political and ideological superstructure of the economic base. In the "last analysis," economic developments were the factor both in generating change and in human aspirations at any stage.

**Philosophy—The "Dialectic."** Marx's philosophy as a whole has been termed "dialectical materialism" by his followers. It is "dialectical" because it takes Hegel's philosophy of the dialectic as its model of the process of change in society and in the world of nature. In a given situation (the "thesis") opposing forces (the "antithesis") that ultimately break up the original situation and produce a new one (the "synthesis"). The synthesis becomes the "thesis" for the next stage of development.

Marxian theory of society follows the dialectic model closely. Social change is brought about by the development of "contradictions" between the class system and the political superstructure. On the one hand and new developments in the economic base on the other. Quantitative changes are suddenly transformed into qualitative changes when the tension between the "thesis" and "antithesis" erupts in revolution. In the dialectical view, social change is usually gradual and violent, and revolution is therefore inevitable.

Marxian dialectic is "materialist" because contrary to Hegel, it deals not with the ideas as the primary reality, but with the material world. Marxism is materialist in that it is first, in rejecting any religious or metaphysically "idealist" view of the universe and, in asserting the primacy of material factors rather than ideas in human development. Marxism does not hold that individuals are motivated solely by economic self-interest, nor does it deny the ethical materialism of expediency motives. On the contrary, Marxism is an impassioned moral protest against the lack of self-interest in human affairs. The central ideal of Marxism as a creed of equality and social justice has been a major factor in its popularity.

Marx had no particular scientific reason for turning the philosophic dialectic over into his dialectic of society; it was merely his crude way of representing social problems in a dy-

namic developmental manner. Some Marxists, following Engels, have attempted to apply the dialectic to the physical and biological worlds. There is even less scientific merit in this.

**Marx's Economic Theory.** The Marxian theory of economics is primarily an analysis of capitalism, with England in Marx's own time as the model. He combined a moral and an economic attack on capitalism with his theory of exploitation and surplus value, and he argued dialectically that the inherent contradictions in capitalism would ultimately destroy it.

Capitalism, according to Marx, is based on the exploitation of the working class (proletariat) by the owners of capital (factories, machinery, and working capital), whose profits come from the difference between the wages of labor and the value of the product. Marx borrowed most of his argument from the British classical economists Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, and David Ricardo, although they wrote in defense of capitalism. He followed them on the labor theory of value, the iron law of wages, and the concept of surplus value. According to the labor theory of value, the value of a commodity is determined by the labor necessary to produce it. Wages, however, according to the iron law, are pushed down to the subsistence level by increasing population and held there by the "reserve army" of the unemployed. The difference between the wage level and the value of the product is "surplus value," which is appropriated by the capitalist as profit.

Besides his moral condemnation of surplus value and exploitation, Marx added three propositions about the development of capitalism: the law of accumulation, by which, he argued, competition forced capitalists to reinvest their profits in order to cut labor costs and increase production; the law of concentration of capital, by which big capitalists grew bigger by forcing the smaller ones out of business and into the working class; and the law of increasing misery of the proletariat, by which labor-saving machinery increased the ranks of the unemployed and thereby depressed wages.

In the later volumes of *Capital*, Marx tried to argue that the rate of profit on capital must necessarily fall as industry expands, thus contributing to the business cycle and the ultimate crisis of capitalism. Ultimately, Marx believed, capitalism would be paralyzed by the contradiction between the social nature of industry and the system of ever more concentrated private property. Capitalism would exhaust its possibilities of development and give way in the next stage of the dialectic to the proletarian revolution and socialism.

**Theory of the Proletarian Revolution.** Marx was convinced that his historical and economic research had created the basis for "scientific socialism," and that the laws of history he believed he had discovered made the breakdown of capitalism and the rise of the proletariat just as inevitable as the overthrow of feudalism by the bourgeoisie. The proletariat would seize power as the new ruling class, abolish capitalist private ownership of the means of production, eliminate class differences, and thus usher in the classless society of communism. Since the victory of the proletariat would end the history of contradictions between the ruling class and its subjects, the whole process of the dialectic would finally come to an end. Beginning in the most indus-

trially advanced countries, the revolution would ordinarily be violent, but where the workers had the vote, as in Britain and the United States, it might be accomplished peacefully.

While Marx hesitated to draw up a detailed blueprint for the revolution and the ensuing socialist society, he did make a number of general predictions and suggestions. The revolution must be the work of the proletariat itself, following naturally from the trend toward organization and consciousness promoted among the working class by the conditions of capitalist industry. Capitalism would tend toward monopoly and the boom-and-bust fluctuations of the business cycle. Sooner or later there would be a crisis severe enough to bring the working class to power. The workers' first step would be to destroy the old bureaucratic government and replace it with a "dictatorship of the proletariat." This workers' state, based on direct democracy and workers' pay for officials, would expropriate the monopoly capitalists and bring the whole working class into the administration of industry.

Following the abolition of class differences by the proletarian revolution, the state—existing primarily to enforce the exploitation of the propertyless class—could begin to wither away. Society would gradually evolve through the "first phase of communism," in which people still would be paid for their work, into the "final phase of communism," in which the state would disappear, national differences would subside, and the entire system of monetary rewards and inequalities would vanish. Then, as Marx wrote, "Society can inscribe upon its banners, from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

**Critique of Marxism.** Like any other broad theory of society, Marxism is subject to many criticisms, and its significance should be weighed as a contribution to the development of modern politics and social thought rather than as a dogma that must be condemned or taken on faith.

Marxism is replete with inconsistencies and ambiguities, and has been subject to all manner of interpretations both by its detractors and by various schools among its followers. The factual weaknesses in Marxism center on the analysis of classes and the prediction of their future development. The scheme of rulers and exploited is much too simple for any period of history, and there are numerous instances of political changes that do not correspond to social and economic changes. Certain powerful historical forces—nationality, for one—cannot be explained by the class struggle, and the Marxian explanation of religious and ideological commitments is quite inadequate.

Judgment of the predictive value of Marxism depends on whether one accepts the Communist revolutions as the sort of event Marx had in mind. The proletarian revolution has failed to materialize in the advanced capitalist countries, where Marx expected it, unless the gradual reform under Scandinavian and British socialism is viewed as proof of the prediction. Marx was clearly wrong on the trend toward increased misery of the working class, and he failed to foresee the rise of the salaried middle class of professional, technical, and white-collar workers.

A major weakness in the inner logic of Marxism is the question why the dialectic should stop once capitalism has been overthrown; why not a new ruling class exploiting the masses on some new basis? Some Marxist writers have

suggested that the bureaucracy of the party has become a new ruling class that exploits the masses not through private property but through its control of the state. For example, Leon Trotsky, *The Revolution and Us*, James Burnham, *The Managerial Revolution*, and Milovan Djilas, *The New Class*.

Certain questions were left in an inconclusive, contradictory state by Marx and have been the subject of recurring controversy among his followers: the necessity of violence versus the possibility of democratic methods in the proletarian revolution; the inevitability of a two-stage and proletarian revolution for the world versus the possibility of separate lines of development; and the efficacy of deliberate leadership and ideological inspiration versus rigorous determination of the future by objective circumstances. Marxism suffers from a fundamental duality of the objective and the subjective, that is, determinism and voluntarism—trying to offer simultaneously a prediction of the course of history and a moral prescription. From this stem two tendencies that have repeatedly divided the Marxist movement: passivity in the face of a foreordained course, or manipulation of the science to make it conform to the impulses of activism.

Marxism aroused violent antagonism in advanced countries, as a dangerous challenge to political, social, and religious order. As a revolutionary threat has subsided, it has gradually to be recognized intellectually by social scientists in Europe and America as a major contribution to the understanding of social change and social problems, although many of its particular concepts and predictions may not be valid. Marxism challenged scholars to develop the interrelatedness of the different aspects of society—political, economic, social, and cultural—and, in particular, to give economic factors their due weight in explaining social change and the present. With the concept of Marxism as a set of beliefs that justify the purpose of the movement or a ruling class, Marx continued to be the foundations of the sociology of labor and the notion of relativism in the interpretation of history. These approaches, of course, are confined to Marxists or particularly tied to Leninism. On the contrary, Communists do not insist with favor on the application of such rigorous sociological analysis to their own philosophical movement.

