

The Christian Communist Manifesto



by Christopher Rix

The Christian Communist **Manifesto**

© 2017 Christopher Rix, a Bishop of Bread

Written for all of those people that have been abused at the hands of the Church.

- Reader, please note that the following is necessary reading for all those people within the Church who wish to break their chains and save the Church from the precipice of destruction. This is but the first step on the road to salvation.

Introduction

Acts 4:32 – 5:10

4:32 “Now the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common. 33 With great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all. 34 There was not a needy person among them, for as many as owned lands or houses sold them and brought the proceeds of what was sold. 35 They laid it at the apostles’ feet, and it was distributed to each as any had need. 36 There was a Levite, a native of Cyprus, Joseph, to whom the apostles gave the name Barnabas (which means “son of encouragement”). 37 He sold a field that belonged to him, then brought the money, and laid it at the apostles’ feet.

5:1 But a man named Ananias, with the consent of his wife Sapphira, sold a piece of property; 2 with his wife’s knowledge, he kept back some of the proceeds, and brought only a part and laid it at the apostles’ feet. 3 “Ananias,” Peter asked, “why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and to keep back part of the proceeds of the land? 4 While it remained unsold, did it not remain your own? And after it was sold, were not the proceeds at your disposal? How is it that you have contrived this deed in your heart? You did not lie to us but to God!” 5 Now when Ananias heard these words, he fell down and died. And great fear seized all who heard of it. 6 The young men came and wrapped up his body, then carried him out and buried him.

7 After an interval of about three hours his wife came in, not knowing what had happened. 8 Peter said to her, “Tell me whether you and your husband sold the land for such and such a price.” And she said, “Yes, that was the price.” 9 Then Peter said to her, “How is it that you have agreed together to put the Spirit of the Lord to the test? Look, the feet of those who have buried

your husband are at the door, and they will carry you out.” 10 Immediately she fell down at his feet and died. When the young men came in they found her dead, so they carried her out and buried her beside her husband.”

Two things may be placed firmly in the knowledge of any who read about the physical nature of the days of the early Church. First is her location, situated often in homes of patrons^[1], or in other places related to the early union-like guilds of the Empire^[2]. There has been some discussion over this first matter (that of location), as it has readily fascinated scholars and casual observers alike over ten nature of society surrounding the New Testament. However, it is the second matter, to which we now turn, and over which all bourgeois scholars have either turned up their nose or have been afraid to interact with, that is of paramount interest to this discussion. That is, the appropriating of, and sharing of, wealth. This is a system that was so rigorously applied in the early church that not to comply, would result not only in expulsion from the gathering, but also in death^[3]. This is the secret that has haunted the Church since Constantine the Great first took the Church from the people and turned it into a tool of the oppressor. This is the greatest kept secret of the last two millennia. A secret kept locked up behind walls erected by bourgeois priests and imperialist institutions, so that the tool that once liberated slaves and took the wealth from the rich, the tool that once uttered the bitter words “Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God”,^[4] has been curbed into the same opiate that emperors had used since the dawn of humanity. Yet here, in this text, there is a whisper of that secret, a spectre that haunts the Church, that one day soon, the chains will once again be broken. This spectre is that of the Church, as she should be, reclaimed once more by the hands that once built her, the hands of Christians, filled with the Holy Spirit of revolution.

With this manifesto, I will show you the world that Christ so longed to see. A world of equality and justice, a world without sin, without abuse. I will show you the empirical rejection of abuse and oppression, and will open to you the parts of the scripture that no bourgeois scholar can ever hope to understand

until they embrace the nature of God's intent. I will show you the story of a people on a quest for salvation through the hands of revolution, and justice, whose dialectical materialism is the clearest inclination of truth, shown in paramount in the works of Marx and Lenin. Through this dialectical materialist study of the bible, and the rejection of the limited, positivist view often expounded by those who would reject Christianity as a tool of the proletariat, I shall show you the dialectics of the historic Church, and then, with this recognised, I shall project us forward on the only course available to us, if we are to hope to survive the world that faces us now and cast off our chains.

Through Isaiahic vanguardism, and the lovingly installed, refining fire of hell shall our beloved dictator Christ rule over a progressive Church which inherently outworks the teachings of Marx.

Dialectical Materialism in the Bible

It has rarely been attempted that one is so brave as to look at the material conditions and surroundings of the community at the heart of the biblical narrative to deduce their possible decisions as a people-group.^[5] Always the Church reflects upon the spiritual nature of stories, whilst refusing to relinquish the stance that many of the events actually did take place as historical events in a social setting. To imagine these communities reacting to materialistic stimuli, for the Church today, is viewed with mockery and contempt or, falsely, as a rejection of spiritual value attributed to the stories. Whilst a full and detailed study is not appropriate for this text, there are certain developments that we can observe broadly, without difficulty.

Firstly, we may observe the first Biblical creation narrative. Genesis 1. Of course, there are endless streams of Scholars ready to denote the poetic nature of the discourse^[6], a stance that this writer has no problem with recognizing. These scholars often link the Genesis narrative broadly to the Babylonian creation narrative, the latter depicting a God who strives for chaos and who enjoys destruction, placing himself as the dominant creature in the universe. Of course this stands in juxtaposition to the writer of the biblical account, whose purpose, it seems, is to underline that God wishes for order, stability, and for humanity at the centre of the focus of the creation. From the outset then, there is a rejection of a dominant third party, but rather the expression of humanity as in some way the deciding force in a world of order.

At some point, one of these people hears a whisper, a voice attributed to a local deity; this man, Abraham, uproots his life and displays enormous loyalty to this deity. In their new home, the Abrahamic community develops but after immigrating to Egypt, is sold into slavery.

It is here, in Bolshevnik fashion, that Moses appears. A class traitor in feudal society, he flees his heritage as an oppressed Hebrew, and runs into the dessert. Here he encounters the nameless 'I am' who is later spoken of using only the breathing consonants of the language, a being who resides in the breath of all peoples and who tells Moses to "Go and set my people free." This is the true great commission upon which the later expansion is based.

Moses returns to Egypt and empowers the people to become free, resorting to barbarism when nothing else would work. Moses gave up on democracy and instead stole back the slaves so that they may live free. Many questioned Moses, pointing to the initial decrease in quality of life since they left Egypt, but Moses led them on, through a parted sea that the oppressors could not overcome, and onwards towards the Promised Land.

There are diversions back towards the old bourgeois distractions, idolatry and the like, which require the emergence of rules to be followed wholeheartedly. These rules form the basis of the confused community, stumbling towards a more progressive society than their surrounding neighbours; a rejection of human sacrifice, embracing caring for the poor and elderly, and always seeking repentance for abusive nature.

This people-group violently imposed their ideals, which were not entirely benevolent (I do not wish to suggest that they are similar to those of the Bolshevniks, merely that they were incredibly socially progressive for the time), on the world around them. They established an eternally fluctuating kingdom, sometimes under a good (in the platonic sense) leader or King, and sometimes under an immoral leader or King. Sometimes these good leaders were rewarded and sometimes they were not, though always the struggling, confused community would strive to put these leaders and their lives into the context of the unseen 'I am' that they believed governed everything. When

failure occurred, they blamed the immaterial world of their God, rather than the physical world that surrounded them, and who can blame them for hoping in a higher, eternal power that would one day be exalted by all? Before there was an understanding of the trajectory of human society and the movement towards freedom of the morally driven workers, there had to be some other hope, some other expression, and physical manifestation, of a moral society.

This hope became far more pronounced during the Exile. As the Israelites and the people of Judah were taken away from their homeland by the warring nations around them, the desire for a world under Yahweh became more and more desperate. In a mix of nationalism and universalism, as seen in books written during exile, such as (we may assume) Isaiah, we see the nomadic Israelite's desire for Israelite ideals proclaimed throughout all of the nations. This, the writer (or writers) of Isaiah believes, is to happen in both a centripetal way, in which Israel's ideals spread through the other nations as a natural diaspora of morality, and also in a centrifugal way, in which all of the other nations of the world are drawn into Israel as a vanguard of morality which draws all nations into itself.^[7] These two forms of salvific exchange are to be called, Isaiahic Vanguardism, because they express one of the earliest understandings of a particular people-group, who are morally driven, both expounding their progressive ideals into the world around them, and also by leading through the magnetic example of the central society, through which all peoples could be liberated.

