

one piece
of nge ne
nd. bet
in to
behā
gely

RTSF

MARX AND JESUS

St. in s
ma
middy
ht

IN A POST-COMMUNIST WORLD

10 v
13 How
the

TOV

d

DAVID SMITH

RTSF Monographs

MARX AND JESUS IN A POST-COMMUNIST WORLD

By

David Smith

© David Smith

ISBN 1 870137 14 0

Published by:

Religious and Theological Studies Fellowship
38 De Montfort Street
Leicester
LE1 7GP

First published December 1992

RTSF publishes a series of booklets on a wide range of theological and religious studies topics. For a free catalogue and order form write to the above address.

MARX AND JESUS IN A POST-COMMUNIST WORLD

Foreword

Introduction

Section 1: Karl Marx and Religion

Marx's family and upbringing

The influence of Ludwig Feuerbach

Religion as opium

Religion as ideology

The future of religion

Section 2: Christian Responses to Marxism

A Southern response to Marxism

A Northern response to Marxism

Section 3: Marx and Jesus in a Post-Communist World

Talking about God

The new humanity

Doxology

Footnotes

FOREWORD

There are some who would write off both Jesus and Marx as having little, if any, relevance to the contemporary world. There are others, and the author of this book is one of them, who would argue that the collapse of institutional Marxism in the former Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe allows Marx, and the challenge which he poses to comfortable Christian thinking, to be heard free from distortion. (There are some of us, of course, who believe that a similar freeing of Jesus from many of the established institutions of the Christian religion would have a similar liberating effect on his message!). In this beautifully written, but hard hitting essay David Smith challenges Christians to listen again to the uncomfortable words of both Jesus and Marx and to face up to the social and political challenge which they pose. Marx, of course, is no substitute for the Gospel, and the message of Jesus, as the author recognises, sees our life here and now in the ultimate context of Eternity. However, the gospel does contain a social imperative and readers of this book will be made uncomfortably aware of the necessity for Christian criticism of much of the politics and economics of today, particularly (but by no means exclusively) with regard to the countries of the southern hemisphere. I hope this book will be widely read. It has much to say that should be heard far beyond the Christian readership for which it is primarily intended. The author's exposition of what Marx actually said about religion is masterly.

James Thrower

Aberdeen University.

INTRODUCTION .

MARXISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Recent events in Eastern Europe might seem to make a study such as this an exercise in futility. As the peoples which made up the Communist bloc renounce the ideology which has controlled their societies for the best part of a century and set about establishing political pluralism and freemarket economies, the time when Christians needed to grapple with the thought of Karl Marx may seem to be past.

The collapse of a state-Communism in Eastern Europe and its discrediting in China surely does mark a significant turning point in modern history. However, a Christian analysis of these watersheds cannot merely echo the triumphalist slogans of Western commentators who appear to believe that the demise of Marxist-Leninism has revealed a global market-economy to be the goal of the historical process. Such a view should be no more acceptable to Christians than was the similar claim made by Marxists in relation to socialism.

In some ways the challenge facing Christians in a post-Communist era is more daunting than that confronted during the cold war. Then it was possible to believe that the line between right and wrong could actually be drawn across a map of Europe. Now, with that line fast fading, Christians can no longer avoid the question as to what the confession of the Lordship of Jesus actually means in a world dominated by market capitalism. Ironically, the removal of the iron curtain creates a context in which European Christians can and should listen afresh to the voice of Karl Marx. As they reflect upon their socio-political responsibility in relation to the so-called 'New World Order', believers can learn from Marx's critique of religion and, in the words of an Evangelical apologist, can purge their faith of accretions that 'are alien to the essence of the biblical message and only serve our social class interests'.¹

SECTION 1

KARL MARX AND RELIGION

In 1841, at the age of 23, Marx identified himself with the confession of Prometheus, 'I hate the pack of gods!'. Writing in the introduction of his doctoral thesis, he declared that this statement expressed his opposition to 'all heavenly and earthly gods who do not acknowledge human self-consciousness as the highest divinity'.² Marx's repudiation of theism is here paralleled by an equally fervent affirmation of humanism. Indeed, the rejection of God is merely the prelude to the deification of man, the 'highest divinity'. Although the denial of the existence of a transcendent God is fundamental to Marx's thought, he has no interest in atheism as a creed and his own belief is best described by the term *anthropotheism*.

What were the influences at work on the young Karl Marx which led him to believe that a radical rejection of theism was the indispensable condition for the attainment of human dignity and freedom?

Marx's family and upbringing

Born in Trier in 1818, Karl Marx grew up when, amid the aftermath of the French Revolution, reactionary social forces were battering down the hatches to prevent further challenges to the status quo. Throughout Europe a surge of traditional religion occurred among the middle and upper classes. The Holy Alliance devised by Metternich attempted to suppress the political freedoms won after 1789 while, across the Channel in England, the growth of Evangelical Christianity went hand-in-hand with the defence of a hierarchical social system. In the post-Revolutionary era, Evangelical religion was often propagated in a form which made it 'an attractive and exemplary model for the concurrence of piety and social position'.³ Religion was used to sanctify the traditional structures of society and to curb demands from the oppressed and disenfranchised masses for social reform. This context must be remembered in all that follows since Marx's critique of religion was prompted by the concrete

realities of his age - the alliance between Christendom and reactionary politics and the worship of Mammon by those who publicly confessed the name of Christ.

Karl Marx's father had undergone a formal conversion from Judaism to Christianity as the price of acceptance in a society dominated by state-Protestantism. It is hard to believe that the young and impressionable Marx was unaffected by this event and some have claimed that his later writings reveal traces of lingering resentment at the servility and humiliation inflicted upon his family. For example, when Marx describes the social principles of Christianity as preaching 'cowardice, self-contempt, abasement, submissiveness and humbleness' and dismisses them as 'sneaking and hypercritical', was he recalling the anguish resulting from his father's forced conversion? Whatever the answer to this question may be, Marx appears to have retained at least a formal belief in God by the time he began his studies at the University of Berlin.

