

Preface 3

Ecclesiastes 12:12

- Institute for Christian Economics, 1983

Igor Shafarevich's **THE SOCIALIST PHENOMENON**

by David Chilton

In 1975, a blockbuster of a book was published in Paris entitled *From Under the Rubble* (available from Regnery/Gateway, \$6.95). Edited by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, it was a collection of essays by Solzhenitsyn and six of his dissident Russian colleagues—men who were, at the time of publication, still residing in the USSR, exposed to punishment by the Soviet state. Solzhenitsyn's co-editor, and the author of three of the essays, was the distinguished, world-renowned mathematician Igor Shafarevich. As a Moscow university professor, Shafarevich was risking—at the very least—his academic career by going into print with a Christian attack on Soviet civilization. And Shafarevich lost. As a result of the publication of those essays, this brilliant scientist was fired from his post; yet he immediately published *The Socialist Phenomenon*, an expansion and continuation of his *From Under the Rubble* essays.

The *Socialist Phenomenon* is, unquestionably, the most perceptive and significant work on the personal and cultural meaning of socialism ever written. Shafarevich has accomplished the awesome task of bringing together the diverse strands of numerous socialist movements and societies and weaving them into a recognizable, coherent definition—a definition that is able to include ancient Egyptians and medieval Anabaptists, the Incas of Peru and the Soviets of modern, enslaved Russia.

Shafarevich begins with a question: How can we explain the remarkable fact that socialism, which criticizes society for its injustice and inequality, results in even greater inequality? How is it that a system which agitates for freedom has so consistently produced slavery on a massive scale? Is this simply stupidity—or is there an underlying logic to socialism which, when uncovered, can provide us with a definition of socialism that is free of contradictions? Shafarevich argues that there is a cohesive and consistent worldview on which socialism is based—one which explains the seeming contradictions.

We should remember that for Shafarevich himself, his wife, and his two children—all still living in Moscow—the issue is far from being merely academic; and thus the book, though scholarly, is anything but detached in tone. It is at once both sober and urgent. And the book carries an unexpected urgency for us as well, for Shafarevich spends a large portion of his treatise dealing with the appalling, horrifying history of a movement that is much closer to American Christians than to Russians. Russian Christians, it may be hoped, have learned their lesson. (And that, indeed, is the question with which the book closes: Has the Russian experience been sufficient?)

Christian Socialism: The Early Years

No, it didn't begin with Ronald Sider. The attempt to justify socialist ideals and practices on the basis of Christian terminology has a long history, and has its origins in the antinomian gnostic heresies which flourished during the early church period. (The second-century Carpocratian heresy, which taught that justice required complete communism—including

communality of wives—claimed the apostate deacon Nicolas and the Nicolaitans as precursors of their movement.) But socialism as a broad-based, popular movement began during the Middle Ages with the complex of heresies which, eventually, came to be known collectively as **Anabaptism**, to which Shafarevich devotes a chapter of over 50 pages entitled "The Socialism of the Heresies." Despite the differences, he says, **the Anabaptists had one trait in common: the rejection of orthodox theology accompanied by "a fierce hatred for the Church itself."** (A crucially important work on the medieval socialist heresies is Norman Cohn's *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary messianism in medieval and Reformation Europe and its bearing on modern totalitarian movements* [Oxford, paperback, \$7.95].)

One of the first of these medieval movements was that of the **Cathars** ("the pure"), a loosely united group of Manichean sects (which had strong affinities with the Albigenses). All these sects possessed a dualistic worldview, holding that there was an "irreconcilable contradiction between the physical world, seen as the source of evil, and the spiritual world" (p. 19). This resulted, logically enough, in the denial of the Incarnation and the Resurrection of Christ, and in the rejection of the Old Testament. The power of the civil government was held to be a creation of an evil god; having children was demonic; and the ultimate goal of the the human race was **universal suicide**. The Church was hated and regarded as the Great Whore of Babylon; according to Cathar doctrine, the Church had fallen into irretrievable apostasy when it became legitimate in the time of Constantine (pp. 21, 29, 34; cf. the similar teaching of modern anabaptists. This is the thesis of, for example, Leonard Verduin's *The Anatomy of a Hybrid: A Study in Church-State Relationships* [Eerdmans, 1976]).