As Isaiahic Vanguardism emerged, so too did the natural rejection of imperialist powers that is often espoused when a smaller nation is taken advantage of by a larger nation. Of course, this is not to be confused with the imperialism now enacted in the modern day by capitalist powers, rather this was the accumulation of slaves in a more open way; it is still fascinating to observe Isaiah's thoughts on the matter.

Isaiah 58:6-12

6 Is not this the fast that I choose:
to loose the bonds of injustice,
to undo the thongs of the yoke,
to let the oppressed go free,
and to break every yoke?

7 Is it not to share your bread with the hungry,
and bring the homeless poor into your house;
when you see the naked, to cover them,
and not to hide yourself from your own kin?

8 Then your light shall break forth like the dawn,
and your healing shall spring up quickly;
your vindicator shall go before you,
the glory of the Lord shall be your rear guard.

9 Then you shall call, and the Lord will answer;
you shall cry for help, and he will say, Here I am.

If you remove the yoke from among you,
the pointing of the finger, the speaking of evil,

10 if you offer your food to the hungry
and satisfy the needs of the afflicted,
then your light shall rise in the darkness
and your gloom be like the noonday.

11 The Lord will guide you continually,
and satisfy your needs in parched places,
and make your bones strong;

and you shall be like a watered garden,
like a spring of water,
whose waters never fail.

12 Your ancient ruins shall be rebuilt;
you shall raise up the foundations of many generations;
you shall be called the repairer of the breach,
the restorer of streets to live in.

Throughout the old testament then, we have the emergence of covenants, the Abrahamic promise of a land, the Jacobite promise of blessing, the Mosaic covenant of law and peace for the slaves, and the Isaiahic covenant of freedom for all peoples through the vanguard, an oppressed people group desperate to be free.

It is impossible to observe this monolatrous community, amidst a world of polytheists, who were so clearly adamant in their love of (in the literal sense) their revolutionary ideals, with their clear declarations of desires as an oppressed people group, without wondering if there may be a reason that their materialistic dialectical story may come to incubate a revolutionary community that would one day become the voice of the workers as shown in Acts 4-5 at the beginning of this text.

Thus, the emergence of a Christ-like figure was not inevitable, but certainly a result of the incubated desire for a community of retribution and love. Christ was the outworking of millennia of injustice, spiritualised and quantified in the only way that may be understandable to the community, through death of the old ways, and rebirth of the new. That is not to say that there is no God, or that Christ is not son, nor that miracles and supernatural events did not happen, for a hopeful faith in such is possible and may certainly be true as I myself believe, but rather that this God and Christ both chose to express themselves through a community whose material journey may have naturally incubated the teachings that YHWH and Christ both taught. It is also necessary to state, however, that belief in the supernatural is not a necessity for one to be a Christian communist; one must merely observe the dialectical materialist journey of pre-Zionist, ancient Israel and embrace its teachings as a natural anti-imperialist dabbler. For even before Christ, similar tendencies could be seen in the Maccabees and other Hebrew historical figures (it is important to reject Zionism and to disassociate the positive aspects of Ancient Israel with the ethnocentric imperialist ideals now espoused in Zionism).

What then did this divine embodiment of the progressive nature of Israel, that is, Christ, teach? In all honesty, this is too broad a question to answer here, and yet overwhelmingly we can observe two things about Christ's teachings as a whole. Firstly, Christ insisted upon choosing the most progressive and 'leftist' of the teachings of the time, siding against the conservative theologians, and expounding on Moses' teachings in a way which always favoured the oppressed, and only once seemingly favouring the more conservative view, though in this case they (Christ) have been misrepresented most unfairly. Secondly, Jesus inclines to sum up their own teachings with the statement at the end of the following text:

“34 When the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together, 35 and one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question to test him. 36 “Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?” 37 He said to him, “‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.’ 38 This is the greatest and first commandment. 39 And a second is like it: ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself.’ 40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”^[8]

All of Jesus' teachings and, in fact, the teachings of the Old Testament and Intertestamental Texts, must be viewed through this lens. Jesus here is quoting a Talmudic teaching expressing that love is of course at the heart of all the teachings of the law. Love is the law towards which Jesus came to provide a channel of retribution, forgiveness and salvation. This creates in itself another question, what did Jesus believe a 'society of love' looked like?

It is perhaps this question that is the most hidden from the Church, it is this question that requires us to challenge everything that the contemporary Church stands for, and forces us to reject the entirety of our worldview as

capitalist Christians. For this is the conscious choice that we have all already made. Either we are a part of the capitalist system and become capitalist Christians, who ignore Jesus' teachings on love as an issue to their worldview, or we embrace a change towards a socialist lifestyle as a necessity. To ignore the issue is to take a side against Christ.

Jesus' love was not the love of a pacifist, though those who wish to remove the people's sting would try to suggest otherwise. If we even take the most extreme of Jesus' statements that seems to express pacifist ideals, that of 'turn the other cheek,' we can see clearly what the bourgeois have done to pacify the workers. 'Turn the other cheek' was a recognition of a social construct in which a master would slap a rebellious slave, who may then in turn either cower before their master as a chastised, oppressed person, or defiantly turn and show their other cheek, expressing that they may not be cowed by their 'masters.'^[9] In fact, Jesus was so in favour of violent revolution that he overthrew the capitalist tables in the temples. His words 'he who lives by the sword, dies by the sword' was not a rejection of violence, but rather was a rejection of abusive behaviour, not of aggression against such abusive behaviour, for to reject fight against the sword is the most peaceful option to Jesus. In fact, Jesus was so violent in his opposition to abuse that he allowed himself to be killed in the most violent way imaginable, purely in order to defeat his enemy; hatred, oppression and more acutely, abusive nature (widely referred to by the illusive term 'sinful nature'). Jesus' teaching was inherently violent, what has often been misinterpreted as non-violence, was actually a one-way violence. As opposed to Moses' teaching of 'an eye for an eye,' which may be used in favour of the oppressor, instead Jesus prefers 'an eye for an eye when it is the abused whose eyes have been taken.' This is a comparable teaching to that of Malcom X in the modern world, and is certainly not non-violent but rather is in favour of intolerance of intolerance^[10].

Instead Jesus' love is violent in its defence of the abused and is far from the

weak substance it has been described as for millennia. If I am wrong, then we must envisage a world in which Jesus allows abuse, a world in which Jesus is not willing to stand against anything wrong within people. It is for this reason that, as we will see in the next chapter, I must reject pure universalism, without a need for retribution. For if we believe that all peoples may be led to salvation after death, without first rejecting, as Jesus did, their abusive nature, then we take the same stance as the bourgeois who hope to remove the violent anti-abusive nature of Christ for their own gain, curbing the righteous anger of the workers. Instead, we must envisage a form of salvation, where all may be saved, but only through their own removal of abusive nature, it is this, that all good Christians and all good communists, should hold as the purest of intentions, the rejection of their abusive nature, and the embracing of anti-abusive love.

This is the essence of Christ's love; it is unrestricted and all including, so that everyone may be saved, but only if they first encounter the violent anti-abusive nature therein, let it overwhelm them, and allow them to build faith in the movement, so that there is no abusive nature left in them. There are some who will at first find it almost impossible to accept Jesus' love because of the prickles that they will encounter in trying to remove their abusive nature; as Jesus says:

24 Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God. ^[11]

Jesus' love is comparable only to the love explained in the following text:

“At the risk of seeming ridiculous, let me say that the true revolutionary is

guided by a great feeling of love. It is impossible to think of a genuine revolutionary lacking this quality. Perhaps it is one of the great dramas of the leader that he or she must combine a passionate spirit with a cold intelligence and make painful decisions without flinching. Our vanguard revolutionaries must idealize this love of the people, of the most sacred causes, and make it one and indivisible. They cannot descend, with small doses of daily affection, to the level where ordinary people put their love into practice.

The leaders of the revolution have children just beginning to talk, who are not learning to call their fathers by name; wives, from whom they have to be separated as part of the general sacrifice of their lives to bring the revolution to its fulfilment; the circle of their friends is limited strictly to the number of fellow revolutionists. There is no life outside of the revolution.