The Influence of Ludwig Feuerbach

In 1841 a book appeared which was to have an enormous influence on the circle of young students to which Marx belonged. It bore the title *The Essence of Christianity*. Over forty years later Frederick Engels, Marx's lifelong friend and collaborator, recalled the impact of Feuerbach's famous work in these words,

With one blow it pulverised the contradictions, in that without circumlocutions it placed materialism on the throne again. Nothing exists outside nature and man, and the higher beings our religious fantasies have created are only the fantastic reflection of our own essence ... One must have experienced the liberating effect of this book to get an idea of it. Enthusiasm was general: we all at once become Feuerbachians.⁴

The 'conversion' implied by Engels' last sentence involved turning away from the watered down theism to be found in the philosophy of Hegel. Marx and Engels owed a great deal to Hegel's philosophy since it had undermined the traditional method of dogmatic theology. Hegel taught

his students that truth was not to be found in fixed, unchangeable dogmas. Rather it emerged over time as, in a process of conflict and repeated reformulations, new and broader vistas of human understanding are attained. The same 'dialectical method' was applied to the understanding of human history and social development with the result that all previous social systems were regarded as provisional stages in the advance toward the higher and, eventually, the ultimate goal of the historical process. Engels summed up Hegel's philosophy when he said that for it, 'nothing is final, absolute, sacred'.⁵

However, while Hegel repudiated the method of traditional theology, he attempted to retain theistic belief by recasting it in categories familiar to the modern mind. God, he suggested, was present within and behind the entire historical process; he had externalised himself within the world and suffered alienation in Christ. Hegel's God is not a transcendent ruler, uninvolved and untouched by the conflicts and anguish of history. On the contrary, the 'world-spirit' struggles through the dialectical process to achieve the ultimate synthesis and complete reconciliation. For Hegel the world 'is God in his development'; God is everywhere present and 'leads the world as nature and finally as spirit through all stages up to himself and to his infinity and divinity'.⁶

While Marx retained the Hegelian method and took up and adapted a number of key concepts from Hegel's philosophy (including the notion of 'alienation'), he was not disposed to accept the view that the Prussian state, operating censorship in the interests of political conservatism and sanctified by Protestant Christianity, was an advanced expression of a free society. Hegel's grand vision of the historical process needed to be rescued from the Prussian bog in which it had become trapped; theory must be translated into practice. This is the background to the famous statement, 'The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it'.⁷

It is at this point that Feuerbach's significance can be appreciated. He pointed out the way by which Hegel's fundamental philosophy of history could be retained while being divorced from his theology. Feuerbach reversed Hegel's teaching by insisting that the human condition could not

be understood by positing a God alienated within history, but by recognising man's alienation from himself as a result of his projection of imaginary divine beings within the cosmos. God, even in his Hegelian form, had no objective existence; he was merely a projection of man's essence and true being. Feuerbach in his *The Essence of Christianity* argued that consciousness of God is in truth self-consciousness. 'God is the manifested inward nature, the expressed self of a man - religion the solemn unveiling of a man's hidden treasures, the revelation of his intimate thoughts, the open confession of his love-secrets'.⁸ Thus, the central biblical affirmation that 'God is love' is, in Feuerbach's hands, a statement concerning human nature. Frustrated in a selfish, loveless, greedy world, man projects himself, his own ideal being, into the heavens and is thus doomed to an alienated existence. God, says Feuerbach, is in reality 'human nature purified, freed from the limits of the individual man ... contemplated and revered as another, distinct being'.⁹

Engels, as we have seen, spoke of the 'liberating effect' of Feuerbach's theory of religion. In fact Feuerbach went so far as to claim that his understanding of religion was the 'necessary turning point of history'. Using a term later taken up by Freud, he claimed to have destroyed the *illusion* of religion and opened the way for 'the unclouded light of reason' to stream in upon humanity. Feuerbach's approach is essentially rationalist; he believes that the battle to free man from his infantile delusions is a simple matter of logic, reason, ideas. Once people become aware of the spurious nature of religion their alienation from their true selves will be overcome and the liberation of humanity will occur. Marx echoes Feuerbach in this passage written in 1844:

The criticism of religion disillusioned man to make him think and act and shape his reality like a man who has been disillusioned and has come to reason, so that he will revolve around himself and therefore around his true sun. Religion is only the illusory sun which revolves around man as long as he does not revolve around himself.¹⁰

Religion as opium

Famous texts have a way of being misunderstood and Marx's well known statement that religion 'is the *opium* of the people' is no exception. In context it is clear that Marx here develops a far more sensitive and nuanced awareness of the root and function of religious faith than Feuerbach. While he continued to take for granted the theory that religion was an entirely human product involving the projection of man's essence into the cosmos, Marx was *not* satisfied with Feuerbach's explanation of this phenomenon, nor with his rationalist remedy. Against Feuerbach, Marx recognised the social dimensions of religion: 'Feuerbach does not see that the 'religious sentiment' is itself a *social product*, and that the abstract individual whom he analyses belongs in reality to a particular form of society'.¹¹ This being so, it is simply not the case that religion can be destroyed by reason: no programme of re-education will overcome religious belief in the absence of the revolutionary change in society which alone will remove the cause of human alienation and misery.

Marx also disagreed with his friend Bruno Bauer who believed that the dismantling of the Christian state would cut the roots of faith and lead to the withering of religion (a view, incidentally, shared by some Christians who used the same argument to defend an established Church). Marx pointed to the example of the United States where religion not only survived the separation of Church and State, but actually appeared to thrive in this situation. Political emancipation represented real progress, but so long as the fundamental structures of economic and social life remained unchanged, men would continue to experience alienation and so would *need* the comforts offered by religious faith. Religion, therefore, is the symptom of a profound disorder in society.¹²

Karl Marx recognised that for deprived and oppressed humanity, religion is both an inevitable and a *necessary* form of consolation. Again, the concrete situation needs to be recalled. The young Marx encountered the devastating consequences of industrialization and urbanization in the slums of Paris and his friend Engels described similar scenes in Manchester. Given the alienation experienced by people in capitalist society, it was no surprise to Marx that they should seek consolation in

religion:

Religious distress is at the same time the *expression* of real distress and also the *protest* against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the *opium* of the people.¹³

Religion as Ideology

While a sympathetic note can be detected in Marx's description of the function of religion among the poor and oppressed, his tone is markedly different when he turns to consider its role in the hands of the rich and privileged. Whereas it provides the former with necessary (but false) consolation, in the hands of the latter religion is an instrument of control and manipulation. In a society rent by class divisions and structured in the interests of the powerful, religion sanctifies the established order by suggesting that a hierarchical social system is ordained by divine authority.