Because property was considered an aspect of an inherently sinful, material world, the Cathar leaders demanded that their followers forsake private ownership and practice communality of property. "In their sermons, the Cathars preached that a true Christian life was possible only on the condition that property was held in common" (p. 23). (It was, of course, the benevolent leaders who watched over the socialized belongings.) And, since the evil god of the Old Testament had forbidden adultery, promiscuity was encouraged, wives were shared, and faithful marriage was condemned as sinful: "Marital bonds are contrary to the laws of nature, since these laws demand that everything be held in common" (p. 24).

The Cathars were amazingly popular and successful. For two centuries they spread over Europe, electing numerous bishops and holding synods and councils. In Milan, the orthodox bishop reported that there were more heretics than faithful in his diocese. The Cathar movement, which was opposed by repeated missionary efforts (including the work of St. Bernard of Clairvaux), was not finally stamped out until the thirteenth century. But other socialist movements had already arisen to take its place.

The **Brethren of the Free Spirit** were charismatic antinomians whose doctrines were shaped, in part, by a pair of 12th-century heretics named **Joachim** and **Almaric**—men who have been

largely forgotten, but whose ideas keep cropping up in socialist theory. They divided history into three ages: the age of the Father (Slavery to the Law), the age of the Son (Filial Obedience), and the age of the Spirit (Freedom). In this last age, all property would be socialized, no one would have to work hard, and God's people, freed from all moral constraints, would be incapable of sin.

The Free Spirit had an ideological position on sexual promiscuity, and was able to participate in an "orgiastic mass": "What had been blasphemy for him in the past (and remained so for 'rude' folk) now became a sign of the end of one historical epoch and the beginning of another—the new Eon" (p. 27). And this freedom from moral restraints meant freedom from all restraints—the Free Spirits launching rebellions in which entire populations of cities, including women and children, were brutally massacred, and in which these Brethren, freed from biblical law, took special pride in raping nuns. Much of the revolutionary, violent character of the Free Spirits stemmed from a doctrine that is absolutely central to socialism: an egalitarian hatred for authority. For the socialist, all hierarchy must be destroyed, all implications of superiority in any way must be wiped out. And this easily grades, as we shall see further, into an obsession with erasing all differences between people, on the grounds that differences are inequalities, and inequalities are unjust and sinful. Thus there is a constant tendency, as socialism becomes more consistent, toward the socialization of wives and children, and the utter abolition of the family.

Growing out of the movement of the Free Spirits was another cult, the **Apostolic Brethren**. Their leader, a bastard named Dolcino, announced that the Church was irrevocably apostate and therefore doomed, commanded the communalizing of property and wives, issued apocalyptic prophecies of the End, and gathered thousands of followers into an armed camp. From their fort they began raiding throughout the region, establishing a pattern of plunder, destruction, and mass murder that would be followed by Christian Socialists for years to come (one of the latest examples being the evangelical Sandinistas in Nicaragua, whose vicious butcheries were made possible, in part, through the generous tithes and offerings donated by pacifistic Anabaptists in the United States). Dolcino's millennium lasted for three terrible years, until the orthodox Christians finally captured and executed him in 1404.

But within a dozen years another Christian heresy appeared, earnestly striving for peace and justice through socialism: the **Taborites**, who were more self-consciously bloodthirsty than even the Apostolic Brethren. The end of the world was coming in 1420, they decided, so they had to work fast: "It is necessary for each of the faithful to wash his hands in the blood of the enemies of Christ," declared their prophets. "All peasants who refuse to join the Taborites shall be destroyed along with their property" (p. 30). Everything was socialized (again, wives included), towns were razed to the ground, and men, women, and children were indiscriminately and gleefully slaughtered. They were regarded as almost completely inhuman in their taste for cruelty and torture (special atrocities were reserved for pregnant women). As with the previous experiments in socialist Christianity, the Taborites were remarkably successful: they shook central Europe to its foundations, and their impact was felt as far away as England and Spain. While the earth has endured long after 1420, in stubborn defiance of the inspired prophecies, the Taborites' world ended in a bloody battle in 1534. For almost a century thereafter, Christian Socialism left the Church in relative peace; then, in a Satanic, frantic attempt to destroy Christian civilization and the Protestant Reformation, it raised its head again, in even more murderous and devastating forms.