**Influence of Marxism to 1917.** In the latter part of the 19th century, Marxism was adopted by the majority of the rising labor and socialist movements in Europe (except Britain) and eventually as the official philosophy in the Social Democratic parties. At the same time, the emphasis of Marxism shifted from revolutionary change, as encouraged by the later writings of Marx and especially Engels. This was the position of the Labor and Socialist International (the Second International), a loose association of the Social-Democratic parties formed in 1889.

During the next two decades two opposite tendencies, based on particular interpretations of Marx, appeared within the Social-Democratic movement. On the right, or moderate, were the "revisionists," led by Eduard Bernstein, who sought to bring Marx up to date and replace his revolutionary program with a democratic program of evolutionary socialism." On the left a radical

led by Rosa  
by 1  
center  
German soci  
the P  
but the  
Our dist  
out i  
theory of  
to the relati  
and  
to mutu  
of  
the major c  
Marxism  
1890's,  
of the coun  
the  
that  
stage of  
the pre  
was  
of R  
to  
in the  
in the  
The others,  
Democratic  
Congress in  
to achieve  
organization  
conspiracy.  
taken by t  
faction, led  
revolutionary  
Victor L  
faction  
Lenin's  
the co  
the pamph  
and the y  
ization at  
Russian r  
as a c  
Marx was  
with the W  
organizati  
to ove  
in the  
early 1  
al Den  
the bourg  
the diet  
the pen  
the m  
later on  
the m  
Capitalis  
backw  
weakest  
the rip  
Lenin  
the in  
the nature  
of a bou  
a contin  
which th  
in the m  
permane  
the Russ  
of prolet

Rosa Luxemburg in Germany and supported by most of the Russian Marxists, emphasized the violent revolution of early Marxism. The center the "orthodox" Marxists, led by the German socialist Karl Kautsky, stuck to the deterministic philosophy of the proletarian revolution but they expected it to come by peaceful

One distinctly new theoretical contribution, worked out mainly by the left-wing Marxists, was the theory of imperialism, which applied Marxism to the relations between advanced and colonial countries and suggested that monopoly capitalism in its mature stage led necessarily to the expansion of backward nations and to war among major capitalist powers.

Marxism became influential in Russia in the 1890's, just as the capitalist industrialization of the country was getting started. Georgi Plekhanov, the founder of Russian Marxism, insisted that Russia would have to pass through the stages of capitalism in order to become ready for the proletarian revolution (although Marx himself was not convinced of this). A revisionist group of Russian Marxists (the so-called "Economists") took the position that all they could do in the meantime was to work for improvement in the economic position of the workers. Others, after establishing the Russian Social Democratic Workers' party, split at their Second Congress in 1903 over the question of the means to achieve revolution—by patient democratic organization or by an accelerated revolutionary strategy. The more democratic position was supported by the orthodox Menshevik ("minority") group, led by Julius Martov, while the more revolutionary, left-wing position was taken by Vladimir Lenin and the Bolshevik ("majority") group.

**Lenin's Contribution to Marxism.** Lenin's distinctive contribution (expounded particularly in his pamphlet *What is to be Done?*, 1902) was to combine with Marxism the conspiratorial organization and tactics developed by the pre-Marxist revolutionary movement. His central contribution was the idea of the class was to be his concept of the party—not a party in the Western democratic sense but a disciplined organization of professional revolutionaries aimed at overthrowing the government and seizing power in the name of the working class. To justify this bid for power, Lenin argued that the democratic party should take the lead in the bourgeois revolution and establish a "democratic dictatorship" of the proletariat and peasantry pending the economic development that would make a transition to socialism feasible. Lenin, reiterating the Marxist theory of imperialism (in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, 1916), Lenin argued that Russia, as the backward victim of exploitation, was the "weakest link in the chain of capitalism" and ripe for revolution.

Lenin's fellow countryman Leon Trotsky suggested in 1906 a different rationale for the early seizure of power in his "theory of permanent revolution." According to Trotsky, the outbreak of a bourgeois or permanent state of revolution in Russia would allow the workers to seize power temporarily in the major cities. This in turn would set up a permanent state of revolution internationally, as the Russian example triggered the mature forces of proletarian revolution in the West. The latter

would come to the aid of the Russian Marxists and help clinch their victory despite Russia's backwardness. Trotsky's theory was part of the Bolshevik rationale in 1917 and helps explain the emphasis placed on world revolution by the Bolsheviks.

Lenin's major statement of Marxist political theory was his book *State and Revolution*, written while he was in hiding in the summer of 1917. He expanded on the smashing of the old state, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, equality under the new regime, the withering away of the state, and the two phases of communism (which Lenin labeled "socialism" and "communism" respectively). The generally anarchistic ideal of *State and Revolution* was violated by Lenin himself soon after he took power, for he set up a highly centralized dictatorship and industrial administration. Shortly before his death in 1924, Lenin acknowledged that Soviet Russia lacked the economic and cultural foundation for communism and that a long period of gradual building under the tutelage of the Communist party would be necessary.

**Critique of Leninism.** Lenin always insisted that his actions as well as his theories were absolutely orthodox applications of Marxism, and all Communists maintain that Leninism is the only correct 20th century version of Marxism. In reality, Lenin introduced some very different implications and emphases, particularly in his doctrine of the party as the conscious, disciplined vanguard of the proletariat. Drawing on the views of the pre-Marxist Russian revolutionary movement, Lenin repeatedly warned that the proletarian revolution would not occur simply as the result of economic forces, but depended on the willful action of a revolutionary organization that seized the strategic movement. He frequently was at pains to justify the most extreme measures for seizing and holding power, and he denounced as "bourgeois" any absolute standards of democracy, morality, legality, or pacifism.

Lenin is rightly charged with having believed that the end justifies any means, and he is vulnerable to the criticism that evil means tend to become ends in themselves. In fact, in his hierarchical organization and command practices, which he justified as "democratic centralism," he manifested a spirit of extreme authoritarianism that contributed to the rapid transformation of the Soviet regime into a dictatorship over the workers rather than by them. Lenin's own exposition of the Marxian theory of the state thereafter served merely as a work of utopian propaganda.

**Marxist Reactions to the Russian Revolution.** Marxists outside Russia split deeply over the Russian Revolution and the Communist dictatorship. Those of the left wing, favorable to Soviet Russia, broke away from the Social Democratic parties and founded Communist parties committed to revolutionary Marxism and pledged to support Soviet Russia. Because of the imposition of Soviet control over these parties through the Third, or Communist, International (Comintern), they made relatively little independent contribution to Marxist theory. An exception was the voluntaristic interpretation of Leninism by the Italian Antonio Gramsci and the Hungarian Georg Lukacs, both of whom avowedly stressed the role of belief and force in history as against purely economic factors.

The Soviet leadership, however, rejected their contribution, despite its accurate reflection of Lenin's revolutionary role.

Marxists who opposed the Soviet dictatorship affirmed their commitment to the democratic process and condemned the Communists for attempting socialism by means of dictatorship in a country where the industrial prerequisites were lacking. This was the argument of Kautsky, Hilferding, and Martov, and even of the "Austro-Marxists," who clung to the spirit of thoroughgoing socialism. In practice, all non-Communist Marxists became revisionists, accepting the gradual and piecemeal approach to socialism. In 1950 the leading democratic Marxist party, the Social-Democratic party of Germany, formally gave up Marxism as its official doctrine while at the same time according Marx a place of respect in the history of socialist thought.

**Development of Stalinism.** During the struggle for power in Soviet Russia just preceding and following Lenin's death, the meaning and role of Marxist theory for the Communist movement were profoundly changed. Bitter disagreements had already erupted among the Russian Communists—between those ("Left Communists," "Democratic Centralists," and "Workers' Opposition") who demanded immediate steps toward the classless society and the withering away of the state and those (including Lenin) who stressed the temporary consolidation of the state and the administration of industry by centrally appointed officials.

From 1923 to 1927, Leon Trotsky led the Left opposition in calling for democratization of the Communist party, a more revolutionary foreign policy, and systematic plans to strengthen the proletarian basis of Soviet communism by rapid industrialization. Trotsky was opposed by Nikolai Bukharin, the leading Soviet theoretician of the 1920's, who continued Lenin's position of firm Communist party control and education while the industrial basis for communism grew gradually in response to market demand. Bukharin was supported until 1928 by Joseph Stalin, who as general secretary of the Communist party had built up a formidable system of personal power.