What Marx meant by the ideological function of religion can be illustrated in the case of the great Scottish Evangelical, Thomas Chalmers. Addressing working class parishioners, Chalmers defended the social status quo on the grounds that 'The structure of human society admits no other arrangement'. To people struggling to survive in the slums of Glasgow, he lavished praise on a system in which the monarchy was 'borne up by a splendid aristocracy, and a gradation of ranks shelving downwards to the basement of society'.¹⁴

At a number of points Marx reveals an astute awareness of the distance between the ethical demands of discipleship in the New Testament and Christianity as a historical religion. He accuses the Protestants of his time of worshipping 'golden Mammon' and chides them on their failure to live according to the precepts of the gospel: 'If you have been struck on one cheek, do you turn the other also, or do you rather start an action for assault? But the gospel forbids it... Are not most of your court cases and most of your civil laws concerned with property? But you have been told that your treasure is not of this world'.¹⁵ Similarly, Marx is able to point

out that the union of the Throne and Altar maintained by Protestant states was a monstrous mismatch from the perspective of the teaching of Jesus. How is it, Marx asks, that primitive Christianity separated church and state yet modern Protestantism finds it necessary to rely upon the support of the police in order to maintain its authority?¹⁶ At this point Marx's critique of religion has such a prophetic ring that Christians can avoid his challenge only if they are prepared to evade the authority of the Bible itself.

The future of religion

For Marx, the criticism of religion 'is the premise of all criticism'.¹⁷ However, having accepted the theory that religious worldviews arise from the projections, fantasies and longings of people alienated within a perverted and unjust form of society, Marx has little further interest in the subject. The reason for this is clear: to mount a sustained attack upon religion would be merely to treat symptoms while leaving the social sickness which produced them untouched. Religion will not be destroyed by logical arguments and crude anti-Christian propoganda is likely to be counter-productive. On the basis of Marx's own understanding of religion, the physical harassment of believers practised by Communist states during the twentieth century must be judged a grotesque absurdity. Marx believed that religion would disappear only when revolutionary social change destroyed the soil on which it depends for its existence. It is class-based, capitalist society which sustains religion and thus, "The struggle against religion is indirectly a fight against *the world* of which religion is the spiritual *aroma*."¹⁸

Consequently, the main project of Marx's life was socio-political. Driven by a profound humanistic concern, he developed a comprehensive analysis and critique of a social system which he regarded as founded upon error and injustice and responsible for untold human misery. Raymond Aron describes Marx's thought as 'an interpretation of the contradictory or antagonistic character of capitalist society'.¹⁹ Marx has no doubt that religion will persist so long as the present dehumanizing social system remains in place. Religious criticism is the premise and

prelude to socio-political analysis and radical change:

The criticism of religion ends with the teaching that *man is the highest being for man*, hence with the *categorical imperative to overthrow all relations* in which man is a debased, enslaved, forsaken, despicable being, relations which cannot be better described than by the exclamation of a Frenchman when it was planned to introduce a tax on dogs: Poor dogs! They want to treat you like human beings!²⁰

At this point it is necessary to refer again to the concrete realities which form the context of Marx's project. Liberal economists like Adam Smith argued that capitalism operated according to economic laws which guaranteed the ultimate good of all people. While individuals sought their own advancement and prosperity, an 'invisible hand' so ordered this quest that its end product would be to the good of all. In effect, the theory justified personal greed and granted *laissez faire* economics the status of a scientific law on a level with Newton's discoveries in the realm of physics. Moreover, leading theologians accepted the theory uncritically, assimilating Adam Smith's 'invisible hand' to the Christian doctrine of divine providence. Thomas Chalmers, for example, claimed that if men were 'released from the chain of their own self-interest' they would be like 'dogs of rapine let loose'. Selfishness, he declared, 'is the grand principle on which the brotherhood of the human race is made to hang together'.²¹

Marx would have none of this. The slums of London, Glasgow and Manchester made a mockery of the claim that capitalism led to universal happiness. On the contrary, an economic system which exalted the individual, sanctified personal greed and set man against man resulted in the dehumanisation of *both* the worker and the capitalist. Marx produced a profound and searching description of the diabolical power of money and showed how, once economic activity was divorced from moral and ethical norms, the category of 'having' increasingly eclipsed the category of 'being'.

Given the radical nature of his analysis, Marx can accept no half measures, no mere amelioration of existing conditions. There must be revolutionary change resulting in the abolition of both the division of labour and private

property. Only then will human relations become reasonable and, since the very grounds of religious fantasy and projection will have been destroyed, belief in beings which transcend man will wither away.

There is some evidence that, toward the end of his life, Marx acknowledged the possibility of a religious reality which could *not* be explained in purely sociological terms. In a remarkable letter to his friend Max Ruge he wrote,

When all the political foundations of religion are wiped out... then normally religious faith, the Christian faith would have to disappear. But it is not out of the question that the Christian faith will survive anyhow. This would mean that there is a religious reality that does not depend upon the sociological and the institutional; and under these conditions, we would have to heed this reality, which is not in the category of traditional religion.²²

Despite this extraordinary statement, Marx's basic theory of the origin and function of religion leads to the conclusion that religious belief will have no place in the 'new world' to come. He describes the secular heaven which lay beyond the cataclysmic day of revolutionary judgement in vague and utopian language. The new society would be one in which specialization ceased to exist and people would be free to become accomplished in whatever field they chose. Communist Man would have liberty to fish in the morning, go to the factory in the afternoon, and read Plato in the evening. Christians, who also struggle to describe a realm which 'eye hath not seen', can understand Marx's lack of specific detail here. The great contrast between their vision and his is, of course, that while they anticipate finally seeing 'the face of God', Marx's new world is one in which man has at last come to 'revolve around himself'.

SECTION II

CHRISTIAN RESPONSES TO MARXISM

Christian responses to Marxism have been influenced by a variety of circumstances, of which two are especially important. First, the socio-economic context in which churches find themselves is a key factor. While rich Christians have often focussed on Marx's atheism and ignored his ethical challenge, those belonging to the 'churches of the poor' frequently testify that the Marxist analysis illuminates the social context within which they must live and bear witness to Christ. This point is extremely important at a time when the growing edge of Christianity is located in the southern hemisphere where the burdens of hunger, poverty and seemingly inescapable debt define the context of the Christian mission.

Second, the relationship of Marxism to political power helps to explain the varied and conflicting responses to this philosophy on the part of Christians. Marx's insights may be received positively by Christians in Bombay, Sao Paulo or, for that matter, Liverpool. By contrast, believers in Prague, Moscow and Shanghai view them from a quite different perspective. Thus, the Romanian Baptist, Joseph Ton, who once argued that the task of Christians within Communist society was to live such beautiful and selfless lives that they would convince Marxists of the gospel's power to produce 'the new man which socialism seeks and desires', now describes Marxism as 'The Faded Dream'. Having suffered for his faith under a repressive regime which used Marx's name to legitimate its actions, Ton concludes that Marxism as a system is responsible for 'centralised dictatorship, the police surveillance and oppression of the people... and the total enslavement of the individual to the interests of the State'.²³ A similar reaction can be found throughout Eastern Europe, not least among Christians in post-Communist Russia.