Christian Socialism During the Reformation

The term for revolutionary socialism during the Reformation was **Anabaptism**. The Anabaptists, while they claimed to be "true" Christians, denied virtually all the content of the faith. They rejected biblical law, rebelled against the Church's government, ministry, worship, and sacraments, and turned from orthodoxy to a multitude of heretical doctrines. And they were forthrightly socialist, using the old techniques of envy- and guilt-manipulation: "It is impossible to be Christian and wealthy at the same time," they proclaimed (p. 36). Thus they formed Chris-

tian communes, in which all possessions—yes, wives too—were shared among the Brethren, and from which they published their radical, egalitarian dogmas: "Therefore it ought to be that all authorities, secular and clerical, be deprived of their offices once and for all or be killed by the sword . . ." (p. 38).

The stories of two important Anabaptist leaders, **Thomas Muntzer** and **John of Leyden**, are crucial for an understanding of the nature of Christian Socialism, and a likely intimation of where it is headed in the future. Muntzer and Leyden are given extended treatment by Shafarevich in a twenty-page, small-print appendix to his chapter on the heresies. Muntzer was a vagrant preacher and organizer of conspiracies who had a habit of rebelling against authorities in the name of Christ. After many escapades and scrapes with the law, he finally established a revolutionary base in Muhlhausen, Germany, from whence he issued proclamations damning landowners, magistrates, and the Reformers ("I would like to smell your frying carcass," he wrote to Luther). Muntzer created an army of citizens, which enforced his doctrine of equality upon the countryside by robbing, burning and destroying the property of the rich. "Let your swords be ever warm with blood!" Muntzer exhorted them (p. 57). He was successful in rousing up all of central Germany in the bloody, so-called "Peasant Rebellion" (although several nobles were on his side) of 1525. The rebellion was eventually put down and Muntzer was executed; Luther said, "Whoever has seen Muntzer can say that he has seen the devil in the flesh, at his most ferocious" (p. 59). That was before Luther saw Jan Bokelson—better known to history as Johann (or John) of Leyden.

Bokelson began his career as the disciple of the Anabaptist leader Jan Matthijs, who took over the town of Munster in 1534. Shafarevich describes the scene:

Armed Anabaptists broke into houses and drove out everyone who was unwilling to accept second baptism. Winter was drawing to a close; it was a stormy day and wet snow was falling. An eyewitness account describes crowds of expelled citizens walking through the knee-deep snow. They had not been allowed even to take warm clothing with them, women carrying children in their arms, old men leaning on staffs. At the city gate they were robbed once more. (p. 61)

But those were the lucky ones. They, at least, escaped the reign of terror which followed, as Matthijs and Bokelson ordered the socialization of all property and ordained apostles of revolution to preach throughout Europe. The communist paradise of Munster attracted thousands of armed Anabaptists from Germany and Holland, and eventually a war broke out between the Munster rebels and the surrounding cities. Matthijs was killed in one of the early battles, and Bokelson took command. He established a dictatorship (in the name of equality, of course), and issued an order for what was by now a standard Anabaptist/socialist tradition: Polygamy (or, more technically, wife-sharing; as Friedrich Engels observed, "It is a curious fact that in every large revolutionary movement the question of 'free love' comes to the foreground"). No woman was allowed to be exempt, either—there was a law against being unmarried, which meant that every girl of "marriageable age" was forced to be passed around among the men. Every woman became fair game for an anabaptist's lust. All this led, understandably, to rapes, suicides, and severe punishments; mass executions took place almost every day. (On one notable occasion, Bokelson himself beheaded a virtuous woman who had refused his sexual advances. As he ceremoniously chopped her head off in the public square, a choir of his wives sang "Glory to God in the Highest.") This went on for a year and a half, until the city was captured at last by the orthodox forces, who put Bokelson and his lieutenants to death for their crimes—crimes committed in the name of love, equality, and spirituality.

Shafarevich observes another very curious fact about Muntzer and Bokelson: they became the first "in a long list of revolutionary leaders" to break completely under defeat. When the end came, both Muntzer and Bokelson ran for cover (Bokelson hid in a tower, which is mildly amusing in light of the fact that, just before the city fell, he had ordered all towers to be destroyed, on the grounds that they were unfairly "superior" to other

buildings; identical orders, incidentally, were issued—but not carried out—during the French Revolution). When they were caught, the socialist leaders confessed, informed on their confederates, and begged for their lives to be spared. “This strange and contradictory figure will reappear in subsequent historical epochs. He is a man of seemingly inexhaustible energy when successful, but a pitiful and terrified nonentity the moment his luck turns against him” (p. 79). Shafarevich explains: “An ideology that is hostile to human personality cannot serve as a point of support for it” (p. 269).