In 1924, Stalin coined the expression "Marxism-Leninism" and laid down in dogmatic form the theoretical justifications followed by the Soviet regime ever since: the necessity of violent revolution by the Communist party; the necessity of Communist party dictatorship throughout the period of the "building of socialism"; the need for "iron discipline" and unity within the party; and the "theory of socialism in one country," which maintained that Russia could overcome its backwardness and achieve socialism without the aid of international revolution ("Foundations of Leninism" and "The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Russian Communists," published in *Problems of Leninism*).

The "theory of socialism in one country" was a turning point in the role of Marxist theory, because, although it was based only on a misquotation from Lenin and was contrary to what all Communists had believed since the revolution, Stalin successfully imposed the view that it had been standard Marxism all along. He thus made the philosophical meaning of Marxism in the Soviet Union entirely subject to the authority and convenience of the political leadership.

The basic premises of Stalinism took shape in the early 1930's as a rationale for the view that Stalin was imposing on the Soviet economic and social system, particularly the organization of the peasantry and the initiation of centralized economic planning. Economic individualism was abandoned, with the slogan that "to each according to his needs" replaced by recognition of the greater needs of managerial personnel. The "withering away of the state" was rejected in favor of recognizing the role of the state—even under the final phase of communism—in the promotion of economic and cultural development as well as in the defense of the country against what was called "encirclement."

In his essay *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* (1938; reaffirmed in *Marxism and Linguistics*, 1950), Stalin held that the political ideological superstructure of society could have a decisive effect in waging class war and promoting development of the economic base. Similarly, the individual was held responsible for his own conduct and achievements, which were not to be viewed as the product of social conditioning. All this was nearly the reverse of Marx's sociology, but Stalin's views were nevertheless enforced in the name of orthodox Marxism.

Stalin's triumph over his rivals for leadership in Russia was the occasion for a series of changes in the Communist movement elsewhere, the course of which most of the original leaders of the various Communist parties left the movement or were expelled. A small left wing sympathetic to Trotsky broke away to form the "Fourth International" (represented in the United States by the Socialist Workers party), which stressed the bureaucratic degeneration of Marxism in Russia and the need for world proletarian revolution to renew the movement. Other splinters, more right, sympathetic to Bukharin, gravitated toward the revisionism of the Social Democrats.

**Critique of Stalinism.** Under Stalin the original Soviet interpretation of Marxism was extensively altered, although the revised version was asserted to be the only correct interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. Because no independent discussion of Marxism was allowed, no one was in a position to challenge interpretations by the leadership that departed from the spirit and the letter of the original doctrine.

The real principles of Stalinism have to be inferred from the historical record. They include the permanent power of the dictatorial Communist party; the maintenance and expansion of Russian national power; a permanently unchanging social hierarchy of officials, technicians, workers, and peasants; and reliance on government coercion to extinguish dissent and accomplish economic and cultural modernization of the country. These de facto principles have continued to guide Stalin's successors, whose views are less in accord with original Marxism than they are with the elitist state socialism proposed by the count de Saint-Simon, a French utopian socialist.

There are at least four different schools of thought among outside observers concerning the function of Marxism in the Soviet regime under Stalin and his successors. One school sees Marxism still as a living faith, setting the course of world revolution and classless society, toward which the Soviet leadership presumably

constantly.  
net aims a  
Marxism is  
reference f  
and appr  
an propa  
leadership  
and abroad  
by some a  
leadership,  
but neverth  
forced. Th  
theory of S  
false cons  
bureaucrats

#### Marxism

Soviet inte  
not chang  
Major deve  
the countri  
ing and aft  
dence from  
other Com  
an in sup  
Yugosla  
left Soviet  
made the  
doctrine.

Delas asse  
to an the ce  
at capita  
applied the  
defend  
to and C  
at roads  
might have  
blazed to

centralize  
play of  
ing soci  
in the  
as critique  
sava itself  
wed from

At the  
audence f  
upsurge  
individual  
Lakowski  
Marxism an  
use for  
ing to v

altoget  
led to  
time in  
on d  
the So  
ist-style  
The inc  
ocurre  
upt tur  
na's rel  
rid. Bef  
Comm  
but wi  
doctrin  
Beacu

d leaders  
z-class  
interprete  
thesize po  
argins. M  
tation o  
bourgeoisie

Another school recognizes that Soviets are more pragmatic but suggests that Marxism is still used as a method or frame of reference for interpreting the outside world. A third approach regards the ideology as no more than propaganda, cynically manipulated by the leadership for day-to-day political effect at home and abroad. Finally, Soviet Marxism is regarded as a system of self-justification for the leadership, modified to fit their practical interests but nevertheless dogmatically believed and enforced. This view accords with the neo-Marxist interpretation of Soviet Marxism as the "ideology" (or "consciousness") of a new ruling class of bureaucrats in a social system of state capitalism.

**Marxism in Other Communist Countries.** The interpretation and use of Marxism have changed appreciably since Stalin's time. Developments, however, have occurred in countries brought under Communist rule during and after World War II, wherever independence from Soviet control made it possible for Communist governments to interpret Marxism in support of their own interests.

Yugoslavia, as the first Communist country to achieve independence and to free itself of Soviet domination of the movement in 1948, made the first overt modifications of Stalinist Marxism.

President Tito and Vice President Vukobratovic asserted that Soviet Russia had deviated from the correct Marxist path into a bureaucratic form of capitalism.

To correct this, they revived and extended the ideal of workers' control of industry, and Yugoslavia's claims of independence, and Djilas asserted the possibility of "separating socialism" on which each country should proceed at its own speed rather than being forced to copy the Soviet model.

Further, they rejected industrial administration to allow the free operation of market forces of supply and demand.

Specialized enterprises, like the Soviet practice of the 1920's. However, Djilas, extending the concept of Communist bureaucracy to Yugoslavia, wrote (*The New Class*, 1957), was released from office and intermittently imprisoned.

At a time Poland achieved internal independence from Soviet control in 1956, there was a resurgence of genuine philosophical work by Polish Marxists, notably Leszek Kolakowski.

He stressed the humanistic ethic of Marxism and attacked extreme determinism as an instrument of terror and dictatorship, before emigrating to western Europe and abandoning Marxism.

In Czechoslovakia Marxism remained the dominant ideology of the temporary liberalization of the 1960's with a highly "revisionist" emphasis on democracy and freedom of thought, until Soviet military intervention reimposed orthodox Marxism.

The most complex development of Marxism has occurred in Communist China, reflecting the differences in Chinese internal policy and in relations with the rest of the Communist world.

Coming to power in 1949, the Chinese Communists subscribed to Marxism-Leninism.

With Mao Tse-tung's personal emphasis on nationalization, nationalism, and coalition tactics, they achieved power with intellectual leadership and a peasant rather than work-

er base. The Chinese Communists rejected the Marxian notion of "class" to emphasize national attitudes rather than economic ones.

Their theory of revolution stressed coalition with all classes—including the "national bourgeoisie"—in the "New Democracy" but re-

quired the liquidation of landlords and any elements that collaborated with foreign imperialism.

When cooperation between China and the Soviet Union broke down in the late 1950's, Marxist theory became an area of political struggle rather than a tie between the two powers. With the institution of agricultural communes in 1958, China claimed to have moved ahead of the Soviet Union on the road to true communism and thereafter condemned the Soviet regime as a "revisionist" deviation on the "capitalist road." On the question of international revolution and the inevitability of war, the Chinese took a bolder stand than the Soviets but one less rash than the latter accused them of.

The "cultural revolution" launched in China in 1966 bore some resemblance to the ultrarevolutionary views of the left-wing communists in Russia in the early days of the Soviet regime, particularly in attacking the influence and privileges of bureaucrats and intellectuals. In theoretical terms, however, Chinese Marxism became increasingly irrational, as a cult of the infallible wisdom of Chairman Mao. Following Mao's death in 1976 and the ouster of his most radical supporters, China swung abruptly toward managerial pragmatism under the leadership of Teng Hsiao-ping. Chinese Marxism assumed a more formal and legitimizing role, as in the Soviet case, though without diminution of the hostility between the two Communist powers.