Of course, there are no uniform responses to Marxism among Christians in any part of the globe. One can find believers in the poorest countries

of Africa, Asia and Latin America who are fervently opposed to Karl Marx and all his works, while in the rich northern hemisphere numerous attempts have been made to construct a synthesis between Marx and Christ. However, we can speak in general terms of 'Southern' and 'Northern' responses. The first term is used here to denote theologians who, working from the perspective of the poor and oppressed in the Two Thirds World, advocate a critical appropriation of Marxism, while 'Northern' refers to current attitudes toward Marxism in European and North American theology.

A Southern response to Marxism

As the East-West division breaks down, the North-South split grows in significance. In this situation the works of Karl Marx continue to be read and appropriated by Christians who perceive their peoples to be the victims of an unjust and oppressive global economic system. The positive assessment of Marxism by liberation theologians in Latin America is well known and is reflected in titles such as *Marx and the Bible - A Critique of the Philosophy of Oppression*²⁴ and *Christians and Marxists - The Mutual Challenge to Revolution*.²⁵ However, the theme of human liberation is not confined to South America but echoes as a constant theological refrain throughout Africa and Asia. Thus, a Christian press in India can publish an *Introduction to Marxism* with the passionate conviction that Marx's analysis of capitalism and his critique of bourgeois religion are profoundly relevant for those working among the churches of the poor. Confronting the realities of the grinding poverty of millions of people on the Indian sub-continent and the abundance and sheer wastefulness of their Christian brothers in the West, these social activists welcome Marx's observation that capitalist society transforms religion into a private, individualistic affair, lacking either the will or the power to challenge the pervasive rule of Mammon. In such a context, Marxism is perceived as having enormous explanatory power and is welcomed, more or less critically, as an invaluable instrument in the fight against evil and injustice.²⁶

In order that we may listen carefully to the 'Southern' Christian response to Marx, I will outline the work of a representative figure from South

America, Jose Miguez Bonino.²⁷ He describes three presuppositions as undergirding all his work. First, he writes 'from the point of view of a person who confesses Jesus Christ as his Lord and Saviour'; second, as a Latin American Christian he is convinced of the necessity of revolutionary action aimed at 'changing the basic economic, political, social and cultural structures and conditions of life'; and third, he sees Marxist analysis as 'indispensable' for such change. Bonino refers to the 'unsubstitutable relevance of Marxism' and insists that, given the existing global structures of oppression and domination, Christian love can have significance in the modern world only as it is expressed through commitment to revolutionary change.

As a Christian theologian, Bonino justifies his critical appropriation of Marxism, notwithstanding its radical critique of religion, on the following grounds. First, he points out that *the perception of religion on the part of Marxists is not fixed and unchanging, but fluid and open to revision*. While it is true that Marx's negative evaluation of religion was expressed in general and absolute terms, this fact is related to the particular forms of religion he encountered in nineteenth century Europe. Had Marx experienced religion as a dynamic force leading to social transformation and human liberation, his response would have been other than it was. Indeed, with the passing of time it has become evident that religion can take quite different forms from the insipid culture-Protestantism known to Marx and Engels. Moreover, it is now clear that the socialist 'new man' will not emerge, or will soon fall back under the malign influences of self-centredness and individualism, in a world lacking a transcendent reference point. Consequently, modern Marxists speak with growing reserve about the effectiveness of a socio-political programme which bypasses the question of God and they use softer and more sympathetic tones when the subject of religion comes up for discussion. Bonino refers to the dialogue between Christians and Marxists in Europe²⁸ and quotes Fidel Castro's comment that 'theologians are becoming communists and communists are becoming theologians'.

A remarkable example of changed Marxist perceptions on religion is provided by Milan Machovec. In his *A Marxist Looks At Jesus* this

Czechoslovak Communist philosopher wrote,

One cannot say that the less someone is a Marxist, the more he will be inclined towards Christianity. The contrary is true. The more deeply and rigorously a Marxist understands himself and the vastness of the tasks which lie ahead and therefore the more he is a Marxist, the more will he be able to learn from the Judaeo-Christian tradition and to welcome Christians as potential allies and brothers.²⁹

Bonino's second point in justification of a Christian appropriation of Marxism relates to *the obvious parallels between Marx's critique of religion and the denunciations of idolatry to be found throughout the Bible*. A Christian well-versed in the prophets of Israel, or in the teaching of Christ and his apostles, will hardly be surprised or offended by the observation that religion can become a substitute for justice, an attempt to mask human oppression before man and God. Marx's awareness of the ideological function of religion is clearly anticipated by Israel's prophets. Indeed, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Micah denounce such religion in language which is every bit as violent as that to be found in the works of Marx and Engels. Moreover, the Marxist emphasis on *praxis* is foreshadowed within the Bible; the knowledge of God is never described in purely mystical or abstract terms but is always related to the practice of truth and justice. Bonino cites Jeremiah's withering attack on what has been called the 'Royal-Temple Ideology' and his insistence that true knowledge of God is inseparable from defending the cause of the poor and needy.³⁰ In truth, Marx reminded European Christians of their forgotten biblical heritage, a forgetfulness induced by the disastrous fusion of Christianity and Greek thought. Thus, Marx fulfills a prophetic function in challenging believers to renewed faithfulness to the covenant Lord of the Bible.

Thirdly, Bonino concludes that *Christians share with Marxists a vision of a transformed world and a commitment to work for revolutionary change within human history*. Bonino defines salvation as 'man's participation by faith and love in the new realm opened by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ - the new life that moves toward its consummation in the "new world", God's new creation'.³¹ This new realm of the kingdom of God is

characterised by love and justice, by the overcoming of sinful egoism and its replacement with genuine community. A Christianity faithful to the biblical heritage has no reason whatever to defend 'the bourgeois concept of an autonomous individual!'. Rather, Christians must identify with movements toward justice and human liberation and, following the demands of the prophets, should support radical structural changes which benefit the poor and the weak.