I have skipped over a great deal of what Shafarevich has to say on this subject, and he has by no means told the whole story. Many other groups, with stories just as horrifying, could be mentioned, along with the various cults that served as links between pagan religions and the Anabaptist heresies. The definitive history of the Anabaptist/socialist heresy has not yet been written, and it may be that the Church will never grow up until that history becomes widely known. For example, some Christian groups today regard movements such as the **Donatists**, the **Paulicians**, the **Bogomils**, the **Waldenses**, the **Petrobrusians**, and the **Albigenses** as “forerunners of the Reformation,” or some such nonsense. They were not. **They were heretical, socialist, revolutionary cults, outside the Christian faith.** In truth, the Reformation was resolutely opposed to socialism and Anabaptism, because the Reformers believed, taught and practiced the law of God. They believed it was wrong to murder, fornicate, and steal. The Anabaptists, freed from the law, came to regard these abominations as marks of sanctification. (See Willem Balke, *Calvin and the Anabaptist Radicals* [Eerdmans, 1981], and John Calvin, *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines* [Baker, 1982].) It is no wonder that the English Reformers specifically repudiated Anabaptist socialism in their official confession of faith, the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*. Article XXXVIII reads:

The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same; as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

While some scholars regard the Anabaptist movement as a product of the Reformation era, Shafarevich argues (correctly, I believe) that Anabaptism has been a unified heresy throughout the history of the Christian Church: “A striking picture emerges of a movement that lasted for fifteen centuries. . . . A precisely fixed set of religious ideas affecting the general attitude toward life was preserved virtually unchanged, often down to the smallest detail. . . . The heretical movement, thoroughly hostile to the surrounding world, flares up from time to time with an all-consuming blaze of hatred” (pp. 72f.).

One obvious objection to all this, of course, would be that the Anabaptist tradition is one of pacifism, not violence; thus it is unfair, and slanderous, to lump the peaceful Anabaptists together with these bloodthirsty revolutionaries. There’s only one problem with that argument: the facts. For the bloodthirsty revolutionaries we have been discussing **were** pacifists! Some groups even had theological positions against the killing of animals—yet they would suddenly explode into some of the most violent orgies of destruction and mass murder known in history. **“The two extremes [pacifism and violence] of the heretical movement were closely interwoven; they cannot be clearly distinguished. At times, in fact, a sect switched from one extreme to the other overnight”** (p. 73). Shafarevich cites numerous examples of this phenomenon, and concludes: **“Apparently it was possible for a sect to exist in two states, ‘militant’ and ‘peaceful,’ and the transition from one state to the other could happen suddenly, and for all practical purposes instantaneously”** (p. 74; cf. pp. 22, 35, 99).

Anabaptism/socialism was not a movement for reform or improvement; rather, it called for utter destruction of the Church, and of the earth itself. In its fervor to establish total equality, it rejected all individuality and hierarchy, ultimately declaring that man was equal to God. Summarizing the Anabaptist doctrines, Shafarevich quotes J. Dollinger:

Each heretical doctrine that appeared in the Middle Ages bore, in open or concealed form, a revolutionary character;

in other words, had it come to power, it would have been obliged to destroy the existing state structure and implement a political and social revolution. The gnostic sects, Cathars and Albigenses, who provoked the severe and implacable medieval laws against heresies by their activities, and with whom a bloody struggle was carried on, were socialist and communist. They attacked marriage, the family and property. Had they been victorious, the result would have been a traumatic social dislocation and a relapse into barbarism. (p. 77)

But they were not victorious. They failed. Socialism parading as radical Christianity was shown to be a pious-sounding fraud. Orthodoxy had demonstrated that **there can never be any such thing as “Christian Socialism,” because socialism is antichrist.** And so the tactics changed. Socialism went secular, and it went underground as well, dropping the theological approach and turning to philosophy instead. Interestingly, William Letwin points out that this also took place, during the same period, with the free-market economists, who “forcefully suspended all judgments of theology, morality, and justice” and “were willing to consider the economy as nothing more than an intricate mechanism, refraining for the while from asking whether the mechanism worked for good or evil” (*The Origins of Scientific Economics*, ch. 6).