Communism in Cuba under Fidel Castro is nominally Marxist, although Marxist theoretical influence did not appear until after Castro had come to power in 1959. In the 1960's, as articulated by Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Cuban Marxism, like the Chinese, took the ultraleft direction of a militarized equalitarian society at home and advocacy of guerrilla warfare against all governments allied with United States "imperialism." Since 1968, thanks to the country's economic dependence on the Soviet Union, Marxism in Cuba has been adjusted to the Soviet pattern of pragmatic legitimization.

**Marxism Since Stalin.** The death of Stalin did not bring any substantial change in the structure of the Communist regimes or in their dogmatic use of Marxist theory. Certain reinterpretations of detail were associated with Soviet Communist party First Secretary Nikita Khrushchev's "destalinization" campaign of 1956 and the party program of 1961—specifically that, contrary to Stalin, the class struggle would not intensify and justify terror under Communist rule and that the state could indeed begin to wither away provided that its functions were taken over by the Communist party or "nongovernmental public organizations" such as the Young Communist League and the auxiliary police.

Khrushchev toned down considerably the international aspects of Marxism-Leninism. "Separate roads to socialism" were acknowledged; the inevitability of war was expressly rejected in favor of "peaceful coexistence"; and violent revolution and one-party Communist dictatorship ceased to be demanded for all countries. With this encouragement and the weakening of Soviet doctrinal influence due to destalinization, the major European Communist parties (most clearly in Italy) moved toward the essentially revisionist program known by the 1970's as "Eurocommunism." Small left-wing factions meanwhile reasserted the revolutionary outlook and endorsed the Chinese cultural revolution.

A major paradox of Marxism is that it has had (especially in its revolutionary form) more appeal in the less-developed countries than in the most industrialized. Thanks to its identification of capitalism with imperialism and its hostility to both, Marxism appeals to intellectuals in backward or troubled countries as an ideology of national development and regeneration. Despite its internationalist phraseology Marxism can be a vehicle of intense nationalism, as has been shown by the Vietnamese Communists, for example, in their struggle not only against France and the United States but against Communist China and Cambodia as well.

In the most stable countries of Western Europe and North America (Britain, Scandinavia, the United States, and Canada), Marxism has never had more than a limited and passing appeal. Rising living standards and democratic access to political power made it hard to apply the Marxian theory of proletarian revolution, however interpreted. The Labor and Socialist parties of Britain and Scandinavia are pragmatic rather than Marxist and not very different in outlook from the liberal factions in U. S. and Canadian politics. The Communist parties in these countries have always been small; they achieved their peak before and during World War II by stressing anti-Fascism rather than Marxism.

In Western Europe in the 1950's and 1960's a philosophy of Marxist existentialism (represented especially by Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty) revived interest in the early writings of Marx as a theory of the individual alienated from society. This movement was reinforced by the work of the "Frankfurt School" of philosophers in Germany and America associated with Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno in the Institute for Social Research. Their "critical theory" employed the dialectical method to attack the oppressiveness of modern society in psychological as well as economic terms. One of their number, Herbert Marcuse, became a major influence among student groups of the "New Left," with his emphasis on the psychologically alienating effect of the entire existing social order. All such innovative interpretations of Marxism are rejected in Communist countries.

ROBERT V. DANIELS, *University of Vermont*

#### Bibliography

- Becker, James F., *Marxian Political Economy: An Outline* (Cambridge 1977).  
 Cole, G. D. H., *History of Socialist Thought*, 5 vols. (St. Martin's 1953-1960).  
 Feuer, Lewis S., ed., *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings in Politics and Philosophy* (Anchor Bks. 1959).  
*Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974).  
 Heilbroner, Robert L., *Marxism: For and Against* (Norton 1980).  
 Hunt, R. N. C., *The Theory and Practice of Communism* (Penguin 1963).  
 Jordan, Z. A., *The Evolution of Dialectical Materialism: A Philosophical and Sociological Analysis* (St. Martin's 1967).  
 Kolakowski, Leszek, *Main Currents of Marxism*, 3 vols. (Clarendon Press 1978).  
 Leonhardt, Wolfgang, *Three Faces of Marxism: The Political Concepts of Soviet Ideology, Maoism, and Humanist Marxism* (Holt 1974).  
 Lichtheim, George, *Marxism: An Historical and Critical Study* (Praeger 1961).  
 Marx, Karl, and Engels, Frederick, *Collected Works*, 12 vols. to date (International Publishers 1975).  
 McLellan, David, *Karl Marx: His Life and Thought* (Harper 1974).  
 McLellan, David, *Marxism After Marx* (Harper 1980).  
 Meyer, Alfred G., *Leninism* (Praeger 1962).  
 Meyer, Alfred G., *Marxism: The Unity of Theory and Practice* (Harvard Univ. Press 1954).  
 Rader, Melvin M., *Marx's Interpretation of History* (Oxford 1979).

**MARY, Saint**, the mother of Jesus Joseph, also called "the Blessed Virgin" and "the Mother of God." The Greek name, *Maria* (or *Mariam*), derives from the Hebrew *Miriam*, held in the Old Testament by Moses' sister (Numbers 26:59), a common name in the New Testament (for example, Mary Magdalen). The canon identifies Mary as "the mother of Jesus" (Matthew 2:1) or, more frequently, as "his mother" (Matthew 1:18; Mark 3:31; Luke 2:34; John 4:19). Her importance is defined by reference to the Gospels.

No strict biography is possible for more than for Jesus. The Gospels do not shape traditions about her according to the conceptions of faith. The slender body of the Virgin concerning her, however, has not impelled reflection on her significance. In the New Testament we find, instead of diverse appreciations corresponding to the document to the image of Jesus, her image is defined by the Gospels.

**New Testament Images of Mary.** Apart from the Gospels and Acts 1:14, Mary is not named in the New Testament. Paul speaks of Jesus as being "born of woman, under the law" (Galatians 4:4) and of his lineage descended from David according to the flesh (Romans 1:3). While these remarks do not conflict with the Gospel accounts (compare Matthew 1:1; Luke 1:32), neither do they add to them and this is consistent with Paul's reticence regarding Jesus' earthly life in favor of his exalted power (II Corinthians 5:16).

A similar but more ambiguous role is observed by the earliest written of the Gospels. Mark emphasizes how Jesus was rejected by those closest to him, even family and disciples. References to Mary come in this context (Mark 3:31-35). Jesus' townspeople in Nazareth spurn him because they do so by contemptuous reference to his father (Mark 6:3); his origin is a scandal (Mark 6:3). Likewise, when Jesus is sought by his mother and brothers, Mark tells the story so that the family is distinguished from those who follow in faith: "Whoever does the will of God is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mark 3:35). Mary has no positive role in Mark's Gospel.

Matthew's Gospel characteristically softens Mark's hard edges. In the stories Matthew tells with Mark concerning Mary during Jesus' infancy, Matthew eliminates any note of rejection of Jesus' family (Matthew 12:46-50; 13:55). Matthew has a uniformly positive view of Mary. This can be seen in the narrative of Jesus' birth (Matthew 1 and 2). There we learn that Mary became pregnant by divine power (the Holy Spirit) before her marriage to Joseph (Matthew 1:20) and that this potentially scandalous event was actually in fulfillment of a prophecy (Isaiah 7:14; Matthew 1:23). Matthew's use of the prophecy and his statement regarding Mary's continence (Matthew 1:25) make clear that Mary was a virgin at the time of conception. Afterward, Jesus' birth, moreover, was announced that "God is with us" (Isaiah 8:8, 10; Matthew 1:23). For Matthew, Jesus truly is the Son of God's presence to humans (compare Matthew 28:18-20), and we find here an understanding of Mary as both virgin and "mother of God" (Theotokos). As important as she is in Matthew's Gospel, however, Mary remains a passive figure. The infancy narrative provides Jesus with lineage from David (Matthew 1:1, 20) and ( Luke 3:23) the woman and Luke's Gospel positive portrait of Mary, a Jesus' mother woman of faith and dignities of mentioned in t in Luke's versi she not Joseph at have Mar Jesus' mother ( Luke 1:21), Lu against Jesus' those who he ( Luke 1:21). Her bl we fidelity as His possi hand above stance narrat graph, Mary vated by th message ( Luke 1:21) (L Elizabeth (L work, 1 Joseph, he ak's account em (Luke Luke 2:16) wled to the 12-year-o w stretches ( Luke 4:22). P ants in ight that tradition Luke, wh on in th deal woman vity and n e for Matl rquity (L regarding th the child: " and the pow you, therefo