It is self-evident to Bonino that market capitalism is profoundly and irredeemably anti-Christian. He repeatedly accuses it of encouraging the basest human instincts, of idolising the powerful and of subordinating man to economic production. Capitalism, he says, pays lip-service to spiritual realities but cannot conceal 'its crass, total materialism in the most degrading sense of the word'.³² Thus, there can be no half-measures, no so-called 'Third Ways'; biblical imperatives compel Christians to support revolutionary socio-political change on a Marxist model.³³

Nonetheless, Bonino is aware of the differences and tensions between Marxism and Christianity. By ruling out any transcendent reference point, the objectives of Marxism are confined within the limits of the physical, material world. Against this, Bonino affirms that Christians are bound to regard all human achievements within history as partial and 'penultimate'. The final goal of human history will be reached only when it can be said that 'Death has been swallowed up in victory' - and the keys of death are in the hand of Jesus, not Marx. Indeed, the Marxist concept of alienation is deficient precisely because it ignores and suppresses the alienating power of death.

A second area of tension in the alliance between Christians and Marxists relates to the problem of ends and means. Does the objective of a humane and peaceful society justify the use of means involving violence, terror and repression? Bonino realizes that the history of the twentieth century, (to say nothing of the radical demand of Jesus that his followers should love their enemies) makes this issue unavoidable. However, when he tells us that we must avoid 'self-righteous denunciation of "Stalinist terror" and "communist oppression"' (note the quotation marks) and asserts that 'at least as much terror and oppression - often even without hope

- is abroad in the Western world under the pretence of defending “Christian values” and “the Christian way of life” we detect a reluctance to face the historical record of Marxism’s use of political power.³⁴

Elsewhere, following a catalogue of Marxism’s social, economic and scientific achievements, he adds, almost as an afterthought, ‘We must also record the human cost of these achievements: the liquidation of certain social groups....’³⁵ When this is followed by the chilling claim that revolutionary change may involve ‘inflicting suffering’ and that a sober calculation and acceptance of human cost may be required, we are entitled to question not only Bonino’s account of history but his consistency as a Christian theologian. It appears that theoretical Marxism has produced a myopia which leads Bonino to ignore the testimonies of brothers and sisters whose lives have been seared by the existential experience of Marxist power. It is doubtful whether this shortsightedness can outlive the systematic destruction of the icons of a communist past by the peoples of Eastern Europe. Should it do so, there is a danger that myopia will degenerate into wilful blindness.

A final problem which must be addressed by any Christian seeking an alliance with Marxists relates to the fundamentally materialist basis of Marx’s thought. Bonino admits that a radically materialist worldview ‘flatly contradicts the Christian faith...’³⁶ Christians are people who ‘have been grasped by the reality of the living God who is beyond history and the universe’ and this God is ‘*the* true and ultimate reality in which everything has meaning and existence’. This statement appears to point toward an unequivocally negative response to the question as to whether a Christian can also be a Marxist. However, Bonino suggests that materialism might be interpreted ‘as a criticism of idealism’ and so made compatible with faith in the biblical God. It is difficult to see how this position can be maintained when, as we have seen, Marx and Engels enthusiastically endorsed Feuerbach’s radical rejection of transcendence and made dialectical materialism the non-negotiable basis of their understanding of man and the world. Given the unambiguous statements of the original sources on this question, there seems no alternative to the conclusion that the denial of materialism, or its reduction to a relative position, would

involve a departure from Marxism itself.

A Northern response to Marxism

Needless to say, European Christian responses to Marx have been many and varied. Within the past two decades a number of serious and thoughtful Evangelical studies have appeared, notably those from David Lyon³⁷ and Klaus Bockmuehl.³⁸ However, I will here outline the work of the Czechoslovak Protestant theologian, Jan Milic Lochman as a representative Northern response to Marxism.³⁹

Two aspects of Lochman's biography are important in understanding his approach to Marx. First, his personal religious life has been deeply influenced by the distinctive traditions of the Czech Reformation. The focal point of this movement was, of course, Jan Hus who 'rediscovered the *biblical concept of truth*'. For Hus, truth (*pravda*) was not a matter of intellectual insight, as in the Greek tradition, but was intimately related to the 'supporting, challenging, binding, reality of the living God and God's righteousness'. Knowledge was related to *praxis*: following Jesus, who Hus described as the 'poor king of the poor', meant radical commitment to the moral and ethical values of the kingdom of God. The execution of Hus in July, 1415, created a religious movement which became a dynamic force both spiritually and socially. In contrast to the Lutheran and Calvinist traditions, the *Unitas Fratrum* in Bohemia insisted that 'an obedient life based on the apostolic model' was an essential mark of a true church. Religious renewal must produce 'practical and concrete social consequences in church and society'. By attacking the unjust social structures of Constantinian Christendom and experimenting with classless models of society, Hussites anticipated some of the themes of liberation theology. The Czech Reformation, says Lochman, reminds Christians of the critical importance of *orthopraxis*: concern for doctrine and personal spiritual life should never have been divorced from matters of lifestyle and practical engagement in a needy world.

The second significant aspect of Lochman's biography concerns his experience as a teacher of theology in a Communist country. After the Second World War, Czechoslovakia came under the influence of the

Soviet bloc and from 1948 was a one-party state. Lochman describes the whole of Eastern Europe as 'a region of deeply shattered Christian institutions'. Yet paradoxically, the removal of the traditional privileges and freedoms of the churches turned out to be liberating. Stripped of the power and status they had long taken for granted and no longer needing to defend particular political interests, the churches suddenly achieved a new credibility. Christians learned all over again what it means to tread the 'narrow way' and, since that path is taken only by those who 'have made a conscious and personal decision and therefore know what they are doing', faith ceased to be easily explicable in terms of the Marxist critique of religion. Lochman has no doubt that the churches of the West have much to learn from their brothers and sisters in 'the Marxist diaspora'

What then is Lochman's estimate of Marxism? At the level of socio-economic theory much of Marx's work echoes the teaching of the Bible. For example, the important theme of alienation, although derived immediately from Hegel and Feuerbach, can be traced back to the Hebrew prophets. Marx's analysis of human alienation and his argument about the strategy of 'fetishism', bears striking resemblance to the biblical description of the domination and enslaving power of sin. Likewise, his penetrating insights into the degrading power of money remind readers of the New Testament of Jesus' language concerning Mammon and the Pauline witness with regard to the dark rule of demonic principalities and powers. As Lochman says,

Above all it is in the statement that the original power of alienation lies in the power of Mammon that the relation to the biblical perspective becomes clearest. That the power of money can corrupt and alienate man in a peculiarly dangerous way is clearly biblical... We are not dealing here with passing references, but with the whole direction and thrust of the biblical message.⁴⁰

