

(Also see [The Black Book of Communism](#) )

The world renowned Russian writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, was warned not to write about the atrocities committed by the Marxists who were ruling the Soviet Union. The warning was, “*If you bring up the past, you will lose an eye*”. His response was that if you ignored the past, you would lose both eyes. Knowing the past and making sure the truth is known about the past, is a vital ingredient in helping us and others to be wise in the present and future. One thing that becomes very clear when you compare our situation in Zimbabwe today with the times Solzhenitsyn wrote about, is that there is nothing new under the sun (Ecclesiastes 1:9).

At the forefront of Lenin’s grasp for power in 1917, was his deceptive tactic of promising the peasants land and allowing them to ruthlessly seize it on their own, telling them it belonged to them. This they duly did, becoming a law unto themselves. The reality, however, was that the previous land owners had much less land than the peasants had been lead to believe. Furthermore, it wasn’t long before Lenin claimed his right to everything that the peasants grew on their newly acquired land. The revolution had been achieved, that is, Lenin had assumed the position of supreme power in the nation and that was all that mattered to him—the peasants had served their purpose. Whatever promises Lenin needed to make in order to attain his ambitions, or whatever promises needed to be broken later to secure his position didn’t matter, he did whatever was necessary to maintain his grasp on power—nothing else had any value or virtue.

Lenin correctly perceived that he needed the peasants’ support if he was to retain his precarious hold on power and so he gave them what they wanted, even though it was diametrically opposed to the teachings of Marxism. Why did he do this? Because once he had consolidated his power, he knew he could take it back whenever he liked. How, one might ask, could Lenin so easily do a complete turn around and trample all over the principles he had previously espoused (i.e., that under Marxism, only the state can own the land)? In order to justify his reversal, Lenin appealed to the Marxist philosophy of dialectical materialism, which holds contradiction to be the central point in dialectics and is therefore at the very heart of Communism. Since contradiction was at the core of Lenin’s philosophy of life, when he acted in complete contradiction to his own previous views, he merely attributed this to how life, by necessity, must work. Such a philosophy is very convenient for oppressors, for it allows them

complete freedom in their actions and policies, whereby they can “justify” (in the name of dialectics) anything they have to say and do in order to retain their hold on power. Though, as Lenin’s ruthlessness quickly made clear, the “privilege” of using contradiction in this way is reserved for the elite leaders alone—everything is remade in accordance with the desires of the rulers and for the express purpose of them staying in control. We see this absolute control used to redefine the much used term, ‘the dictatorship of the proletariat’ which in theory meant that the masses were to be the rulers of the nation (this is the Marxists’ selling point, in other words, the way they try to make their philosophy attractive to the masses). In practice, however, it was/is always ‘the dictatorship of the Party’. The Party assumes that whatever it imagines, that is what the people want, thus the Party’s wishes are said to be the same as if they had actually been given a direct mandate from “the people”. Eventually, what materialises and is established, is a situation whereby what the Party wants, is determined merely by the wishes of a few or even one person, thus in reality, this supreme goal of “the dictatorship of the proletariat”, becomes in actuality, the dictatorship of the one. There is nothing new under the sun!

Death and death threats were an essential ingredient in Lenin’s leadership strategy. His friend, the writer Maxim Gorky, said soon after the revolution, that Lenin and Trotsky were already intoxicated by the foul poison of power and this was evidenced by their disgraceful attitude towards freedom of speech, the individual and all the other rights for which the democracy fought. Gorky was murdered! (Stalin, himself a mass murderer, attributed Gorky’s murder to Trotsky).

What we see with Lenin is also true in every other case, namely, that when a political party resorts to violence in an attempt to hold onto power, they confirm by these actions, that they are only supported by a minority of the people. The only avenues open to power hungry minorities, are deception and violence, which they use with relish and great personal satisfaction. Lenin’s seizing of power in 1917 was achieved with a very small number of supporters and thus Lenin, from the beginning, reigned with a vicious, iron fist.

Despite the fact that Lenin nationalised the produce from the land he had earlier “freely given” to the peasants, some of the more hard working and enterprising peasants were still able to do more than just survive. However, their success as farmers made them into a class that was distinct from the rest of the peasants who worked the land, and in time they were labeled “kulaks”. The kulaks were now called the exploiters and were blamed for all the economic problems the nation and individuals were enduring—which was music to the ears of their envious neighbours. Marxism, ultimately promotes and institutionalises envy and covetousness. The step following the false charge of calling the kulaks “exploiters”, was Stalin’s implementing of a specific policy to eliminate them as a class and so he set about turning all private land and private belongings into collective farms and collective property. (As a point of note, it is no

surprise when you see how the Communists seized power in China either: the elite leaders promised the poor that they would be given land and all their debts would be cancelled. The landlords were wiped out and the land was given to the previous landless peasants, who began working the land with great joy. Yet once the Chinese leaders had consolidated their grip on power, the poor were of no more value to them and so all land was nationalised and every person who worked the land became a slave of the state).