Mary has be  
 given to artists  
 the Christian era  
 the century fresco  
 the site of the Vir  
 Chapel, Pa  
 includes this scen  
 the Adoration of

VOLUME 18

M to Mexico City

T H E E N C Y C L O P E D I A  
**AMERICANA**  
I N T E R N A T I O N A L E D I T I O N

COMPLETE IN THIRTY VOLUMES  
FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1829



GROLIER INCORPORATED

International Headquarters: Danbury, Connecticut 06816

# WITHDRAWAL SHEET

## Ronald Reagan Library

*Collection Name*

SPEECHWRITING, OFFICE OF: RESEARCH OFFICE RECORDS

*Withdrawer*

MJD 6/15/2007

*File Folder*

04/16/1985 DROPBY: CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY  
(1)

*FOIA*

S07-069

*Box Number*

202

10

---

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
37353	CABLE  032318Z APR 85	1	4/3/1985	B1

---

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**

**B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]**

**B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]**

**B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]**

**B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]**

**B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]**

**B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]**

**B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]**

**B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]**

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

# WITHDRAWAL SHEET

## Ronald Reagan Library

*Collection Name*

SPEECHWRITING, OFFICE OF: RESEARCH OFFICE RECORDS

*Withdrawer*

MJD 6/15/2007

*File Folder*

04/16/1985 DROPBY: CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY  
(1)

*FOIA*

S07-069

*Box Number*

202

10

---

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
37354	CABLE  SAME AS #37352	1	4/3/1985	B1

---

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**

**B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]**

**B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]**

**B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]**

**B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]**

**B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]**

**B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]**

**B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]**

**B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]**

**C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.**

EP  
(Noonan/BE)  
April 15, 1985  
5:00 p.m. RR

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: DROPHY AT CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY  
TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1985

Thank you very much.

I am deeply honored to address this conference. I know that a good many of you have come a long way to be here today, and I know you have given greatly of your time, energy and concern. And I can only hope, as you do, that those now suffering around the world for their beliefs will draw renewed courage from your work.

The history of religion and its impact on civilization cannot be summarized in a few days, never mind minutes. But one of the great shared characteristics of all religions is the distinction they draw between the temporal world and the spiritual world. All religions, in effect, echo the words of the gospel of St. Matthew: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." What this injunction teaches us is that the individual cannot be entirely subordinate to the state, that there exists a whole other realm, an almost mysterious realm of individual thought and action which is sacred, and which is totally beyond and outside of state control.

This idea has been central to the development of human rights. Only in an intellectual climate which distinguishes between the City of God and the City of Man -- and which explicitly affirms the independence of God's realm, and forbids any infringement by the state on its prerogatives -- only in such

a climate could the idea of individual human rights take root, grow, and eventually flourish.

We see this climate in all democracies, and in our own political tradition. The founders of our republic rooted their democratic commitment in the belief that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. And so they created a system of government whose avowed purpose was -- and is -- the protection of those God-given rights.

But, as all of you know only too well, there are many political regimes today that completely reject the notion that a man or a woman can have a greater loyalty to God than to the state. Marx's central insight, when he was creating his political system, was that religious belief would subvert his ~~material philosophy~~ <sup>Leninism (or Soviet Party)</sup> intentions. Under ~~communism~~, the ruling party ~~would~~ claim for itself the attributes which religious faith ascribes to God alone -- and the state would be final arbiter of truth, justice, and morality. Marx declared religion an enemy of the people -- a drug, an opiate of the masses. And Lenin said, "Religion and communism are incompatible in theory as well as in practice . . . We must fight religion."

All of this illustrates a truth that I believe must be re-understood: atheism is not an incidental element of communism, not just part of the package -- it is the package.

In countries which have fallen under communist rule, it is often the church which forms the most powerful barrier against a completely totalitarian system. And so, totalitarian regimes

always seek either to destroy the church or, when that is impossible, to subvert it.

In the Soviet Union, the church was immediately attacked by the communist revolution. But the Soviets, bowing to Western "squeamishness" about the denial of liberties, often characterized their actions as merely defensive.

In 1945, Josef Stalin met with Harry Hopkins, who had been sent by Harry Truman to discuss various East/West problems. In the middle of a talk about politics, Stalin interjected the following: In 1917, he said, the Russian communist party had proclaimed the right of religious freedom as part of their political program. But, he said, the churches of Russia had declared the Soviet government anathema, and had called on church members to resist the call of the Red Army. Now what could we do, said Stalin, but declare war on the church! He assured Hopkins, however, that World War Two had ended the church-state antagonism and now freedom of religion could be granted to the church.

But that, as you know, never happened.

History has taught us that you can bulldoze a church but you can't extinguish all that is good in every human heart. And so, in spite of the dangers involved there are Christians throughout the communist world, and Muslims, and Jews, and others, who continue to practice their faith. Some of them have been imprisoned for their courage.

There is the late Valeriy Marchenko, who died in a Soviet prison hospital a few short months ago. He was 37 years old, a

scholar and a Christian who, at his most recent trial, spoke of his belief in God and his faith in human goodness. There is Father Gleb Yakunin, who was recently sent to Siberia for 5 years of internal exile. He is another prisoner of faith. And Bronislav Borovsky, recently sentenced for smuggling bibles into Czechoslovakia. These are only a few of many.

Dr. Ernest Gordon, the President of an organization named CREED -- Christian Rescue Effort for the Emancipation of Dissidents -- noted that on a recent trip to Eastern Europe, he spoke with a priest who had spent 10 years in prison. The priest asked him to deliver a message to the West: there is a war going on; it is not nuclear but spiritual. The fallout of the atheistic explosion is everywhere. But Dr. Gordon added, "Although the fallout may be everywhere, we are reminded that God too is everywhere and not even tyrannies can keep him out."

We in the United States have protested this terrible abuse of people who are nothing less than heroes of the century. Most recently, when Congressional leaders met in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev, they gave the Soviet leadership a list of Baltic and Ukrainian prisoners of conscience. And the Council on Soviet Jewry and other groups were magnificent in making sure that the congressional delegation did not leave without extensive data on repression against Jews in the Soviet Union.

Religious persecution, of course, is not confined to Europe. We see it in Iran, whose leaders have virtually declared war on the Bahais. We see it in Afghanistan, where the Soviet military has resorted to increasingly cruel measures against the Moslem

people. And we see a variation on how to abuse religious freedom in the Sandinista regime of Nicaragua.

In Nicaragua, the Sandinista regime is faced with a politically active church that -- although it supported the revolution -- is now considered a major obstacle to complete totalitarian control. Some time back, Nicaraguan Bishop Pablo X Antonio Vega said, "We are living with a totalitarian ideology that no one wants in this country." The Sandinistas are actively attempting to discredit and split the church hierarchy. And there is one new area to be watched: the Sandinistas, like all communist regimes, are injecting their ideology into the educational system and have begun widespread campaigns to indoctrinate children and adults. But the Catholic Church is fighting to maintain autonomy and keep this indoctrination out of their churches and schools.

This has not been resolved. Cuba solved the problem by closing all private schools, including religious schools.

The general state of religious liberty in Nicaragua is suggested by testimony from various sources, but most vividly by those who have fled this brutal regime. We recently learned of a pastor of the Evangelical Church in a Nicaraguan town who told the Freedom Fighters that the Sandinistas had threatened to send the 3,000 members of his church to relocation camps. The pastor and his church members are now hiding out in caves and temporary settlements in the countryside.

*Sandinistas told the Kellerman's to go back into the synagogue --  
"to burn alive"*

Page 6 \*

*50-60 people  
Some people inside had been in concentration camps*

*6 Sandinistas  
w/ firearms*

May I interject here that stories like this are the reason

*1978*

we are asking Congress for aid to help the Freedom Fighters, and to help the victims of the Sandinista regime.

*Phone calls every 2-4 days saying they were going to take the children.*

*Sandinistas had a complete dossier on all Jews in Nicaragua*

The Sandinistas also harassed Jews. Two Nicaraguan

refugees, Sarita and Oscar Kellerman, have told of the firebombing of their synagogue by the Sandinistas -- and how they

*wrote on wall*

wrote on the synagogue and the Kellerman's home the words,

"Jews -- Out of Nicaragua."