However, there are serious limitations in the Marxist analysis. Marx's theory is suspect precisely because it explains the phenomenon of alienation solely in economic terms. His contribution to our understanding of the decisive importance of economics to human happiness (or misery) must not be underestimated, but the very strength of his theory becomes

a weakness when he views all human anguish from the perspective of economics. As Lochman points out, this has dangerous consequences since by localizing evil in this way, expectations are aroused that revolutionary change in one dimension (for example, the public ownership of the means of production) will lead to the overcoming of all forms of alienation. This is a cruel and misleading illusion because it underestimates the staying power of evil in the new society.⁴¹ As Lochman's Marxist compatriot Milan Machovec admits, 'it took twentieth-century Marxists a long time and involved much pain to learn how difficult it is in fact to make any real progress without secretly reviving the demons of the "past" in some new guise'.⁴²

Lochman offers a similar critique of Marx's view of work. On the one hand, Marx 'has pointed out more sharply than any other philosopher the graceless consequences of capitalism' and his fervent protest at the manner in which the worker is reduced to a product under the heartless law of the market has clear parallels in the Bible. However, Marx goes beyond this: 'Labour makes God superfluous; it solves the mystery of world history, it "redeems" man and nature, becomes the instrument - and subject - of salvation in the universe of man'.⁴³ The Christian can affirm with Marx the dignity and right of labour but cannot accord it redemptive significance: 'Paul's protest...against justification by works - mobilized at the Reformation against the medieval "earned piety" - has its reality also in the meeting with Marxists'.⁴⁴

Like Bonino, Lochman acknowledges the importance and validity of much of Marx's critique of religion. His devastating assault on a Christendom which abused political power and sanctified the worship of Mammon was entirely justified and *should* have come from the pen of a contemporary biblical theologian. What Marx and his followers failed to realise however, was that the promethean challenge to a deity who would restrict human liberation and development finds support within the Bible. Unlike the Greek Zeus, the God of the Bible has no intention of keeping human beings in 'ontocratic chains': he is 'not a cosmological policeman jealously watching the frontiers of the unapproachable divine realm'.⁴⁵ On the contrary, the God who is revealed by the great acts of

exodus and resurrection is a liberating God, one who 'opens up the way out of all human captivity, even the captivity of death'.⁴⁶ Sadly, Marx and Engels could hardly be blamed for overlooking all this at a time when the churches defended an unjust status quo and adhered to a theology closer to the Greek model than to the dynamic revelation of the Bible:

The severe Marxist criticism of religion.....has much to do with the Christian church losing the prophetic and apostolic vision with its concern for total salvation, peace, and justice in history.⁴⁷

However, while Marx's atheism can be understood within the context of his time it nonetheless had very serious negative consequences for his socio-political project. The rejection of religion leads to a dangerous absolutizing of politics since the predicates of the dead God become secularized and applied to human activities. Questions that are rightly secular now take on a sacred and mystical quality. Ideology assumes the character of revelation and the political sphere becomes an eschatological battlefield. The tragic history of Eastern Europe in the twentieth century illustrates all too clearly how a 'false absolutization of human activities and tragic messianic claims' lead to untold misery, suffering and death.

Lochman's profound critique of Marxist atheism is here very close to Albert Camus' brilliant examination of the ills of European culture in *The Rebel*. Modern European history shows, according to Camus, that a metaphysical rebellion in which God is denied the right of existence leads inevitably to a metaphysical revolution in which man actually replaces God. Humankind must now take absolute responsibility and create a new world of justice. However, the history of this project reveals a terrible paradox. Innocent suffering, which led to the rejection of God in the first place, is now justified by the revolutionary purpose of ultimately establishing justice! In Camus' memorable phrase, 'The sky is empty, the earth delivered into the hands of power without principles'.⁴⁸

It is precisely at this point that the question of God re-emerges. Long before *glasnost* the officially silenced subject of God became for many East Europeans a real question and 'a supremely relevant human theme'.

Indeed, says Lochman,

at the very moment when it lost the official protection of society, just when it became culturally displaced and “homeless” in virtue of the shattering of all its internal and external ideological self-evidence, the theme of God took on fresh actuality and credibility.⁴⁹

SECTION III

MARX AND JESUS IN A POST-COMMUNIST WORLD

In historical terms the collapse of Marxist-Leninism in Eastern Europe seems to have brought the twentieth century to a premature end since it is difficult to imagine an event of comparable significance occurring before AD2000. Clearly, the demise of state-enforced Communism throughout the former Soviet empire has left a huge socio-political vacuum. The Marxist vision of a new world has been plausibly described as the one secular doctrine which approximated to the role of traditional religion, providing modern people with the hope that the immediate human condition might be transcended.⁵⁰ With the failure of the revolutionary experiment the way appears to be open for the global expansion of market capitalism and, not surprisingly, voices are heard proclaiming the 'triumph of the West'.

This situation presents both extraordinary opportunities and great dangers for Christian theology. On the one hand, the chorus in praise of Western socio-economic values must not deafen us to Christian voices from the Southern hemisphere warning of the potential for disaster in the yawning North-South economic chasm. Samuel Escobar's words, uttered at Lausanne nearly twenty years ago, are still relevant and searching:

Christians in the Third World who contemplate the so-called West, expect from their brethren a word of identification with demands for justice in international trade, for a modification of the patterns of affluence and waste that are made possible because of unjust and exploitative trade systems, for a criticism of corruption in the arms race and in the almost omnipotent maneuverings of international intelligence agencies.⁵¹

At the same time, the signs of fatigue and crisis *within* the West lead many commentators to argue that, in the absence of moral regeneration, it

cannot long survive. Karl Marx was by no means alone in suggesting that a culture built around the justification of rampant individualism and acquisitiveness was, in the long run, unsustainable. Indeed, Jesus' parable concerning the rich fool whose immense wealth was purchased at the cost of complete inner emptiness has great relevance in this situation. Before we join the celebrations at the 'triumph of the West' we do well to realize that economic success is bought at a terrible price when it evacuates human existence of ultimate meaning and suppresses questions concerning spiritual and moral values. Even those who enjoy the material fruits of capitalism find their pleasures tarnished when the wretched of the earth keep pushing their noses against the television screen, reminding the modern Dives that the price of conspicuous affluence is being met elsewhere on the globe.