In these circumstances one must have a great deal of humanity and a strong sense of justice and truth in order not to fall into extreme dogmatism and cold scholasticism, into isolation from the masses. We must strive every day so that this love of living humanity will be transformed into actual deeds, into acts that serve as examples, as a moving force.”^[12]

Jesus' love was revolutionary by nature, and whilst not inherently communist, it was inherently anti-abusive and as a result, inherently against high economic disparity. It was therefore authoritarian in the same sense as Marxist-Leninism is, acknowledging the need for a temporary dictatorship in order to establish a free society in which there is no economic disparity or abuse. It is clear that Jesus envisaged no poverty in heaven. This authoritarian dictatorship shall be discussed in the fourth section of this manifesto, and the refining nature and purpose of heaven and hell in the following pages, I ask only that, should the reader be unconvinced of the plausibility of my arguments because of the limited possibility of study in this piece, that they read the surrounding texts that they may see I am merely (for the most part) rewording old, established ideas .

Regardless, Christ's love is so great that nothing can withstand it, and was embodied in the Church by the Holy Spirit after Christ's ascension. The Holy Spirit guided the early Church, the new abused people-group, who organised themselves around synagogues, whose duty it was to teach the nations about Jesus' love so that they may surrender their abusive nature in life. This love continued on in the tradition set by Christ, in which people were so devoted to their anti-abusive society that they would fulfil the message, 'there is no love greater than this, for one to lay down their life for their friends.'

There are of course many interpolations in the text that we possess today, and thus we must be wary of interpolations that may favour an abusive dynamic, later inserted by abusive benefactors. However, this wariness may also grant us even more satisfaction when we find a text that has survived bourgeois attempts to pacify the bible, such as that already mentioned at the beginning of this study, in the book of Acts 4-5.

Paul's teachings continue in this fashion, always purveying equality at all costs, such as in Galatians:

"28 There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus."^[13]

Paul was keen to emphasise the removal of restrictions upon any person within the community. Of course he could not have understood fully the Marxist ideals that we have come to embrace for many reasons, not least of which being that he still lived in a slave based society. However, all he could do was point to the problems within their current system and point towards a goal. In Galatians 3:28 he does this, and in Philemon he rejects slavery as a social construct; for Onesimus, contrary to all bourgeois modern thought, was not a hapless run-away slave whom Paul returned for a half-disciplining-half-

defence. Onesimus may well have been subject to that common ancient practice of out-sourcing slaves as distant labour who lived far from their masters and payed them sums of money every so-often; in fact this in itself was sometimes a method of chastising slaves in ancient Greco-Roman society, (Harris 'Slave of Christ') meaning that Paul sending Onesimus back to Philemon may in itself be Paul refuting the idea of chastising slaves, which would make far more sense both in relation to Paul's words in the letter to Philemon, "accept him back as more than a slave,"^[14] but also within relation to Galatians 3:28 and the wider New Testament community.

Paul was clearly against slavery, for so would any that lived within a society of equals. This too was the stance of the Church in Acts 4-5, confused and in a scrambling effort to understand Christ's love and the intent of the Holy Spirit, they created their community, unaware of dialectical materialism, and of course, the teachings of Marx. They simply wanted an end to the injustice that they faced, favouring communes of equality; but always willing to embrace progressive ideas of equality, as seen in Pauline teachings and the economic redistribution of wealth, required with the punishment of death if the rules on equality were not met.

The Bible ends with the assertion of a coded text^[15] that one day the Empire will fall and that Christianity will succeed in a new all-encompassing society, presumably endowed with the ethics already expressed throughout the Church of withstanding Imperialism with death, and expressing Christ's love and reformative justice at all costs, even martyrdom.

The progressive nature of YHWH's community did not change from its dialectical path for several centuries, always either seeking the most progressive stance that it could, or instead deviating and requiring judgement and atonement. This is a stance that could also be seen in the revolution.

In fact, this is the only way one may see the bible when applying dialectical materialism to its pages. Next we shall look at a further study on the refining fires of heaven and hell, be they on earth or in an afterlife, following a study of the authoritarian nature of Christ. After this we shall look at the destruction of the Church as the Vanguard of the people and then the Church throughout the ages. After this we shall look at Marx's reaction to religion, before determining a Christian stance in the modern day. Throughout all of our study we shall impose Christ's violently anti-abusive love, for as one raising children must not allow one to hurt another unjustly, so too must we examine history, with our anti-abusive, cleansing, lens.

The refining nature of love.

Exilic justice is the key to understanding Hell. Many scholars are satisfied with an understanding of hell as an absence of God's presence, and truthfully this may describe hell quite suitably in a physical sense, though it completely ignores the function of hell. What is the function of hell? What is the function of the prison system? The exile from society? The exile from the community of God?

In the west, and in fact, in most cases around the world today, the purpose of prisons has been distorted. People ask questions such as "are prisons there to punish or to rehabilitate?" In reality, however, prisons in the modern world are simply a place to put people whom society condemns, rather, to either punish or to rehabilitate, the latter of which is rarely successful as most are institutionalised and recommit. This makes it difficult for us to understand hell for we force ourselves to assume only one of the following three is true; that hell is a place for punishment where people are 'burnt' or at least put into torment, that hell is a place where people are forgiven and come back out likely to recommit, or that hell is a place where people are kept eternally separate. These pictures are useless in trying to understand hell, for hell is said to exist for an age, and it is said that all knees will bow to Christ's violently anti-abusive love.

Thus we come to a place of understanding in which hell must be a successful place of rehabilitation, successful enough, at least, to allow all knees to bow to the anti-abusive nature of Christ's love at the end of the age. This place must, then, be nurturing enough to teach the right way, as well a punitive enough to teach the wrong. Perhaps this may occur in the way espoused by our scholarly brethren, that if people are abusive, they may be separated from the community, and if they are loving, they may be accepted into the

community, little by little. There is never at any point in the bible, a clearly mentioned cut-off between heaven and hell. Instead there are those such as those in Luke 16 who communicate, though only in a parable, the rich man in hell does not understand his position, and queries it, further exiling himself with his own ignorance, whereas the poor man enjoys involvement in the community.

Of course, there may here be a complex explanation of Calvinism and Armenianism, in which I exegete Romans, though I find myself without need. D. Campbell describes much of this theory in his epic 'Deliverance of God,' in which he outlines his Participatory Pneumatic Martyrological Eschatology. He outlines post-mortem salvation as a continual thing, in which the more the individual participates and surrenders their abusive nature, the more they enter into Christ's community. All we need to do is assert the violence of Christ's anti-abusive nature, and we arrive at a position in which Hell is a place in which those who are counter-revolutionary, are refined into the person that Christ intends them to be (mirroring the perfect incarnation of this model, found at the cross^[16]), so that one day, abuser and victim may meet each other in a situation in which the abuser is no longer the abuser, so changed by the violence of Christ's love, that they are unrecognisable to the victim (as Christ himself was unrecognizable to the disciples after the resurrection), and at last they may come together in community.

Perhaps then I may suggest a final amendment to this understanding of hell? What if hell is not only a place that exists after death, but rather is a tool that we may use today, here, on earth. Perhaps hell, exilic justice, is exactly what Paul spoke of in 1 Corinthians 5:5 when he advised the Corinthian Church to hand over an immoral member to Satan in order to restore them. Perhaps Paul was expressing the desire to bring down exilic justice upon the wrongdoer, in order that he may be restored and again enter into the community, chastised and changed. In fact, what else could Paul mean, unless we expect to

understand that he reverts to the traditional understanding of hell, and hopes that this person is burnt up for an eternity in hell?

Instead, Paul urges for the use of hell as a tool in which one is taught the use of violent, anti-abusive love; much as the Gulags were intended to be used (albeit somewhat unsuccessfully and in reality used to support a bourgeois regime) in Stalinist Russia, though both may have been executed poorly on many occasions, the embodiment of hell as a form of exilic justice rings true throughout the bible. In fact, was it not exilic justice that saw the Israelite community transformed in the exile after the immorality of their Kings?

Hell was intended as a reformatory tool, in which punishment was itself a tool, but never pain, nor abuse, rather the self-inflicted pain of abusive nature as a force to separate the individual from a loving community. It was not an eternal dumping ground (as the western prison system has largely become), and nothing within the bible suggests otherwise; rather it was a place that abusers would be placed for an age, until they were no longer abusive, which for some would take very little time, for others none at all, and for still others, an unimaginably long time; though all would be saved through Christ's violent rejection of abuse, through their death, and conquering of death, in resurrection.

Heaven, however, is always presented as the end of the struggle. Heaven is the realisation of the perfect Christ-following community in which the progressive ideals were absolute. They were mirrored in the early Church's communes, but in heaven all would conform to these equality-based ways of living abuse-free. This state of being can only be reached through the refining anti-abusive love highlighted by Christ, and required an authoritarian backing in the short run or else, as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, people would disobey. This authoritarianism must manifest itself in order to protect people and must be placed across all people, or else there will always be some who seek to be abusive and go without punishment.