*(June 1979)*

*"What Hitler Started We will finish"*

*other PLO slogans*

When I think of Nicaragua these days, it occurs to me anew

that you can judge any new government, any new regime, by whether

or not it allows religion to flourish. If it doesn't, you can be

sure it is an enemy of mankind -- for it is attempting to ban

what is most beautiful in the human heart.

But we must not feel despair, because it is not appropriate

to the times. We are living in a dramatic age. Throughout the

world, the machinery of the state is being used as never before

against religious freedom -- but at the same time, throughout the

world, new groups of believers keep springing up. Points of

light flash out in the darkness, and God is honored once again.

Perhaps this is the greatest irony of the communist experiment:

the very pressure they apply seems to create the force, friction,

and heat that allow deep belief to once again burst into flame.

I believe that the most essential element of our defense of

freedom is our insistence on speaking out for the cause of

religious liberty. I would like to see this country rededicate

itself wholeheartedly to this cause. I join you in your desire

that the Protestant churches of America, the Catholic Church, and

the General

for American citizens and especially you.

with Mrs. [unclear]

*The State Dept. called you + told you consider  
Amer Embassy in Nicaragua  
we no longer consider  
Nicaragua a safe place  
called sev. American citizens*

*constantly harassed  
only about 50-60 families  
left remaining  
they more & more  
they more & more*

the Jewish organizations remember the members of their flock who are in prison or in jeopardy in other countries.

We are our brothers' keepers, all of us. And I hope the message will go forth, from this conference to prisoners of conscience throughout the world: "Take heart, you have not been forgotten. We, your brothers and sisters in God, have made your cause our cause, and we vow never to relent until you have regained the freedom that is your birthright as a child of God."

Thank you. God bless all of you.

Sandinistas harassed wife @ bayonet point.

305-592-6281 Michael Kellermann  
503-232-623 - Mr. Kellermann.

She returned to Nicaragua because of her business - stayed only a total of 40 days (2 trips) because of fear, harassment.

"What's happened to us is going to happen to everyone else."

Fester Jesaroff

EP

(Noonan/BE)  
April 12, 1985  
10:00 a.m. 8

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: DROPHY AT CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.  
TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1985

Thank you very much.

I am deeply honored to address this conference. I know that a good many of you have come a long way to be here today, and I know you have given greatly of your time, energy and concern. And I can only hope, as you do, that those now suffering around the world for their beliefs will draw renewed courage from your work.

The history of religion and its impact on civilization cannot be summarized in a few days, never mind minutes. But one of the great shared characteristics of all religions is the distinction they draw between the temporal world and the spiritual world. All religions, in effect, echo the words of the gospel of St. Matthew: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things <sup>that</sup> ~~which~~ are God's." What this injunction teaches us is that the individual cannot be entirely subordinate to the state, that there exists a whole other realm, an almost mysterious realm of individual thought and action which is sacred, and which is totally beyond and outside of state control.

This idea has been central to the development of human rights. Only in an intellectual climate which distinguishes between the City of God and the City of Man -- and which explicitly affirms the independence of God's realm, and forbids any infringement by the state on its prerogatives -- only in such

a climate could the idea of individual human rights take root, grow, and eventually flourish.

We see this climate in all democracies, and in our own political tradition. The founders of our republic rooted their democratic commitment in the belief that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." And so they created a system of government whose avowed purpose was -- and is -- the protection of those God-given rights.

But, as all of you know only too well, there are many political regimes today that completely reject the notion that a man or a woman can have a greater loyalty to God than to the state. Marx's central insight, when he was creating his political system, was that religious belief would subvert his intentions. Under <sup>Communism,</sup> ~~Marxism,~~ the ruling party <sup>would</sup> ~~was to~~ claim for itself the attributes which religious faith ascribes to God alone. <sup>and</sup> ~~Under Marxism,~~ the state <sup>would</sup> ~~was to~~ be ~~the~~ final arbiter of truth, justice, and morality. ~~And so~~ Marx declared religion an enemy of the people -- a drug, an opiate of the masses. And Lenin said, "Religion and communism are incompatible in theory as well as in practice . . . We must fight religion."

All of this illustrates a truth that I believe must be re-understood: atheism is not an incidental element of communism, not just part of the package -- it is the package.

In countries which have fallen under communist rule, it is often the church which forms the most powerful barrier against a completely totalitarian system. And so, totalitarian regimes

always seek either to destroy the church or, when that is impossible, to subvert it.

<sup>I</sup>  
~~For the former, we have the Soviet Union, where~~ the church was immediately attacked by the communist revolution. <sup>But</sup> ~~This was not done without considerable craftiness.~~ The Soviets, bowing to Western "squeamishness" about the denial of liberties, often characterized their actions as merely defensive.

In 1945, Josef Stalin met with Harry Hopkins, who had been sent by Harry Truman to discuss various East/West problems. In the middle of a talk about politics, Stalin interjected the following: In 1917, he said, the Russian communist party had proclaimed the right of religious freedom as part of their political program. But, he said, the churches of Russia had declared the Soviet government anathema, and had called on church members to resist the call of the Red Army. Now what could we do, said Stalin, but declare war on the church! He assured Hopkins, however, that World War Two had ended the church-state antagonism and now freedom of religion could be granted to the church. <sup>But that, as you know, never happened.</sup>

*Handwritten notes on the right margin:*  
I  
Don't  
know  
if  
it  
is  
true

~~Well, this, as you know, goes under the heading "The Big Lie." But it was told in a typically plaintive and put-upon manner, as if there was just no choice; try as we could to reason with those cruel and powerful priests, they just wouldn't stop attacking us and so we had to close their churches.~~

Well, history has taught us that you can bulldoze a church but you can't extinguish all that is good in every human heart. And so, in spite of the dangers involved there are Christians

throughout the communist world, and Muslims, and Jews, <sup>and others,</sup> who continue to practice their faith. Some of them have been imprisoned for their courage.

There is the late Valery Marchenko, who died in a Soviet prison hospital a few short months ago. He was 37 years old, a scholar and a Christian who, at his most recent trial, <sup>spoke of</sup> ~~said that~~ <sup>his belief in God and his faith in human goodness.</sup> ~~all of his life he had tried to "serve goodness" which he considered to be his "Christian duty."~~ There is Father Gleb Yakunin, who was recently sent to Siberia for 5 years of internal exile. He is another prisoner of faith. And <sup>Bronislav Borovsky, recently sentenced for smuggling Bibles</sup> ~~Vladislav Rakay, recently jailed for helping to distribute Bibles into Czechoslovakia.~~ <sup>into Czechoslovakia.</sup> These are only a few of many.

Dr. Ernest Gordon, the President of an organization named CREED -- Christian Rescue Effort for the Emancipation of Dissidents -- noted that on a recent trip to Eastern Europe, he spoke with a priest who had spent 10 years in prison. The priest asked him to deliver a message to the West: there is a war going on; it is not nuclear but spiritual. The fallout of the atheistic explosion is everywhere. But Dr. Gordon added, "Although the fallout may be everywhere, we are reminded that God too is everywhere and not even tyrannies can keep him out."

We in the United States have protested this terrible abuse of people who are nothing less than heroes of the century. Most recently, when Congressional leaders met in Moscow with <sup>General Secretary</sup> ~~Premier~~ Gorbachev, <sup>they gave the Soviet leadership</sup> ~~House Minority leader Bob Michel brought along~~ a list of Baltic and Ukrainian prisoners of conscience. And the Council <sup>(and other groups were</sup> on Soviet Jewry ~~was~~ magnificent in making sure that the

congressional delegation did not leave without extensive data on ~~repression against~~ persecuted Jews in the Soviet Union.

Religious persecution, of course, is not confined to Europe. We see it in Iran, whose leaders have <sup>virtually</sup> declared virtual war on the Bahais. We see it in Afghanistan, where the Soviets ~~have moved~~ <sup>military has resorted</sup> ~~do increasingly cruel measures against the Moslem people.~~ ~~against the Mujahadeen.~~ And we see a variation on how to abuse religious freedom in the Sandinista regime of Nicaragua.