In this context perhaps the fundamental task of Christian theology at the close of the millenium involves constructing a new apologetic for the biblical faith. That is to say, theology must be related in a vital and dynamic way to *mission*. Christians in the West must learn from the experience of their brethren in the East that the loss of the status which Christendom has taken for granted for centuries can bring liberation and spiritual renewal. Churches without privileges, released from captivity within a fundamentally secular culture, may discover the ability to bear credible witness to a nihilistic age and thus be able to face the challenge of one of the neediest and most difficult mission fields of all time.

The question which remains to be considered is this: at this particular juncture in history, *what can the churches learn from the work of Karl Marx?*

Talking about God

Marx, as we have seen, accepted Feuerbach's theory that religion originated as a fantasy of alienated man. This conviction was shared by many of the thinkers whose works laid the foundation for contemporary culture. Freud developed an influential psychological theory to explain human 'illusions' about God, while Nietzsche announced the death of God with the ringing certainty of a prophet. The Christian conception of God, Nietzsche said, involved hostility 'towards life, nature, the will

to life', and should be dismissed as 'one of the most corrupt conceptions of God arrived at on earth... God degenerated into the *contradiction of life*, instead of being its transfiguration and eternal *Yes!*'.⁵²

Not surprisingly, this sustained intellectual assault on traditional theism resulted in what Lochman calls the 'eclipse of the obligatory idea of God'. That is to say, 'God' as the taken-for-granted assumption of Western society, part of the mental or social furniture, is no more. In this sense, 'God' really is dead within Western culture. Tragically, Christians show little awareness of this cultural fact, engaging in God-talk in a manner that enables them to be easily pigeon-holed as quaint survivors from earlier times.

The really important issue here is whether the Marxist critique of religion does not, in fact, raise entirely valid questions about our conception of God? Should not the Marxist challenge to a God who can be taken for granted, whose existence and nature is simply a basic axiom, be welcomed by Christians? Such a theology bears little resemblance to the description of God recorded by biblical prophets and apostles. Thus, Marx's critique of religion can have positive benefits if it enables us to take our leave of 'the obvious, self-evident God; the God who is built into our dominant world-view'. In addition, we must also take our leave of 'the *obligatory, compulsory God* whom believers impose on their fellow human beings, over-riding their consciences and even threatening sanctions in case of non-conformity'.⁵³ Such a God is not the God of faith.

There is a second sense in which Marx provides a salutary warning to modern theology. He has reminded us that people do dream, imagine, project all kinds of fantastic beings: a great deal of religious belief is explicable as a purely human product. In view of this we have reason to be worried if our image of God is 'human, all too human'. Theology which is, in truth, disguised anthropology, will find no way through the flames of Feuerbach's penetrating critique. As Bockmuehl says,

Those who make humanity the sole object of theology ... who glorify their own religious experiences (a subject dear to evangelicals!)

instead of the “mighty works of God”, who reduce theology to human existence and endeavour, prepare Christianity for annihilation by the Marxist critique of religion.⁵⁴

The new humanity

I have argued earlier that Western Christians have often ignored the ethical challenge of Marx while focussing attention on his atheism. The deepest reason for this may be that while the God of the Bible remains beyond the range of Marx’s attack on Zeus-like deities who oppose human freedom, those who profess to worship him have lamentably failed to demonstrate evidence of their liberation from selfishness and greed. That is to say, the moral challenge of Marxism comes far too close for comfort.

Karl Marx and his followers always understood that ‘new men’ were indispensable to the creation of a new world. Marx wrote that only when the individual becomes ‘a species (social) being in his everyday life, in his particular situation ... only then will human emancipation have been accomplished’.⁵⁵ Human nature must be changed; the fundamentally selfish bent of the heart of man must be overcome, eradicated. Bockmuehl describes Marx’s vision as focussing on the ‘emancipation of humanity from egotism - the liberation of *each person* from selfishness’.⁵⁶

Of course, it is easy to point to Communism’s failure in this regard. Modern Marxists readily acknowledge that the ‘new man’ has failed to emerge. Greed, corruption and self-interest survived and flourished under revolutionary conditions which (according to Marxist theory) should have killed them off. Yet Christians can hardly throw stones here: the ethic of the churches appears to owe more to the influence of consumerism than it does to the values of the Sermon on the Mount. The problem of Western Christianity, says Andrew Walls, is that it has

issued no clear call to repentance from the cult of Mammon. It is possible to accommodate his worship very well to the apparatus of church going. It is possible to hold evangelistic campaigns that spell out the gospel in easy steps, and never breathe a word about the

false gods that hold Western society in thrall. It is not that the West is devoid of Christian witness, far from it. It is rather that Western Christianity has ceased to have critical contact with Western culture. It can no longer do it any harm or any good. Perhaps the voice that prepares the way of the Lord will next time be heard not in the desert but in the supermarket.⁵⁷

As a market economy based upon a thoroughly secular ideology spreads its influence around the globe, the voice of Karl Marx may perhaps remind Christians of the condemnation of a similar system in the last book in the Bible - and of the word of God in that context, 'Come out of her my people'⁵⁸

Thus, no theological project can create a widespread renewal of faith in the post-Communist era so long as the churches pay lip-service to the values of the kingdom of God. Marx continues to challenge Christians to demonstrate in their lives that God is something more than 'a language event'. More than anything else, says Bockmuehl, Christians 'need the experience of God's healing presence' in their personal and social lives, since experience and deed are the best answers to argument and 'the concrete reality of God is the most effective means to counter atheism'.⁵⁹

Doxology

Marx believed that the goal of history would be reached when man came finally to revolve around *himself*. The worship of God practised in the well-filled churches of the Victorian era was, in his view, an ideological tool of the ruling classes. In 1855 Marx was present at a chartist rally against legislation curbing Sunday recreational activities popular among the poor. With evident satisfaction, he reported how a lady who offered the demonstrators a prayer book was met by a thundering cry from the crowd, 'Give it to your horses to read!'⁶⁰ However, while this protest against ideological religion was justified, the subsequent history of Europe has shown that Marx's high social ideals cannot long survive the loss of transcendence. When man is understood solely in socio-economic terms the way is open for his enslavement within new systems of idolatry and tyranny. Dostoevsky's famous warning that in the absence of God

'all things are permissible' now appears as a truly prophetic prediction of the tragedies of the twentieth century. While it is true that the worship of God can be perverted in a manner that leads to the oppression of certain sections of society, we now know that the worship of man has consequences even more disastrous and terrifying. In this post-Communist situation there is an opportunity to rediscover the healing power of worship, to be 're clothed in our rightful minds' in the presence of the living God. Worship must not be a retreat into a cosy ghetto, insulated from the pain and agony of humanity. As Karl Barth has said, to clasp hands in prayer is the beginning of an uprising against the disorder of the world. On the eve of the third millenium, Marx's criticism of religion challenges Christians to prove that the worship of the living God can renew human hope and provide the dynamic to work for the liberation of all peoples on earth. As all merely human possibilities of change are exhausted, Christians must remind a despairing age that the river of life which brings healing to the nations flows from the throne of God and of the Lamb.