The Church no longer seeks to create this anti-abusive society, instead pursuing an abusive dynamic of its own. The modern church is concerned primarily with defending its own stance as a spiritual defence of the straight, white, western, male dominance over society, in its rejection of violence as a means of defence of the oppressed, simply because it would incur violence against them as the oppressors. There are some areas where the Church represents only the interests of the petite bourgeois, where it suggest their superiority over other cultures, but also expresses sadness at the inequality, seeming to react to social debates only as they arrive rather than taking the initiative; yet these Churches are just as guilty as the former if they only seek to protect the oppressed because the issues were individually raised one a time in a reactionary manner. There are some few Churches who FOR themselves seek out these issues in order to confront them and seek the love of Christ in their community, but these Churches are in the vast minority, with most afraid to admit that there are things worth being angry about because who would that hurt most of all? Even in those places where the Church is itself still a repressed minority, they still voice the opinions of their rich capitalist allies, rather than the abused people groups. I shall discuss the current position of the church more fully in Chapter 4, for the moment it is necessary simply to observe that if the Church continues on the trajectory that it is currently upon, we shall never reach a heavenly state. It is only with the rejection of our bourgeois leaders, with their overthrowing, and the assertion of a true, loving, Christ-like love, that we may reach the heavenly community towards which we have been reaching for so long.

Thus, hell is essentially a Gulag of restorative justice and reformatory relationship to humanity, present both here on earth, and, in the mind of the Christian, in the afterlife. Heaven, is the abuse-free environment towards which we have always hoped to strive, in an echo of the early Church and now in communism. There is no community that is abuse-free and heavenly, unless it represents an end-goal of freedom (limited by the restriction of 'no abuse') and equality of opportunity and quality of life, where all labour benefits all rather than allowing some to live off the labours of others.

This is not the heaven and hell painted by Bosch, or by the words of Dante, or Milton^[17]. Though these are the depictions that first jump to mind, before even the biblical understanding. We imagine hell as the abusive battle-ground of God against those filled by what God hates most, 'sin', without realising what sin is, what God's reaction to sin or 'abusive nature' is, and without recognising that there is a way for God to love and discipline to the point of salvation. There is no other explanation of hell that makes sense with other Christian values other than the one that I have explained, and with the view that I have explained, there is no other reaction than to hope for a heavenly commune as the one that I, and the bible before me, have described. Therefore, for a church-goer to read this they must become at least a socialist, if not a Communist or, dare we presume, a Christian. Moreover, unless you agree with the ideal of heaven as the anti-abusive community mentioned in Acts, then you cannot believe in the love of Christ, in which case, I find it difficult to count you upon our members; for we Christians will always live and die for the anti-abusive love of Christ.

Those who profess themselves to be Christians but do not embrace this anti-abusive love will find, if hell does exist after death, that they themselves are in need of refining. In fact many of those who would have thought themselves to be first will be last, and last will be first. Those such as Malcom X and Lenin may be very quick to understand the love of Christ, if it is as I have said, whereas those such as pastors of many *Hillsongs* churches, other conservative evangelical Churches or patriarchal denominations will find themselves in utter conflict with Christ, whose love they will have no comprehension of, and no way of understanding, so far into their own abusive, homophobic, nature are they enveloped. However, Christ will save them and will provide for them the light towards which they will be drawn into a loving relationship and through whom their abuses will be removed.

How does one experience salvation? Salvation by faith? Salvation by works? Salvation by participating in the eternal spiritual dying to abusive nature and

moving towards Christ? Surely it is the latter, which by itself requires an anti-abusive faith? Which is correct? According to the traditional view, faith in Jesus is what leads to salvation, and yet even those who believe this would admit that there are restrictions, that if someone believed in an idol who happened to be called Jesus without any relation to the Jesus we worship, that purely shared a name by coincidence, that it would not in itself lead to salvation. Therefore there is a concurrent knowledge that one must worship and strive towards living like the 'correct' Jesus. Until my dying breath I will worship the violently anti-abusive Christ that I have found in the scripture, and I am convinced that any other understanding of Christ is a distortion of how Christ wished to be understood, and as such must be refined. They may share the name Christians, as the idol worshipper may happen to worship an idol named Jesus, but unless they recognise the need for anti-abusive love, then we are separated by their own admission of abusive nature. They are either with me and for anti-abusive love or against me and in favour of abuse. I love them, in my anti-abusive way, as I love the world, but I separate myself from them as the vanguard of the true Christian way, which I pray daily will direct the entire Christian movement behind me, for it is not too late for the Church to become as Christ intended.

For now they are like the Pharisees to us, this 'Christian community.' They understand the law, but do not understand the point of salvation, nor the purpose of Christ. We can sit in communion with them and in community with them; but they will always persecute us for believing in equality and anti-abusive love, even if only in the most painful of liberalist ways. I shall eternally be crucified for them, and yet reject their false teachings which support only the highest amongst them and their patrons.

It should also here be noted, whilst further study is not possible here, that there may perhaps be made, a fascinating comparison between the Christian-communist understanding of hell, and the glorious Soviet book "the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy." In which it is argued that

there are three deaths that a revolutionary encounters, the first is the willingness to die for the revolution in which the revolutionary becomes willing to sacrifice themselves for the cause, in this there is a willingness to give everything one has, which is a death to the normal life that non-revolutionaries live. Second is the normal death that we encounter as mortal creatures. The third is the undying death in which our values and the revolution towards which we all fought are continually lived out through the continuing body of the revolution. These three deaths may be compared to Christianity with impossible accuracy. The first, the baptism, and death to the old way. The second, the physical removal of the body in the fight towards Christ. The third, the undying movement towards Christ's revolutionary community.

Christ the dictator

23 “All things are lawful,” but not all things are beneficial. “All things are lawful,” but not all things build up. 24 Do not seek your own advantage, but that of the other.’^[18]

This is, in essence, the heart of Christ’s dictatorship. Christ’s Kingdom or ‘Party’ (or perhaps ‘group’ or ‘community’ would be a more helpful description) is not one that allows ‘all things’. For capitalist, entrepreneurial systems were introduced under the incorrect interpretation of the law of the prophets, whilst with a deeper reading of the Old Testament texts as outlined here we may reject capitalism, there are those who seek to exploit all people groups and proffer Christ’s grace as their excuse. These people are those to whom this Pauline text was written; those who hoped to engage in abusive behaviour, only then to return and be allowed once more into the community because of ‘grace.’ However, to proffer such ideas is to misunderstand Christ’ love.

Christ’s love does not dictate that people may do whatever they please and still be a part of the community. Rather, Christ’s love is restorative. It seeks to heal the wounds of abuse by reclaiming the abuser so that they become loving in themselves. This is achieved by exile from community, as explained in the previous chapter, by allowing the abused victim to be safe from the abuser, so that they may heal and become whole, whilst also allowing the abuser to recognise their sin and become clean once more. This system can be understood in only one way. It is a dictatorship. A drawing in that features one path, one ‘true way’, that being the anti-abusive nature that Jesus highlights.

If we ponder, for a moment, Emmanuel Kant^[19], we can see that the metaphysics surrounding logic may suggest that there are certain categorical imperatives that may transcend our cognition. We cannot pre-requisitely understand these imperatives, and they must transcend experience, by very nature. And yet there may still be an ideal towards which we slide, towards which we reach without understanding with our mere experiential understanding. If there was one who understood these ideals, one who transcended human cognition, and pointed towards the morality that they understood in a greater way than we; and that has so often been hid behind words such as 'sin', then shouldn't any striving towards this moral objective be considered a moral dictatorship? If there is a social obligation to strive towards a particular objective, and refusal to move towards this objective results in removal from community; even to the non-revolutionary, it is impossible to argue against the dictatorship that is found in Christ. For even amongst Calvinists, there must be an acceptance that in Christ is the only model for which all others strive, and within the striving is found morality. Even the Calvinist must see the authoritarian nature of Christ.

All of this is without recognising the authoritarian nature of God in the Old Testament, who themselves is depicted (albeit likely only as a result of social constructs) to have struck down numerous people who diverted from the cause, or insisted that those who betrayed the revolution must be killed. This too is what we see in Acts in our earlier reading and indeed throughout the Bible and related texts.