In Nicaragua, the Sandinista regime is faced with a politically active church that -- although it supported the revolution -- is now considered a major obstacle to complete totalitarian control. <sup>Some time back, Nicaraguan Bishop Pablo Antonio Vega said, "We are living with a totalitarian ideology that no one wants in this country."</sup> ~~And so~~ the Sandinistas are actively attempting to discredit and split the church hierarchy. <sup>is one new area to be watched;</sup> ~~to be watched,~~ <sup>And there</sup> ~~by the way:~~ the Sandinistas, like all communist regimes, are injecting their ideology into the educational system and have begun widespread ~~literary~~ campaigns to indoctrinate children and adults. But the Catholic Church is fighting to maintain autonomy and keep this indoctrination out of ~~church-run~~ <sup>their churches</sup> ~~and~~ schools.

This has not been resolved. Cuba solved the problem by closing all private schools, including religious schools. ~~So did~~ Ethiopia

The general state of religious liberty in Nicaragua is suggested by testimony from various sources, <sup>but most vividly by those who have fled this brutal regime.</sup> including refugees. We recently learned of a pastor of the Evangelical Church in a Nicaraguan town who told the Freedom Fighters that the Sandinistas had threatened to send the 3,000 members of his church to relocation camps. The pastor and his church members

are now hiding out in caves and temporary settlements in the countryside.

May I interject here that stories like this are the reason we are asking Congress for aid to help the Freedom Fighters, and to help the victims of the Sandinista regime.

The Sandinistas also harassed Jews. Two Nicaraguan refugees, Sarita and Oscar Kellerman, have told of the firebombing of their synagogue by the Sandinistas -- and how they wrote on the synagogue and the Kellerman's home the words, "Jews -- Out of Nicaragua."

When I think of Nicaragua these days, it occurs to me anew that you can judge any new government, any new regime, by whether or not it allows religion to flourish. If it doesn't, you can be sure it is an enemy of mankind -- for it is attempting to ban what is most beautiful in the human heart.

But we must not feel despair, because it is not appropriate to the times. We are living in a dramatic age. Throughout the world, the machinery of the state is being used as never before against religious freedom -- but at the same time, throughout the world, new groups of believers keep springing up. Points of light flash out in the darkness, and God is honored once again. Perhaps this is the greatest irony of the communist experiment: the very pressure they apply seems to create the force, friction, and heat that allow deep belief to once again burst into flame.

I believe that the most essential element of our defense of freedom is our insistence on speaking out for the cause of religious liberty. I would like to see this country rededicate

itself wholeheartedly to this cause. I join you in your desire that the Protestant churches of America, the Catholic Church, and the Jewish organizations remember the members of their flock who are in prison or in jeopardy in other countries.

We are our brothers' keepers, all of us. And I hope the message will go forth, from this conference to prisoners of conscience throughout the world: "Take heart, you have not been forgotten. We, your brothers and sisters in God, have made your cause our cause, and we vow never to relent until you have regained the freedom that is your birthright as a child of God."

Thank you. God bless all of you.

He  
(Noonan/BE)  
April 12, 1985  
10:00 a.m. S

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: DROPHY AT CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY,  
TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1985

Thank you very much.

I am deeply honored to address this conference. I know that a good many of you have come a long way to be here today, and I know you have given greatly of your time, energy and concern. And I can only hope, as you do, that those now suffering around the world for their beliefs will draw renewed courage from your work.

The history of religion and its impact on civilization cannot be summarized in a few days, never mind minutes. But one of the great shared characteristics of all religions is the distinction they draw between the temporal world and the spiritual world. All religions, in effect, echo the words of the gospel of St. Matthew: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things <sup>that</sup> ~~which~~ are God's." What this injunction teaches us is that the individual cannot be entirely subordinate to the state, that there exists a whole other realm, an almost mysterious realm of individual thought and action which is sacred, and which is totally beyond and outside of state control.

This idea has been central to the development of human rights. Only in an intellectual climate which distinguishes between the City of God and the City of Man -- and which explicitly affirms the independence of God's realm, and forbids any infringement by the state on its prerogatives -- only in such

a climate could the idea of individual human rights take root, grow, and eventually flourish.

We see this climate in all democracies, and in our own political tradition. The founders of our republic rooted their democratic commitment in the belief that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain <sup>un</sup>~~in~~alienable rights." And so they created a system of government whose avowed purpose was -- and is -- the protection of those God-given rights.

But, as all of you know only too well, there are many political regimes today that completely reject the notion that a man or a woman can have a greater loyalty to God than to the state. Marx's central insight, when he was creating his political system, was that religious belief would subvert his intentions. <sup>And, as developed by Lenin</sup> ~~Under Marxism,~~ the ruling party was to claim for itself the attributes which religious faith ascribes to God alone. <sup>the Soviet system</sup> ~~Under Marxism,~~ the state was to be the final arbiter of truth, justice, and morality. And so Marx declared religion an enemy of the people -- a drug, an opiate of the masses. And Lenin said, "Religion and communism are incompatible in theory as well as in practice . . . We must fight religion."

All of this illustrates a truth that I believe must be re-understood: atheism is not an incidental element of communism, not just part of the package -- it is the package.

In countries which have fallen under communist rule, it is often the church which forms the most powerful barrier against a completely totalitarian system. And so, totalitarian regimes

always seek either to destroy the church or, when that is impossible, to subvert it.

For the former, we have the Soviet Union, where the church was immediately attacked by the communist revolution. This was not done without considerable craftiness. The Soviets, bowing to Western "squeemishness" about the denial of liberties, often characterized their actions as merely defensive.

In 1945, Josef Stalin met with Harry Hopkins, who had been sent by Harry Truman to discuss various East/West problems. In the middle of a talk about politics, Stalin interjected the following: In 1917, he said, the Russian communist party had proclaimed the right of religious freedom as part of their political program. But, he said, the churches of Russia had declared the Soviet government <sup>an</sup> anathema, and had called on church members to resist the call of the Red Army. Now what could we do, said Stalin, but declare war on the church. He assured Hopkins, however, that World War Two had ended the church-state antagonism and now freedom of religion could be granted to the church.

Well, this, as you know, goes under the heading "The Big Lie." But it was told in a typically plaintive and put-upon manner, as if there was just no choice; try as we could to reason with those cruel and powerful priests, they just wouldn't stop attacking us and so we had to close their churches.

Well, history has taught us that you can bulldoze a church but you can't extinguish all that is good in every human heart. <sup>the</sup> ?  
And so, in spite of the dangers involved there are Christians

throughout the communist world, and Muslims, and Jews, who continue to practice their faith. Some of them have been imprisoned for their courage.

There is the late Valery Marchenko, who died in a Soviet prison hospital a few short months ago. He was 37 years old, scholar and a Christian who, at his most recent trial, <sup>he affirmed</sup> said that his belief in God and his faith in human goodness. all of his life he had tried to "serve goodness" which he considered to be his "Christian duty." ] There is Father Gleb Yakunin, who was recently sent to Siberia for 5 years of internal exile. He is another prisoner of faith. <sup>And</sup> ~~Vladislav Rakay, recently jailed for helping to distribute bibles in Czechoslovakia.~~ <sup>And Bronislav Borovskiy + 2 others were recently sentenced for bringing bibles from Poland to Czechoslovakia.</sup> These are only a few of many.

Dr. Ernest Gordon, the President of an organization named CREED -- Christian Rescue Effort for the Emancipation of Dissidents -- noted that on a recent trip to Eastern Europe, he spoke with a priest who had spent 10 years in prison. The priest asked him to deliver a message to the West: there is a war going on; it is not nuclear but spiritual. The fallout of the atheistic explosion is everywhere. But Dr. Gordon added, "Although the fallout may be everywhere, we are reminded that evil is everywhere and not even tyrannies can keep him out."

We in the United States have protested this terrible abuse of people who are nothing less than heroes of the century. <sup>On</sup> ~~last week,~~ <sup>last week,</sup> recently, when Congressional leaders met in Moscow with <sup>Soviet</sup> ~~Premier~~ <sup>officials</sup> ~~the delegation~~ Gorbachev, ~~House Minority leader Bob Michel~~ brought along a list of Baltic and Ukrainian prisoners of conscience. And the Council on Soviet Jewry was magnificent in making sure that the

congressional delegation did not leave without extensive data on persecuted Jews in the Soviet Union.

