

**COMMUNISM AND CAPITALISM:  
BIRDS OF SIMILAR FEATHERS,  
BUT WITH DIFFERENT CHARACTERISTICS**

The inevitabilities of life include, in order of undeniable pre-eminence, first death, and, then, change.

Death is an indelible part of life: Nothing can be forever.

It is a truism that honours, monuments and all works of vanity and ambition are demolished and destroyed in time, but the reputation of a man's wisdom is venerable ... to posterity.

Since Karl Marx first published *The Communist Manifesto* in 1848, followed by *Das Kapital* a three-volume masterpiece in 1867, he became one the most-influential thinkers in the world; and, he continues to hold a place of high honour as one of the most-important, prime movers in the field of social science.

But history has proved that communism, as propounded by Karl Marx, ultimately, leads to a form of capitalism.

The People's Republic of China (PRC), today, maintains that it is a communist state, but it is veering, slowly but surely, toward a specific type of capitalism.

The PRC's pace toward its type of capitalism is akin to an avalanche that, when the forces that first created it exceed its strength, gains in mass and speed as it descends from a height to the valley below.

Capitalism is defined as being an economic and political system in which a country's trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit, rather than by the state.

Communism, on the other hand, is defined as being a socioeconomic order, structured upon the common ownership of the means of production and the absence of social classes, money and the state.

It was not that long ago that the Government of PRC was strongly promoting the concept of a market economy – which it continues to promote to this day.

A market economy is defined as being an economic system in which decisions, regarding investment, production and distribution are determined according to supply-and-demand factors.

In short, within a market economy, the allocation of capital is controlled not by a government edict, but by factors, relating specifically to the characteristics of production.

What is common to both capitalism and communism is that both socioeconomic systems depend, almost entirely, on human capital.

Human capital is defined as being the skills, knowledge, and experience, possessed by an individual or population, viewed in terms of their value or cost to an organisation or country.

Put another way, the ability of the proletariat (applying Karl Marx's definition of the working classes) to harness their concerted abilities, leading to the betterment of the state, becomes crucial to the growth of the economies of both the communist state as well as the capitalist state.

As the state benefits from the efforts and determinations, due to the activities of the proletariat, so the individuals within the state, be it a communist or a capitalist state, reap the rewards for their efforts: An improved standard of living, proportionately to their efforts, is among the expected rewards.

In both the communist state and the capitalist state, the knowledge that, at the end of the day, there shall be rewards in the offing for the working classes becomes the spur that leads to peace and tranquillity within the social order.

But reward there must be because, inter alia, it acts as a fillip for the proletariat to aim for higher and better standards.

## **Greed**

Man is inherently greedy.

If it could be held that man has any instincts, at all – which he is known not to possess – then, greed could be asserted as being that only instinct.

Instinct differs from drive in that instinct is an inborn pattern of behaviour in response to specific stimuli.

Drive is, simply put, an innate, biological urge to attain a goal or to satisfy a need.

Greed, the intense and selfish desire for something, is not, necessarily, an objectionable trait in man, because, without it, nothing could ever be accomplished.

Avarice, however, is something else, again, for it imputes extreme greed for wealth or material gain – and it is to be abhorred within polite society.

While change is inevitable in nearly all aspects of life, there is, perhaps, in one field where change is immutable: To advance the mind, materially.

The ability to advance one's mind is superior to all the riches that life has to offer for, at the end of one's sojourn on this planet, it is forever: Thoughts of pith and moment can never perish from the earth.

Karl Marx proved this in spite of many of his theories in the realm of social science, being held out to have been flawed by some people.

But could one find fault with the thinking of the great minds of centuries past, with Socrates, with Plato, with René Descartes, with John Locke, etc?

That which the government of the largest communist country on this earth shall be forced to learn, in time, is that man's desires are boundless and that these desires may never be completely constrained.

No governmental proclamation or legislation shall be able, for any reasonable period of time, to deprive man of the freedom of movement that drives him onward in order to satisfy his acquisitive nature for that which he covets.

That which a man obtains is but a method by which he is able to add to his collection ... more, and more, and more ... without end.

As long as man is solicitous in his pursuit for more and more and more, the more shall he come to learn that wealth has a tendency to lose its true usefulness: The medium of exchange no longer seems as important as it did in days of yore.

In his pursuit for that which he holds out to be his sacred cow, man remains honest, but, should the devil offer him better wages, then, he may well consider changing to that Party.

In the world, as we think that we know it, today, man is covetous in the extreme.

He learns, only too late, that no vessel is sufficiently large to hold all of a man's ambitions for ever-greater wealth.

This realisation must become only too apparent when the moon signals day's end because it shall, then, become obvious to him that one cannot empty the sea of its water.

Extreme covetousness is a chronic disease, the medicine for which has yet to be discovered by the great minds that make the claim as being wise.

The seemingly exciting journey along the path to great wealth, leading to the bestowing upon one of immoderate honours by those who are envious and desire to seek benefits, could well be the path that, in reality, is a disguised cul-de-sac.

### **The Unity Of Opposites**

There is, today, a firm belief that there is, indeed, a unity of opposites.

It was, during the life of Heraclitus (circa 535-475 BC), that he made the determination that a unity of

opposites did, indeed, exist.

Some people may pooh-pooh this concept, first propounded more than 2,500 years ago, but is it not so that fear and hope are deeply embedded within the realm of the unity of opposites?

Fear and hope are among the many innate characteristics, well ingrained in man: They are linked by one unbreakable chain.

The prison warden is as much a prisoner as is his charge although the warden might not have realised this as such when he first embarked on the acceptance of this august position.

Both fear and hope look to the future, both, being solicitous of an unknown factor, though, for the most part, it is hope that is the dominant of the two passions.

Without fear, there could never be hope – only certainty; without hope, there could never exist fear – only despair.

Of the two passions, fear must be considered the likely misery, lurking during one's journey through life: The darkness only tends to exacerbate the reality of fear in man. <

At first sight, one may think of another as being effeminate, but, when one looks closer, one might discover that that same man is made of sterner stuff, perhaps being even greater than ordinary man: It might be only in the clothes that he wears that single him out to be different from the mob.

Clothes do not make the man, to be sure, but how many men are judged by them – or without them?

In the madness of the day, most men seem to have their minds set upon amassing those things in the realm of superfluities.

They value few men for virtues – sadly.

Whether living in a communistic world or in a capitalistic world, one is the occasion of fortune, being, in effect, the artificer of his own happiness or misery.

When one learns that a statement, uttered by one who dared to make the claim that the government of a specific communist country lacks this or that and that, in time, there is likely, out of sheer circumstance, to come about a dramatic change, with that communistic country's policies, being forced to lean ever more toward the more-inviting shores of the policies of a capitalistic economy, is one to be considered so brittle that such utterances cannot be tolerated?

Such utterances should be, to the mature and understanding mind of a man of political power, but a pinprick, rather than a wound, caused by the keenest arrow from the quiver of fortune.

Is such a man of politics so delicate that he cannot so much as bear a single scandalous report?

Has such a man forgotten that among the greatest evils of man is the want of courage?

**-- End --**

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,  
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in **TARGET**, please feel free to e-mail your views to [editor@targetnewspapers.com](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com). **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*