There is a dictatorship, and that dictatorship centres on the majority of the community being at peace with itself. The community may accept or reject those attributes within people that either mirror Christ or reject Christ. Therefore those who are abusive in nature are rejected by the community and those who are anti-abusive in nature are allowed a portion of representation in Christ's dictatorship of love. There is no way of being a Christian without accepting that this love must dictate your life; and thus we cannot be both a

Christian and a libertarian, for such a way is a rejection of the very nature of Christianity which in itself requires a following. There can be no following, no community, without the dictatorship of love that Christ first gave to everyone, until abusive nature is removed. This dictatorship of a community filled with the anti-abusive love of Christ can be known simply as, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Too often the western preachers fear the removal of 'rights to freedom,' and yet, the freedom to harm others, the freedom to lie, the freedom to embody abusive nature, has been taken from us by the dictatorship of Christ. I thank my God daily that he has removed the burden of these freedom's from me. There is nothing free in living in a world where one person is allowed to hurt another; in such a world only tyranny can be found. A dictatorship of the people, a dictatorship of the loving community is the only way that society may advance to a state of universal love, the Church's rejection of this and focus upon the wrong areas has been its greatest historical mistake and the greatest success of the bourgeois invaders of the Church.

Throughout history the Church has tried to spread this dictatorship of the community with abuse. Such a development is a denial unto itself, even if the people of the Church that sought to extend itself were, in themselves, moral from the outset, the second that the Church denies the anti-abusive categorical imperative, it ceases to be the loving community, and thus expansion is pointless and becomes about ulterior motives. Only a community that expands through love may embody the values of Christ the dictator, and those people who have often been at the heart of the 'Christian' community rarely have anything to do with the true purpose of the church.

The dictatorship of Christ is not restrained to the Church. Why should it be? The dictatorship of Christ is found in any who impose the anti-abusive will of

one group upon another. Every true communist who has ever lived has been a part of this dictatorship, and so were the vast majority of early Muslims (and many since), or indeed any that hope to end the abusive nature of another. I do not say this to cause offence to our Muslim brothers, quite the contrary. After Christ's death, it was the community that represented the anti-abusive nature of Christ's restorative love that became important; and whichever community has outworked this love has been the harbinger of morality. Muslims for much of their (particularly early) history, and today as a force against western imperialism, have been a force for morality and anti-abusive love. The dictatorship is found in any community which embodies the values of the dictatorship, not within those who utilise the apparatus of the dictatorship for their own ends.

To return to our reading, 1 Corinthians 10:23-24:

23 "All things are lawful," but not all things are beneficial. "All things are lawful," but not all things build up. 24 Do not seek your own advantage, but that of the other.'

Although a person may be accepted back into the community under the law of grace, first they must align themselves with the dictatorship. The dictatorship that fiercely seeks advantage of the other, the love of the other and reject the abusive nature within people. Thus it is a dictatorship of the loving community that all people may enter, though some may have to first align themselves with Christ and shed their abusive nature, as many have yearned to do, such as Lenin, Marx and every other revolutionary who has stood against the injustice of abuse. By nature, the striving towards a categorical imperative has inherently no room for rejection when weighted with social exile as a negative response, all will be saved.

If in life, the church has failed to embody this dictatorship, we should not fear, however, for as outlined in the previous chapter, upon death we enter

into the restorative gulag of hell; either through afterlife or through the testing of ideals through the revolution in which we all have place our communal hopes as the only restorative means of humanity.

The historical nature of the Church

Throughout the bible, the *true* community of Yahweh has always been positioned on the progressive side of the current social scale. In the Old Testament, where the rest of the world talked about slavery and enthrallment, the Israelites talked about releasing anyone from servitude indebted to you every jubilee year (although they were still confined to the early stages of dialectical materialist social development including ideas understood in the terms of "Kingdoms", a construct which existed into the New Testament). Where some cultures saw the elderly as a burden to be sent off into the wilderness, the Israelites taught respect of the elders. Such a parallel may even exist in the creation narrative, for example, the Babylonians had the Enuma Elish, which read:

When in the height heaven was not named,
And the earth beneath did not yet bear a name,
And the primeval Apsu, who begat them,
And chaos, Tiamut, the mother of them both
Their waters were mingled together,
And no field was formed, no marsh was to be seen;
When of the gods none had been called into being,
And none bore a name, and no destinies were ordained;
Then were created the gods in the midst of heaven,
Lahmu and Lahamu were called into being
Ages increased
Then Ansar and Kisar were created, and over them
Long were the days, then there came forth
Anu, their son,
Ansar and Anu
And the god Anu
Nudimmud, whom his fathers, his begetters
Abounding in all wisdom,'

He was exceeding strong
He had no rival -
Thus were established and were... the great gods.

Where the Babylonian creation mythology exalts chaos and disorder, the Hebrew creation myth exalts YHWH as the one who brought order. Out of the chaos, the temple was built, and in the temple we were created as the representatives of YHWH. Whereas other religions and nations preferred a way of violent sacrifice, for YHWH the sacrifice of honest faith and obedience in the anti-abusive love, was paramount. Always, where this anti-abusive love was present, the Israelites were on the progressive edge of the social spectrum.

In the New Testament, then, it should cause no surprise that Christ is always found upon the far left of the social spectrum. On every issue, Christ chooses the most progressive and least conservative path. Potentially even on the issue of divorce, in which he claims that two people may only divorce where one person has committed adultery was made in an effort to perfect the then-current system so as to remove the possibility of male promiscuity in damaging the trade agreements that were then embodied in marriage.

Certainly Paul, in his declaration that within the Church there should be no 'slave or free' was a massive advancement within an age in which Slave-based society was the normal social structure. At every turn the community sought to refute apathy and seek a world which better embodied the anti-abusive love of YHWH. Of course, each stage built upon the last. For example, Moses could not have understood the restructuring of the community as well as Paul for he had not encountered Christ. Rather, each stage was a progression upon the previous stage, but always the community of YHWH, when embodying anti-abusive love, can be found on the far

progressive end of the spectrum. [\[20\]](#)

This continued into the first three centuries of the life of the Church, which largely tried to protect the most vulnerable in society, whilst also standing against Roman imperialism. In fact, one must understand Marx if one is to understand why the Roman Empire was so oppressive to the early Church. This was largely because the Empire had an established means of subduing its populace. It already had an established religion which placated the lower classes and orders as an opiate. The idea of Christianity and its anti-abusive, sharing, loving community was undermining the core opiate of the masses. People were beginning to open their minds to a view that they should join a community in which one person could not abuse another.

In response to this we see an example of a social movement that has happened an impossible number of times over the ages, in which the bourgeoisie and aristocracy invaded an institution that caused them anxiety. The ruling class invaded the Church in every segment that they could, dulling the edge of the revolutionary sword and putting instead within its echelons a golden spoon, so that when at last Constantine the 'Great Swine' made Christianity the official religion of the Western Empire, it was a fitting replacement for the old placating tool. The martyrdoms and extremist anti-abusive nature of the Church died as it was handed over to the very abusive people it had opposed. Pagan priests that had once worshiped Venus as the tool of the ruling class, instead worshiped Mary. Where once was served sacrificial meat was served communion bread. The old ritual of dissuasion and separation of the proletariat from social progression resumed.

Over the years, many good Christians did emerge. Many Catholic and Orthodox Christians would lead the way for social reform, but as all were inevitably seeking to wield a golden spoon as if it were a revolutionary

sword, their success was inherently limited. Generally the Church served the interests of the ruling class, even itself becoming the uniting imperialist power in the Europe and instigating an invasion of the then-new proletarian movement, Islam.

As Islam developed, in many ways it became the new community of Christ's values. The anti-abusive love can be found more in the early days of Islam than it the contemporary Christian culture certainly, and there are many good Muslims who live more as Christ intended than the vast majority of Christians today. In fact, so twisted and distorted was the "Church" of that time that it found itself scrambling to selfishly protect its own imperialist interests in Crusade after Crusade. These twisted abusive wrecks, so devoid of love and compassion that they would kill for their own abusive dominance no longer represented the community of YHWH, and it sticks in my throat to call them 'Christians,' for they were no more Christians than are the Klu Klux Klan today. This is the problem with Calvinist salvation by faith alone. Many of the people on the Crusades had a faith in Jesus, but not only was the Jesus they worshiped far-separated from the real Christ, but also faith without works shows only a lack of anti-abusive love.

There were Christians at the time, I am sure, perhaps amongst the Muslim community, at least in the way that we have defined Christianity's true values here. However, none who were a part of the system understood the anti-abusive nature of Christ, for the proletariat and indeed anti-abusive love was put aside.