It is striking that the two great opponents of that era—Reformed orthodoxy and the Anabaptist heresy—resurfaced in our age at the same time. In 1973, Ronald Sider and his Anabaptist/socialist colleagues (who, at this writing, are still pacifists) issued the *Chicago Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern*, which brought a forthright demand for Christian socialism to the attention of Christians across the country. In the very same year, two Reformed works were published which will mean the eventual defeat of Christian socialism in our day as well: R. J. Rushdoony’s *Institutes of Biblical Law* and Gary North’s *Introduction to Christian Economics*. Just as (according to tradition) Pelagius and Augustine were born on the same day, so God again has brought the poison and its antidote into the world simultaneously.

Philosophical Socialism

The literature of socialism acquired a purely secular and rationalistic character; new means of popularization were devised: works on this theme now frequently appear under the guise of voyages to unknown lands, interlarded with frivolous episodes. By the same token, the audience to whom the message is addressed is also different. It is no longer pitched to peasants or craftsmen but to the well-read and educated public. Thus socialism renounces for a time a direct influence on the broad masses. **It is as if after failing in its direct assault on Christian civilization, the movement launches an evasive maneuver which lasts for several centuries.** It is only at the very end of the eighteenth century that socialism once again comes out into the street, and we meet with a fresh attempt to create a popular movement based on its ideology. (p. 81)

One of the more outstanding examples of the new form of socialist literature was Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516). More saw the source of life’s problems in the fact that money and property existed; he felt that everything would work out nicely if these evils were simply abolished. So he constructed a fictitious society, Utopia, as the perfect socialist state. It is remarkably accurate in its outline. All of life is regulated: clothing is uniform, food is rationed, the government resettles whole populations at will; private property, and privacy itself, have been abolished. There are no material needs, no need for any citizen to do heavy work, and everyone is completely, absolutely equal—except for the elite class, who don’t work at all. So who does all the hard labor? It turns out that even in this socialist paradise of complete equality, **the real economic basis for the whole society is nothing other than the labor of slaves.** And if the slaves don’t like the work, the saintly Man for All Seasons has the solution: **“They are slaughtered like wild beasts”** (p. 86).

More’s work was followed for the next few centuries by other utopian socialist writers, who refined More’s basic outline in terms of a more consistent, thoroughly paganized, socialist vision. In general, no practical steps were suggested for

alleviating the condition of the poor; the image of the suffering poor was simply dredged up in order to incite hatred and envy against the rich. The philosophers were explicit in their insistence upon complete standardization: increasingly, **equality** meant **identity**. They dreamed of the "inevitable" approach of the socialist ideal, of total equality under a total State, when language would become static and unchanging, reading (and eventually thinking) would atrophy, all days would be alike, and even facial appearances would be identical.

Inspired by all this literary ferment—and by the brief incarnation of socialist ideals during the French Revolution and the Reign of Terror—secret societies and conspiracies came into being, of which Shafarevich makes a very important observation:

At the moment of their inception, socialist movements often strike one by their helplessness, their isolation from reality, their naively adventurist character and their comic, "Gogolian" features (as Berdyaev put it). One gets the impression that these hopeless failures haven't a chance of success, and that in fact they do everything in their power to compromise the ideas they are proclaiming. However, they are merely biding their time. At some point, almost unexpectedly, these ideas find a broad popular reception, and become the forces that determine the course of history, while the leaders of these movements come to rule the destiny of nations. (p. 129)

State Socialism

Shafarevich turns at this point to a discussion of the nature of socialism when it gains control of an entire nation, beginning with what is probably the best example: the Inca civilization of Peru, in which an almost total socialism was actually achieved (the Inca state would be cited as the model for later experiments, including the Soviet Union). One conscious imitator of the Incas was the Jesuit state in Paraguay during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which ruthlessly enslaved hundreds of thousands of Indians, attempted to govern all of life, absolutely destroyed any individual initiative on the part of its "citizens," and created a stupendously unprofitable economy. Predictably, the Jesuit state was a great hit with philosophers such as Voltaire, who pronounced it "a triumph of humanity" (p. 151).

Shafarevich goes on to deal with socialism as it was expressed in the ancient states of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and ancient China, which saw it as the duty of the state to destroy initiative, make business unprofitable, eliminate all private interests, and control all the natural resources. Mao Tse-tung was fascinated by one ancient ruler in particular, but asserted that "we are better. . . . He buried alive 460 people, and we, 46,000—one hundred times more. . . . we have still done little in this respect—much more can be done" (p. 185).