NOTES

- 1 Anthony Campolo, *We Have Met the Enemy, and They Are Partly Right* (Milton Keynes: Word Publishing, 1985), p.146.
- 2 *Marx, Engels - On Religion* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975), p.15. Quotations from Marx will be from this volume unless otherwise indicated. It will be cited hereafter as *On Religion*.
- 3 Geoffrey Best, in Anthony Symondson (ed), *The Victorian Crisis of Faith* (London: SPCK, 1970), p.44.
- 4 From 'Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy' (1886), *On Religion*, p.197.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p.192.
- 6 Hans Kung, *Does God Exist?* (London: Collins, 1980), p.148. This book provides an excellent introduction to the thought of Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx and Engels.
- 7 The famous eleventh 'Thesis on Feuerbach'. *On Religion*, p.64.
- 8 Ludwig Feuerbach, *The Essence of Christianity* (New York/London: Harper and Row, 1957).
- 9 *Ibid.*
- 10 From 'Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law'. *On Religion*, p.39.
- 11 The seventh 'Thesis on Feuerbach'. *On Religion*, p.64.
- 12 See for example, *On Religion*, p.38.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p.39.
- 14 N Masterman (ed), *Chalmers on Charity* (London: Constable, 1900), p.167.
- 15 Leading article in 'Kolnische Zeitung' (1842), *On Religion*, pp.32-3.

- 16 *Ibid.*
- 17 *On Religion*, p.38.
- 18 *Ibid.*
- 19 Raymond Aron, *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*, 1 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), p.115.
- 20 *On Religion*, p.46.
- 21 Thomas Chalmers, *The Application of Christianity to the Commercial and Ordinary Affairs of Life* (Glasgow: Chalmers and Collins, 1820), p.76.
- 22 This letter is quoted by Jacques Ellul in *Perspectives of Our Age* (New York: Seabury Press, 1981), p.97. Unfortunately, I have been unable to trace the original source.
- 23 Joseph Ton, *Marxism, The Faded Dream* (Basingstoke: Marshalls, 1983), p.12.
- 24 Jose P Miranda, *Marx and the Bible - A Critique of the Philosophy of Oppression* (London: SCM Press, 1977).
- 25 Jose Miguez Bonino, *Christians and Marxists - The Mutual Challenge to Revolution* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976).
- 26 Bastiaan Wielenga, *An Introduction to Marxism* (Centre for Social Action: Bangalore, 1984).
- 27 I shall draw mainly on the book cited in note 25 above. Bonino's other major work on this theme is *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).
- 28 On this see Peter Hebblethwaite, *The Christian-Marxist Dialogue and Beyond* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1977).
- 29 Milan Machovec, *A Marxist Looks at Jesus* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976), p.31.
- 30 On the 'Royal Temple Ideology' see the writings of Walter Brueggemann, especially his *Hope Within History* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987).

- 31 *J M Bonino, op. cit.*, p.96.,
- 32 *Ibid.*, p.99. Elsewhere Bonino insists that 'the basic ethos of capitalism is definitely anti-Christian'. Christianity 'must criticize capitalism radically, in its fundamental intention, while it must criticize socialism functionally, in its failure to fulfil its purpose' (*Ibid.*, p.115).
- 33 In 'An Open Letter to Jose Miguez Bonino', Jurgen Moltmann has criticised his denial of the validity of a 'Third way'. See Gerald Anderson and Thomas Stransky (eds), *Mission Trends 4 - Liberation Theologies*, (New York/Grand Rapids: Paulist Press/W B Eerdmans, 1979), pp.57-70.
- 34 *J M Bonino, op. cit.*, p.87.
- 35 *Ibid.*, p.88.
- 36 *Ibid.*, p.97.
- 37 David Lyon, *Karl Marx - A Christian Appreciation of his Life and Thought* (Tring: Lion Publishing, 1979).
- 38 Klaus Bockmuehl, *The Challenge of Marxism - A Christian Response* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980). See also Bockmuehl's important article, 'Karl Marx's Negation of Christianity: A Theological Response' in *Evangelical Review of Theology*, 9/3 (July 1985), pp.251-263.
- 39 Jan Milic Lochman's most important contributions are, *Encountering Marx: Bonds and Barriers Between Christians and Marxists* (Belfast: Christian Journals Ltd, 1977) and *Christ and Prometheus?* (Geneva: WCC, 1988). These works are referred to below by title only.
- 40 *Encountering Marx*, p.70.
- 41 *Ibid.*, p.72.
- 42 Milan Machovec, *op. cit.*, p.27.
- 43 *Encountering Marx*, p.50.
- 44 *Ibid.*, p.74.

- 45 *Christ and Prometheus*, p.47.
- 46 *Ibid.*
- 47 *Ibid.*, p.28.
- 48 Albert Camus, *The Rebel* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), p.117.
- 49 *Christ and Prometheus*, p.47.
- 50 See Alisdair MacIntyre, *Marxism and Christianity* (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1971), p.10.
- 51 Samuel Escobar, 'Evangelism and Man's Search for Freedom, Justice and Fulfilment'. This address to the Lausanne Congress is in J D Douglas (Ed) *Let the Earth Hear His Voice* (Minneapolis: Worldwide Publications, 1975), p.316.
- 52 From '*The Antichrist*' - *A Nietzsche Reader* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), p.187.
- 53 *Christ and Prometheus?*, p.44.
- 54 Klaus Bockmuehl, *op. cit.*, p.67.
- 55 Quoted by Bockmuehl, *Ibid.*, p.128.
- 56 *Ibid.*, p.129.
- 57 Andrew Walls, 'Christian Expansion and the Condition of Western Culture' in *Changing the World*, (Bromley: MARC Europe, nd), p.23.
- 58 Revelation 18:4.
- 59 Klaus Bockmuehl, *op. cit.*, p.81.
- 60 'The Anti-church Movement Demonstration in Hyde Park', (1888) in *On Religion*, p.114.