Thus, as the centuries progressed, and the old teachings faded and were replaced by doctrines further and further removed from the teachings of Christ and further and further in favour of the ruling class (so much so that even the most distorted views of the Bible could not support them). The

Church became not only conservative but regressive in nature, so eager to maintain its empire. The next big change came with Luther.

Now Luther was in himself, not a good Christian in many senses. His theological advancements may have been better than the Catholic Church at the time, but soon the Catholic Church had caught up and corrected most of the basic theological regressions that Luther highlighted. Perhaps these reforms within the Catholic Church only took place as a result of Luther, or perhaps they would have occurred of their own volition, either way Luther, whilst filled with a just anger at the then-current system, had little to offer in the way of positive change. All of his changes were largely redundant a century later, and he had plunged the continent into a war fought by (and at the expense of) the masses, largely, on the interest of the bourgeoisie, of which Luther was most certainly a part. Rather, in the Europe, the true advancement that Luther instigated was entirely accidental and was something in fact that Luther did not wish for.

The forming of Protestantism was a development by Luther to reform the Catholic Church, not to create a new movement. Yet this new movement found within itself an opportunity. For the first time in over a millennia there was a Church which was not intrinsically an opiate of the masses. Again, the Protestants could stand against imperialism, for there was no definite centralised empire of power as there was in the old denominations (though the Lutheran defectors from the Catholic Church soon, largely, filled that void). This movement meant that briefly we had glimpses of movements which represented new ideas about Christ, some of which stood against the then-current trend for Christianity to remain an opiate of the masses. Dialectical materialism was no longer being strangled in the way that it had been.

Of course, such strains of thought were quickly stamped out, and soon the bourgeois and aristocracy once again inherited the seat of power in the new movement, in some cases in even purer forms than had previously been the case, such as Henry the VIII of England declaring himself head of the national Church. However, the separation of the Church into different groups (whilst temporarily atomizing) allowed an incubation of groups that came later who challenged long-held theological ideas much in the way that we not must challenge so many theological ideas.

As feudalism began to teeter on the edge of collapse, we find a number of fascinating scenarios which highlights the benefits of decentralised imperialist Christian power. In the English civil war, for example, there were a number of groups that emerged; most noticeably for this discussion, the diggers.

The diggers were a group of deeply Christian pre-Marxian peasants who decided that land should be publically owned, and insisted on farming certain land owned by the aristocracy. Thus, because of the nature of these peasants, they found themselves arriving at very similar conclusions to Marx, purely through the use of logic and biblical understanding of the anti-abusive love of Christ.

Of course, they could not phrase it as I have, nor could they hope to arrive at a complete, Marxian worldview, for such would have been impossible; however, they understood on a basic level that society was weighted in an inherently abusive way that needed reordering rather than passively allowing the aristocrats to dictate to the peasants, and hoping in turn that they would not betray their interests. Of course, in the case of Henry VIII, the aristocrats did betray the interests of the British working class, even allowing a period of three centuries to elapse before women would be allowed to participate in

their democratic system. If the British public had listened to the diggers, perhaps this would not have taken so long, for these people strove towards anti-abusive love, whether wittingly or unwittingly. Such a movement and further social progression was only possible because of the removal of the monopoly of power from the Catholic Church in Europe; this was the greatest contribution of Luther to the Church, even though it was something he adamantly hoped against. A returning of the possibility of a voice for the proletariat within the Church.

Sadly, however, Christianity once again became the opiate of the masses under capitalism as the bourgeois rose again. People in the west were filled with apathy because of their misunderstanding of Christ and allowed their old shackles to be placed upon their wrists once more. There were pockets of Christianity which burst in brilliant radiances of anti-abusive love. The French 'July Revolution' may be counted amongst these, as may the later Marxian writings and revolutions.

In fact, everywhere that people fought for love (including the many that cannot be mentioned here for lack of space^[21]), Christ could be found; whether in the emergence of atheism and the discarding of the social opiate that Christianity had become, or in the heart of the scholars who detested capitalist imperialism. In each of them could be found the same necessity to die for social progression that was found in Christ, whilst the Christians continued to lay about in the same apathy that they have been infected with since the fall of the early Church. The golden spoon has since remained in their mouths and they have been watching fearfully as the symbiotic relationship between the Church and the bourgeois has long since verged on the edge of collapse. This symbiotic relationship is so engrained in the Church after all those centuries that separation is met with the opposition of every facet of Christian society, whose fate is now, it believes, desperately linked to the fate of the bourgeoisie. If this is to change, it will not come from the ruling echelons of the Church, but rather through those within the Church

who embody the anti-abusive love of Christ, and will require a complete overhaul and destruction of the bourgeoisie. Without such an overhaul, the Church cannot be as it was intended to be.

Here we should note that to say as many capitalists have that “capitalism embodies human nature” is to misunderstand human nature. Human nature always changes; it is the product of our environment. Lenin once argued that within capitalism, of course this nature would breed pompous greed, for people will want to exploit others so that they will no longer have to be exploited. However, if we place people within the values of anti-abusive love, within the values suggested by Christ, there is no exploitation. It is the sworn duty of all those who love Christ to smash the current 'human nature' and instead strive to embody the anti-abusive, progressive, love that YHWH's true community has always sought.

It is an outrageous display of apathy, and surely unacceptable to Christ that when we look at YHWH's community in the bible, we see social regression as immoral, when we look at YHWH's community throughout the ages, we see abusive nature as immoral, and yet we currently live in an age in which people are exploited through wage-slavery, and surely we have not reached heavenly standards, and yet we who observe these truths do nothing. Surely this apathy must be rejected at all costs? Surely the world in which we live today is not the last stage of 'human nature'?

From Marx to Christ

It is thus quite easy to separate Marxism from antitheism, for Marx did not seek an end to religion, but rather an end to the opiates of the masses and to the apathy that had previously and wrongfully been applied to religion. Lenin was of much of the same opinion and, once having established that Imperialism was the highest stage of capitalism, believed that using the ways in which the bourgeoisie had divided up the proletariat to challenge imperialism was acceptable. This manifested itself in abused people groups (which is one of many reasons that communists and Christians should always act as agents on behalf of abused people groups), particularly in abused nations claiming and coming to possess a level of nationalism and self-pride, [\[22\]](#) in anti-colonialism, and even in the direct defence of Islam as a uniting force for many abused peoples. If Lenin supported Islam as a force against capitalism, shouldn't we support radical Christianity as a force that should be overtly opposed to capitalist greed and enforced apathy?

Religion was the 'reality television' of the 1800s. It had been used to allow people to forget about their immediate problems, to forgo a struggle towards freedom and to abide a system of direct slavery. This is what Marx was against. Religion in itself is but a social phenomenon, whether correct in itself or false, if this social phenomenon stands by what both Christ and Marx fought for, (equality and anti-abusive love) then it is possible that it could be used as a tool for the revolution.

Of course, to say that there are no contradictions with Marx and the Church would be clearly false. This is of course because the Church is currently a bourgeois system and so is naturally weighted in favour of those in power who exploit and may claim the 'divine right of Kings,' in a similar way to the way that the democratic national system may often be flawed (and yet within which Trotskyists seek entryism as a means to an end). This means we are put in one of two situations, either we (as Christian Communists) denounce the Church as impossibly and irreconcilably bourgeois and establish a new order for ourselves, or we seek reform within the current body. This is the age-old difficulty of not knowing when, if ever, to resort to barbarism.

For me, within the Church, it is an entirely different question to within a political climate. For despite their invasion of the Church, and partly as a result of it, the bourgeois could not remove the spiritual sense of wanting to avoid domineering nature. It may be just an unrecognised shadow of what it should be, but this mind-set exists, albeit for the wrong reasons. The Church was pacified because the Bourgeois gave power over to those it perceived as least dangerous, much as the British Empire under the imperialist Prime Minister Atlee handed over Indian independence to Ghandi,^[23] for he was the most peaceful of those in the clamour for change, or as the US government dealt primarily with Martin Luther King in the struggle for black rights. The Church was neutered and the Martyrs, largely, were taken from her by allowing the more peaceful, or least fervently anti-abusive of the people within the Church have power. This is a trait which has continued for millennia, and unlike political spheres (within minority-led systems such as capitalism and feudalism) where a level of abuse is necessary within the social construct, the Church has instead exalted a trait of being as 'un-radical' possible in order to better fulfill the role given to it by the ruling classes. This is a trait which at best merely lessens the 'anti' within 'anti-abusive love,' and yet it is perceived as a holy trait, despite the many instances in which Jesus and YHWH became overwhelmed with radical emotion in the bible.