The term kulak was never defined, however, if you hired labourers, or owned two horses or had a nice house you probably would be called a kulak, that is, if the revolutionary cause needed to define you as such. Why would the “people’s revolution” call people kulaks? Because the only way Marxism can survive is if it perpetuates a never ending revolution and to have a revolution you need to have an enemy who can be blamed and then eradicated—with the consent of the rest of the nation. A Marxist country’s hardships and gross inefficiencies are never the fault of the philosophy of Marxism or of their greedy leaders, no, the fault is always the kulaks—whoever or whatever they might be. Thus, there is a constant cycle of identifying and then isolating another group of people who are said to be exploiting the nation. Once this is done, war is declared against them (the perpetual revolution), though what is always promised, is that with the eradication of this particular group, the revolution will finally be completed and then everyone will have whatever they desire—“from each according to his ability, to each according to his need”. The road of Marxism is perpetual revolution, because the fruit of Marxism is perpetual failure and thus new kulaks have to constantly be invented, identified, blamed and eliminated—“all for the good of the people”, which is what the state propaganda machine urges everyone to believe.

Another fundamental aspect in the philosophy of Marxism, is the belief that life, health and prosperity are birthed out of the revolution—out of chaos, it is claimed, will come paradise. This is held to with religious zeal and is clearly seen by the mindless destruction that is so commonly carried out by radical revolutionaries—past and present (if you look around you will see that there is nothing new under the sun, or under the Party).

The main reason for the perpetual revolution, though, is to secure power for the elite rulers. This revolution, is in essence, a civil war, however, it is a civil war that is focused and contained within an area or among a certain class of people so that the rest of the nation does not get roused and drawn in—the strategy is to isolate, divide and destroy. The elite rulers could never hold back the whole nation if it rose up together, but they can deal with isolated groups, one at a time. Thus, the rest of the nation is neutralised towards the plight of the targeted kulaks, either due to their envy or becoming indifferent about true justice after succumbing to the state’s propaganda about the kulaks, which “reveals” how evil and exploitive the kulaks are and how their intention has always been the destruction of the nation. The general feeling, therefore, while the kulaks are being oppressed, is that they are a greedy subversive bunch of people who

are merely getting what they deserve. The rest of the nation separates themselves from the “subversive” kulaks and believes that the sooner this latest disturbance is settled the better for everyone. Even if this means the destruction of the kulaks, that’s just too bad since life needs to go on and once the kulaks are out of the way, it’s thought, things will get back to normal. However, after the unhindered destruction of the kulaks, things do not improve. Why? The reason is obvious: another sinister group of kulaks has arisen and is exploiting the masses, thus there will be no prosperity or peace until they too are eliminated.

In Zimbabwe, our elite rulers have adopted the slogan, “Land is the economy and the economy is land”. The final revolution, we are told, is now taking place whereby the landless will be given their own, rightful land. Is it mathematically possible for every Zimbabwean to own productive land? Maybe we will need to colonise some land from neighbouring countries in order to fulfil this “dream”? If every Zimbabwean cannot possibly own such land, then doesn’t the slogan imply that some Zimbabweans will be prevented from sharing in the “economy” of the country? Who then is going to determine who the privileged ones will be, i.e., who can own land and thus be part and parcel of Zimbabwe’s “economy”? Be warned though, remember, today’s landless are tomorrow’s kulaks! The “Land is the economy...” slogan being used to fuel and justify the present chaos, is nothing but blatant deception—as deceptive as Lenin’s promise to the peasants in his day which was designed for only one purpose: to strengthen his grasp on power. Those who don’t see what’s happening in our day, will reap the reward the Russian people reaped in Lenin’s day and become enslaved to a perverse, greedy and severely intolerant elite group of leaders. Lenin promised land and peace, but what he delivered was slavery and suffering—on a massive scale. Lenin, together with our present leaders, will only be remembered as perpetrators of a new and more despotic intolerance. Ever greater intolerance is always the policy adopted by those who lust after power, but only have minority support.

Perpetual revolution, which is inseparable from Marxism as we know it, has one objective: to keep tyrants in power. Vital to the success of this, is preventing the rest of the nation from becoming involved when civil war is unleashed against the targeted kulaks. Even those who are only slightly awake, however, ought to ask who is going to be identified as the next kulak class and become the chaff for the next purge cycle (Gukurahundi), since such purges are a tyrannical state’s life-blood. Marxism has to constantly orchestrate some kind of class conflict and they do this by lying, then inciting and justifying both envy and covetousness. In reality, the source of our national woes is not the latest “kulak group”, but our tyrannical leaders and thus there will be no relief from our calamities until they are removed from office and Christ is truly honoured as Lord over every area of life.

Think about these things!