Religious persecution, of course, is not confined to Europe. We see it in Iran, whose leaders have declared virtual war on the Bahais. We see it in Afghanistan, where the Soviets have moved against the Mujahadeen. And we see a variation on how to abuse religious freedom in the Sandinista regime of Nicaragua.

In Nicaragua, the Sandinista regime is faced with a politically active church that -- although it supported the revolution -- is now considered a major obstacle to complete totalitarian control. And so the Sandinistas are actively attempting to discredit and split the church hierarchy. One area to be watched, by the way: the Sandinistas, like all communist regimes, are injecting their ideology into the educational system and have begun widespread [literacy] campaigns to indoctrinate children and adults. But the Catholic Church is fighting to maintain autonomy and keep this indoctrination out of church-run schools.

This has not been resolved. Cuba solved the problem by closing all private schools, including religious schools. So did Ethiopia.

The general state of religious liberty in Nicaragua is suggested by testimony from various sources, including refugees. We recently learned of a pastor of the Evangelical Church in a Nicaraguan town who told the Freedom Fighters that the Sandinistas had threatened to send the 3,000 members of his church to relocation camps. The pastor and his church members

are now hiding out in caves and temporary settlements in the countryside.

May I interject here that stories like this are the reason we are asking Congress for aid to help the Freedom Fighters, and to help the victims of the Sandinista regime.

The Sandinistas, <sup>have</sup> also harassed Jews. Two Nicaraguan refugees, Sarita and Oscar Kellerman, have told of the firebombing of their synagogue by the Sandinistas -- and how they wrote on the synagogue and the Kellerman's home the words, "Jews -- Out of Nicaragua."

When I think of Nicaragua these days, it occurs to me anew that you can judge any new government, any new regime, by whether or not it allows religion to flourish. If it doesn't, you can be sure it is an enemy of mankind -- for it is attempting to ban what is most beautiful in the human heart.

But we must not feel despair, because it is not appropriate to the times. We are living in a dramatic age. Throughout the world, the machinery of the state is being used as never before against religious freedom -- but at the same time, throughout the world, new groups of believers keep springing up. Points of light flash out in the darkness, and God is honored [once again.] ? Perhaps this is the greatest irony of the communist experiment: the very pressure they apply seems to create the force, friction, and heat that allow deep belief to once again burst into flame.

I believe that the most essential element of our defense of freedom is our insistence on speaking out for the cause of religious liberty. I would like to see this country rededicate

itself wholeheartedly to this cause. I join you in your desire that the Protestant churches of America, the Catholic Church, and the Jewish organizations remember the members of their flock who are in prison or in jeopardy in other countries.

We are our brothers' keepers, all of us. And I hope the message will go forth, from this conference to prisoners of conscience throughout the world: "Take heart, you have not been forgotten. We, your brothers and sisters in God, have made your cause our cause, and we vow never to relent until you have regained the freedom that is your birthright as a child of God."

Thank you. God bless all of you.

EP.

—  
Steu Steiner 12:45

—  
Take out reference to  
Ethiopia

(7)

Carlos Garcia, President of the International Baseball Federation saw Human Rights violations every day he was in prison. Spent 1640 days of a 14 year sentence for speaking against government. International pressure and poor health got him out after 4 years.

A. Sandinista seizing of children for education in Cuba.

--, Glenn Garvin, "Nicaragua Refugees Flood Costa Rica," WashTimes, March 21, 1985, p. 1., Romero claimed that four families in the village were forced to turn over their children to be educated in Cuba. Other refugees supported these allegations. Fifteen year old Dennis Castro was solicited by the Sandinistas for a free education in Cuba.

B. Allegations of torture of religious figures

Fred Dicker, "Villagers' Catalog of Carnage," New York Post, March 15, 1985, p. 3. Reports from individuals of torture:

Bayardo Antonia Santeliz: 28 years old, evangelistic pastor from Leon. May 1982 I was at a religious meeting with four others. Tied to a pillar in house, doused w/gasoline. Three burned to death, he lived when fire burned through rope. Visibly scarred.

Fidellia Maradiaga Lopez: 51, Nurse. FSLN troops tied to a horse. Fired bullets, horse dragged boy off. Repeated a second time. (no word on fate of youth)

Rosendo Blandon Quinterro: 40, Was told that he could not work unless he joined Sandinistas. Peasants who resisted were killed. One of his friends was shot about 1000 feet from his home. Sandinistas would not allow burial of the body, which was left to rot. Blandon fled.

Sarita and Oscar Kellermann were at the synagogue in Managua when the Sandinistas fire-bombed it in 1979. FSLN took their money and businesses. Left in 1980. Graffiti on her home and synagogue said "Jews--out of Nicaragua" Kellermann stated that the PLO provided \$12 million to the Sandinistas.

x 7750

Dropsy & Conference  
on Religious Liberty

URGENT

congressional delegation did not leave without extensive data on persecuted Jews in the Soviet Union.

Religious persecution, of course, is not confined to Europe. We see it in Iran, whose leaders have declared virtual war on the Bahais. We see it in Afghanistan, where the Soviets have moved against the Mujahadeen. And we see a variation on how to abuse religious freedom in the Sandinista regime of Nicaragua.

~~In Nicaragua, the Sandinista regime is faced with a~~

~~politically active church that -- although it supported the~~  
~~revolution --~~ <sup>but</sup> ~~is now considered a major obstacle to complete in their~~  
~~totalitarian control. And so~~ <sup>by the Sandinistas to be</sup> ~~The Sandinistas are actively~~  
~~attempting to discredit and split the church hierarchy. One area~~  
~~to be watched, by the way:~~ The Sandinistas, ~~like all communists~~  
~~regimes,~~ <sup>communists</sup> ~~are injecting their ideology into the educational system~~  
~~and have begun widespread [literacy] campaigns to indoctrinate~~  
~~children and adults. But the Catholic Church~~ <sup>and other denominations are</sup> ~~is fighting to~~  
~~maintain autonomy and keep this indoctrination out of~~ <sup>their churches and</sup> ~~church-run~~  
~~schools.~~

~~In Nicaragua~~

~~This has not been resolved. Cuba solved the problem by~~  
~~closing all private schools, including religious schools.~~ <sup>Issue left</sup> ~~So did~~  
~~Ethiopia~~ <sup>common to</sup> ~~other states where freedom of religion was intolerable to~~

~~The general state of religious liberty in Nicaragua is~~  
~~suggested by testimony from various sources,~~ <sup>but most vividly by those who have</sup> ~~including refugees.~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~refugees.~~  
~~We recently learned of a pastor of the Evangelical Church in a~~ <sup>flashed</sup> ~~Nicaraguan town who told the Freedom Fighters that the~~ <sup>brutal</sup> ~~Sandinistas had threatened to send the 3,000 members of his~~ <sup>regime</sup>  
~~church to relocation camps. The pastor and his church members~~

are now hiding out in caves and temporary settlements in the countryside.

May I interject here that stories like this are the reason we are asking Congress for aid to help the Freedom Fighters, and to help the victims of the Sandinista regime.

The Sandinistas also harassed Jews. Two Nicaraguan refugees, Sarita and Oscar Kellerman, have told of the firebombing of their synagogue by the Sandinistas -- and how they wrote on the synagogue and the Kellerman's home the words, "Jews -- Out of Nicaragua."

When I think of Nicaragua these days, it occurs to me anew that you can judge any new government, any new regime, by whether or not it allows religion to flourish. If it doesn't, you can be sure it is an enemy of mankind -- for it is attempting to ban what is most beautiful in the human heart.

*and love for*

*essential to the human spirit -- the fruit of a divine being -- a God almighty*

But we must not feel despair, because it is not appropriate to the times. We are living in a dramatic age. Throughout the world, the machinery of the state is being used as never before against religious freedom -- but at the same time, throughout the world, new groups of believers keep springing up. Points of light flash out in the darkness, and God is honored once again. Perhaps this is the greatest irony of the communist experiment: the very pressure they apply seems to create the force, friction, and heat that allow deep belief to once again burst into flame.

I believe that the most essential element of our defense of freedom is our insistence on speaking out for the cause of religious liberty. I would like to see this country rededicate

*to the whom we owe all honor and glory.*