Whatever the reasons, this view of holiness as a person who calmly reaches middle ground, makes barbarism within the Church much more difficult. For barbarism to be successful, the Christian communist (or Xcommunist as X was once the shorthand for Christ) is required first to gain a position of authority, second to show an extreme reaction to situations that require an extreme reaction, third to gain a following, fourth to spread the seeds of anti-abusive love, and fifth to repeat this strategy until there is a large enough segment to break away from the norm and form a vanguard movement. It is a dangerous task, and one which will rarely result in expulsion if the true intent of the communist is discovered. Logic and Christ are on our side, which makes it difficult for the bourgeoisie to fight us within the Church, they are forced to attempt to use the old opiate against us, unaware that we have freed ourselves from its clutches. Always be wary of those who tell you to have 'peace of heart,' and answer such peace with the knowledge and true peace that comes from revolutionary morality. In constant revolution we find a

stability in anti-abusive love. To the Christian communist there is but one giant standing in our way; misinformation, ignorance, bourgeois distraction from the truth, and but one way to combat this, education in the same way as Christ educated, as martyrs whose barbarism will be unending even until death. We should put aside apathy and confront the immorality of the so-called, 'natural environment' of capitalism surrounding us.

If there is 'no slave or free' within the Christian community, can there be people who live within in 'wage slavery'^[24] or should we in fact fight the abolition of all abusive dominance? Should Christians abide a system which supports slavery and exploitation as is dictated by their 'natural' surroundings, as dictated by capitalist goals, or should they in fact stand against it? Can we have peace in a system which is ruled by abuse? Or should the martyrs rise with voices ringing? I do not know where the rest of you will stand, but I shall stand against sin, against abuse, and for anti-abusive love until the day that they nail me to my cross; and even then, I shall not forget my Christ.

We have spent some time discussing how Marxian philosophy may be applied backwards onto Christ and forwards onto the Church, but little time discussing how Christ himself compares to Marx in the reverse. Of course, to assume that Christ understood dialectical materialism, or in fact had any understanding of philosophy as Marx did, or held any but the most basic of universal concepts regarding philosophy of the modern era causes difficulties. Even those with the highest Christology who perceive Christ as fully omniscient and all-knowing would still struggle to defend that Christ would perceive all knowledge within a human understanding rather than having some divine and thus ideal form of knowledge without the need for understanding the dialectical nature of study, unless they are to accept, as I have proposed, that YHWH is himself materialistic. Either way, Christ could not teach dialectical materialism either because of his lack of knowledge of the material development of human society, or because of the lack of necessity to teach it, instead seeing a divine ideal. Either way, for Christ to teach Marxism would be impossible and irrelevant at an era in which slave-based feudal society had not yet deteriorated. Thus we must see Christ using our backward moral understanding and on some level attempt to judge

Christ's dialectical materialism; did Christ seek an end to the current system of the time? Did Christ seek to further the rights of the lower classes? Does Christ's logic lead to socialism if we continue into later social orders? Surely the quote from Acts 4-5 mentioned earlier in the text gives our answer to all of these questions as the outworking of Christ's community. Yes, Christ was opposed to the feudal slave system. Yes, Christ sought to bring the lower classes into a society in which all were of equal standing. Yes, Christ's anti-greed and anti-abusive love could only lead to socialism. My point is simply that Christ embodied socialist ideals as much as was possible for the era; he could not necessarily, by divine nature, have known that the abusive nature of humanity would lead to the rise of wage-slavery and a new order of inequality without our hindsight and advanced human understanding portrayed in dialectical materialism, however if we apply the basic logic that Christ applied we would end up in a world that did not look like our own. If Christ was all knowing, then he may perceive everything that YHWH perceived, but that is not say that he perceived these things in the same way as humans, for there would be no need for speculation or struggle with logic as represented by dialectical materialism; but if Christ was not all-knowing or if YHWH was inherently the existential embodiment of dialectical materialism, then there would be either perhaps no possibility of knowledge, or the knowledge that progression would come in its time and would not come without struggle. Perhaps Christ simply played his role as the catalyst towards the next step of a more equal society, either as Son of YHWH, or as a misguided revolutionary, either way, it is easy to find harmony with Marx and Christ, and impossible to find inherit division. Either Christ embodied the struggle of dialectical materialism (be it as divine but not all-knowing saviour and Son of God, or as a misguided man), or he transcended it (as a divine all-knowing Son of God). Either of these still requires Christians to cast off their apathy and join the revolution, peacefully (though this is impossible when the bourgeois party is being inherently abusive, the only 'peaceful' option is to challenge the present violence until it no longer exists within society) or not.

I must reiterate on the point of apathy. As Jesus recognized, the opposing force to "intolerance" is not "tolerance." The opposing force to intolerance is

intolerance of intolerance (as denoted as anti-abusive love).

If we tolerate racism, sexism, homophobia or xenophobia, we are allowing it to have a degree of power. The only way to progress away from intolerance is not to tolerate it. That is why I will not back down when intolerance has won the bourgeois seats of power, because for me to be "peaceful" about it, allows racists to have power.

I am and will remain utterly opposed to intolerance, and to those of you who find that offensive, please note that I am aiming for peace, there just cannot be peace whilst there is intolerance of abused people-groups widely accepted by society, in such a case society is the aggressor and it is us, the Church, who should be the defensive force.

Here, with a heart for social progression burning in our chests, I would like to implore all who feel stirred by this book to now go and read the communist manifesto, and to learn about the current economic system of wage-slavery and the plausibility of communism as a system which may truly embody anti-abusive live, whatever qualms you may have about its previous implementation.

The future of the Proletarian Church

Christ is the embodied in the revolution and no matter what your religion or nation, we must all lose our chains of oppression for that very same Christ. The only way to leave our prison is to fight our way free, whether by democratic means, or by resorting to firm 'barbarism' or rather, forcefully enacting the clear moral principles upon our society that Jesus taught us (being intolerant of intolerance). I pray and hope for the former, but am resolved for the latter if necessary.

Of course, I understand the reluctance upon many within the leftist movements to embrace two things which may be involved in the aforementioned statement: religious involvement within the state and a Christian cause involving violence.

To many, the imperialist crusades of the middle ages may be drawn to the forefront of the mind. Or perhaps they shall recall with trepidation the 'Christian' ethics of the many imperialist countries, who invaded and colonised into lands occupied by natives of different religions or cultural values in order to bring them 'civilisation.' Such ideas are to be avoided at all costs; this manifesto does not propose that Christianity should be placed upon a pedestal, that through becoming a part of this particular social convention (for even if Christianity is the only correct religion, the church as it exists is primarily a social construct of the western world) one may become part of the 'desirable' culture. Rather, we embrace the revolution as part of the outworking of the ethos behind the teachings of Jesus Christ, and that by embracing the revolution, people of all cultures may become part of the community that Christ envisioned. It is this community that should be spread across the world. Whilst we love Christ, we do not want everyone to enter the western construct, but rather to live in a socialist world which embodies Christ's anti-abusive teachings.

Where global conversion may be impossible within the Church today because of conflicting social interests, all may become part of the true community that Christ envisioned. Where there are many who may never access the modern church, all may enter the global revolution, regardless of culture or religion. All may enter the society that Christ truly envisioned, except for those who do not wish to relent their abusive ways. Through faith in the true Christ, in the ideals that he once stood for, all may be saved.

It is also necessary for us to reject certain principles. We must refute ideas of stationary doctrine upon social development. One of the drawbacks of previous Christian association to the state (aside from the already noted imperialist intervention within Christianity), is that Christians have applied a 'biblical' stance to current issues, without the understanding that even within the bible views on social issues changed as the book progressed. To have a stationary view on many issues within the bible, from eating rituals to teaching on the abilities of God, develops both within the testaments and during the intertestamental period. As the ideas with relationship to social conventions change within the bible, why should we apply biblical ideas without taking social change into account? That does not limit the authority of the bible but rather expands it. Of course, we may be rightly nervous about declaring the ability to have as much authority as the bible in providing new methods of dealing with social developments, yet we can apply the aforementioned ideals found within the bible, of anti-abusive love to social constructs as they emerge. Indeed the church has readily adopted a stance on issues such as drug use, albeit with a dubious consensus reached.