One of the most gripping sections of the book is Shafarevich's account of the embodiment of the socialist ideal in the history of Russia, particularly during the period of so-called "War Communism" (1918-21), when Lenin sought to bring Soviet practice into line with socialist theory as consistently and radically as possible. All industries were socialized, all agricultural products were confiscated by the state for redistribution, and the stated goal of the leaders was to do away with money altogether. The Soviets attempted to turn the entire nation into a "labor army": everyone was drafted into forced labor. Under capitalism this had been called **slavery**; under communism it was officially announced as **progressive**, and arguments were advanced to the effect that forced labor had been unproductive only under capitalism; now, in the Third Age, slavery was freedom.

The Soviets also did their best to abolish the family, since it was a "dangerous institution" opposed to solidarity. Children were taken from the parents as soon as possible to produce "collective man"; divorce was liberalized; and there were plans to institute controlled breeding "for the improvement of the race." In the name of equality, the planners began moves to

abolish art and literature, along with every aspect of individuality in the human personality. And, finally, the state made a systematic attempt to destroy the Church. One laughable but quite seriously intended aspect of this took place in several courts, when God was actually put on trial and sentenced to death. The practical results of this consistent communism were unprecedented famine and the devastation of Russian society.

A very important and distinctive phenomenon of the socialist state, which has no parallel in free societies, is **the party**, which generally occupies the place of Supreme Deity in the socialist pantheon. The party "not only demands that its members subordinate *all* aspects of their lives to it, but also develops in them an outlook according to which life outside the party seems in general *unthinkable*." Trotsky said in his final speech: "It is impossible to be right against the party . . . for history has created no other road for the realization of what is right." This explains the "confessions" of party members at the show trials of the 1930s, and the loyalty of party members who, even in concentration camps, were still devoted to Stalin. As one communist declared:

We are a party of men who make the impossible possible. Steeped in the idea of violence, we direct it against ourselves, and if the party demands it and if it is necessary and important for the party, we can by an act of will put out of our heads in twenty-four hours ideas that we have cherished for years. . . . The party may be absolutely mistaken, it is said, it might call black something that is clearly and indisputably white. To all those who try to foist this example on me, I say: *Yes, I shall consider black something that I felt and considered to be white, since outside the party, outside accord with it, there is no life for me.* (see pp. 216ff.)

Outside the Church, you see, there is no salvation.

Socialism: Theophobic Death-Wish

One of the great values of Shafarevich's treatment is that, amid all the variances of socialism from culture to culture, a consistent picture emerges of the main contours and basic principles of socialism. Whether we look at the theories of Plato or those of the Anabaptists; whether we consider the practices of the ancient Babylonians or the modern Soviets; the same ideas, even in seemingly unimportant details, are present (for example, one of the threads running throughout this book is the recurring socialist condemnation of private rooms, of doors and walls; see pp. 198f.). Socialism is not—contrary to Marxian dogma—a "later phase" in human history. The basic, heretical principles have been championed for ages: the abolition of authority, of property, of the family, and of Christianity. On this last point, Shafarevich says:

The term "atheism" is inappropriate for the description of people in the grip of socialist doctrines. It would be more correct to speak here not of "atheists" but of "God-haters," not of "atheism" but of "theophobia." (p. 235)

And this leads to what Shafarevich powerfully argues is the essence of socialism: the yearning for death and destruction. The closing sections of his book are filled with some of the most startling documentations of socialist hatred for mankind I have ever seen. Again and again, socialists have made it clear that they desire nothing less than the death of mankind. This, Shafarevich says, is **the basic allure of socialism**; this is the secret of its seductive power and its driving force; it is nothing less than a **deeply emotional, ecstatic urge toward self-destruction**. The prospect of the utter annihilation of oneself and of mankind is precisely the attraction of socialism, and possesses a subliminal motivating power far surpassing any rational economic argument. For socialism is the final religion of the Theophobians, the God-haters; and God has told us of the inescapable psychological condition of those who deny Him: **He that sinneth against Me wrongeth his own soul; all they that hate Me love death.** (Proverbs 8:36)

PREFACE is published monthly by the Institute for Christian Economics, a non-profit, tax-exempt educational organization. A free six month subscription is sent to those who ask to be put on the mailing list. **Subscriptions:** P.O. Box 8000, Tyler, TX 75711. All donations are fully tax-deductible; checks should be made out to **Institute for Christian Economics**.