Thus, if we avoid barbarism and Christian political development to further expand western cultural social constructs, but rather seek the furthering of a moral community supported by the anti-abusive love of Christ, we may avoid the pitfalls that may make people nervous of supporting the ideas put forward in the first paragraph of this section of this manifesto.

Now that we have established what the overarching aim of the Christian communist should be, we may establish the way in which this may be hoped to be achieved. It seems inconceivable for me not to consider first the possibility of using the constructs already in place, those of local churches of different denominations (much as Lenin advocated using bourgeois constructs first before resorting to barbarism), so we shall first consider the pros and cons of such actions.

The pros for such a movement are clear:

- Regular members of an already committed movement already have all the necessary facilities and social standing needed in order to develop.
- A mass movement may be created permeating every crevasse of society.
- A successful takeover of church denominations or local churches may mean instant power and a platform for the proletariat to make further changes.
- The social weight of the long-established denominations may lead the vanguard and help to further mobilise the proletariat.

The cons for such a movement are:

- It risks bourgeois intervention and infiltration within the revolution as the bourgeoisie are already largely in control of such institutions.
- Certain movements are inherently bourgeois on an international level,

which would make change almost impossible without creating a split in the Church.

- It limits supporters of the revolution to those who are willing to attend the services of Churches, and particularly those of certain denominations.
- In many Churches the priest may be naturally supportive of the bourgeoisie, and may seek to disrupt socialist development, cutting the head off any local movements.

Rather then, I suggest that X-communists should take a three step approach to reaching out to their local community. Firstly, there should be an inter-denominational and inter-religious (or atheistic) call to arms, in which all of the workers are told about the Christian Communist teachings and told to meet in a central location, in which they should meet with other socialist groups. The X-communists amongst the normal socialists may then make connections and further develop their understanding of Marxist Leninism, whilst also meeting other X-communists with whom, regardless of denomination, they may share a mutual identity.

The second step may involve the education of X-coms within a local grouping in both socialist/ liberation theology and Marxism, in order to help evangelise as many people to the Marxist cause as possible. Once this aim has been achieved they should seek to establish themselves as a political force, allied to the socialist movement both through political action and vanguardalism, showing the moral path of the X-communist.

The third step would be the further infiltration of the Christian Communist communities back into their various denominations and political parties, in order to further their development back into the engrained social structure.

This may sometimes involve moving to a new area in order to further the good news of socialism, or may involve continued working on a local level. The great commission for us now is that all people unto the ends of the earth may hear the real, socialist intention of Christ. Those who wish to join us may then join us and those who do not may join other socialist parties or enter into the loving, refining fire of hell.

If any part of this process is disrupted by bourgeois powers, it is then the duty of the local X-Communist to push back. Of our socialist comrades, who at first shall be naturally distrustful of our cause, and to all those other abused people, we should be primarily loving and understanding, yet to those who seek to disrupt us for the benefits of their own abusive dynamics, we must force our agenda's presence and validity, even unto our own deaths. This barbarism may be antagonised, and I am of firm belief that we shall have to resort to violent anti-abuse, for even Christ himself had to resort to such ends. No matter what, it is our duty to defiantly turn the other cheek, and stand our ground against the abusive people of the world.

We do not seek to live by the sword. We refute the use of swords, and yet we are willing to use them if it is the only method that brings about their end. We will not murder, we will not attack, but we will defend, even as the bourgeois throw themselves upon our swords as we push them from standing upon our comrades, in their own need to break our will.

There are certain demands which should be asked for and met by all denominations, without the meeting of which the X-communist battle has not yet been won. These may include but are not limited to:

- The denomination supporting the Marxist ideas of economic equality and the end of slave labour.
- A rejection of all aspect of the unnecessary institutions which support conservative or bourgeois agendas, such as the division of the proletariat by sexuality.
- A rejection of religious superiority over other groups, but instead that the denomination must support the idea that all religions bare cultural significance. We understand that denominations would want to require a belief in Christ associated with those who wish to involve themselves within the denomination, however whilst X-communists may be required to be Christians for the sake of shared cultural constructs, they may in no way presume their superiority over other groups. All Christians should be communists, not all communists should be required to be Christian, though perhaps all those that wish to be a part of certain denominations should be, provided that this is not used to atomise or give apathy to the proletariat.
- The rejection of any rule in which a minority dictate to the majority, particularly within the Church.
- The support, critical or not, of socialist countries around the world today, and the denouncing of capitalist countries.
- Unconditional support for abused people-groups on a local, national and global level.
- The recognition of plausibility for the X-communist movement.
- The recognition for anti-abusive love being at the heart of the gospel.

If all of these demands are met, then the path will be clear for socialist reform at peace with the Church. This should be the aim of the Christian communist in every sense, the reconciliation of the Church with Marxist ideals on every

level. This is the means by which it should take place. This is the ends which should be pursued endlessly by all Christians, the releasing of the chains of all people. We must form a nucleus, a vanguard, a central core from which the revolution may spread until the Church is free from bourgeois intervention. If we die, and are crucified to this end, then others shall continue our dialectical struggle. We have nothing to lose but what Christ himself lost, we have nothing to lose but our chains in crucifixion.

The church must become the proletarian movement that it once was, rejecting the inequality that it has supported on so many levels. In the words of 'Les Miserable':

'Take my hand
I'll lead you to salvation
Take my love
For love is everlasting

And remember
The truth that once was spoken
To love another person
Is to see the face of God.

Do you hear the people sing
Lost in the valley of the night?
It is the music of a people
Who are climbing to the light.
For the wretched of the earth
There is a flame that never dies.
Even the darkest night will end
And the sun will rise.
We will live again in freedom
In the garden of the Lord.

We will walk behind the plough-share,
We will put away the sword.
The chain will be broken
And all will have their reward.
Will you join our escapade?
Who will be strong and stand with me?
Somewhere beyond the barricade
Is there a world you long to see?
Do you hear the people sing?
Say, do you hear the distant drums?
It is the future that they bring
When tomorrow comes!

Tomorrow comes.'

This is the call to all of the proletarians who love the Church to leave the bourgeois structures behind and join in our fight. We have nothing to lose but our chains. The spectre that has long haunted Europe and now haunts the world is joined by the resurrected body of Christ. May the proletariat unite and once more, fight for the freedom that Christ proclaimed. Workers of the world unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains.

[1] Philemon 1:2

[2] Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*

[3] Acts 5:5

[4] Matthew 19:24

[5] A Full study to such an end is not possible in this work and the reader is expected to read through the texts with the lens given within this piece in order to establish its truth.

[6] Louth, *Genesis 1-11*

[7] for centripetal and centrifugal universalism in more detail as a salvific force see Goldingay's text, *'Israel's Faith'*

[8] Matthew 22:34-46

[9] Wink, *Engaging the Powers*

Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God*

[10] For those liberals amongst the readers who struggle with this idea, for moral use of violence against

abusive nature, see World War 2.

[11] Matthew 19:24, One should ignore the misinterpretation that the ‘eye of the needle’ was a gate at the entry to Jerusalem, such understanding has no scholarly support.

[12] Che Guevara in a speech to the press

[13] Galatians 3:28

[14] Philemon 1:16

[15] The book of Revelations

[16] see Gorman, *Cruciformity*

[17] Upon which the Euro-centric understanding of hell is largely based

[18] 1 Corinthians 10:23-24

[19] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*

[20] The miss-quotations of Paul with regard to sexuality and gender are largely because of a complete lack of engagement with stoic philosophy, within which, penetration of any type was associated with complete dominance of the penetrator over the penetrated. This was such an extreme viewpoint that even if a man should engage in oral sex with a woman, but the woman’s genitals should penetrate his mouth, it may have been viewed as the woman dominating the man socially. As Paul was certainly aware of the popular stoic views, even quoting them himself, he would not wish to see two people dominate each other within the Christian community. The idea of penetration as a form of domination no longer exists in the same form as it did then in any way, and so is no longer relevant. Similar logic can be applied even more drastically, as despite an even more patriarchal society in the New Testament era, there were in fact women in leadership. Generally one should always be in favour of abused people-groups, for their rights are the most at risk.

[21] See Joan of Arc, Saladin, Burkina Faso etc

[22] Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, and Lenin, *What is to be done?*

[23] For the imperialist view of the British Labour Party see Clough, *Labour: A party fit for Imperialism*

[24] For full explanation of wage-slavery and related social constructs see, Marx, *Das Kapital*