

ISSN 1751-8229

Volume Eleven, Number Two

All Communists go to Heaven: the Construction of a Marxist Kingdom of God on Earth

Reith Thomas Funston, Dartmouth College, United States

Since its birth in the mid-nineteenth century, Marxism has had a contentious relationship with religion and Christianity. From the Marxist critique of religion as the “opium of the people” to the secularism of the Soviet Union to the Catholic Church’s “Decree Against Communism,” the two schools of thought have widely been considered incompatible.¹ Despite this tension, many of the critiques leveled by both sides do not attack the real substance of their opponents’ ideas. For instance, in its *Decree Against Communism*, the leadership of the Catholic Church declared Communism to be grounds for excommunication “because Communism is materialistic and anti-Christian;

¹ Karl Marx, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, trans. Joseph O'Malley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 1.

and the leaders of the Communists ... do in fact show themselves, both in their teaching and in their actions, to be the enemies of God,” as opposed to because of any opposition to the abolition of private property.² Likewise, take the Marxist critique of religion outlined above; rather than criticizing any particular aspect of the lessons of Christianity, he argues that all happiness from religion can only be illusory.³ As such, this paper sets out to answer two questions: first, whether Christian morality and Marxist thought can be made consistent on the basis of their ideological foundations, and second, what a Christianity consistent with Marxism would look like. It finds that on the level of ideological foundation, there are important consistencies between Christian morality and Marxism. Given these consistencies, a Christianity aligned with Marxist thought is possible, and this paper will conclude by exploring Liberation Theology as a possible avenue for the actualization of that consistency.

The first important point of consistency is that both Christian morality and Marxism critique the accumulation of wealth and the exploitation of the powerlessness of the working class. For Marx, the conception of alienation is foundational in his work in that it establishes the terms under which we understand private property. The fact that the worker produces for a system that exploits him, and that his labor is not his own, is the reason that revolution is both inevitable and necessary. The critique of the accumulation of wealth logically follows from this conclusion, as to accumulate wealth one must have stolen the labor of the worker – how could any company be profitable if it paid its laborers the full value of their production?⁴ This criticism is consistent with Christian teaching, and in *Marx and the Bible*, José Porfirio Miranda explores the Christian and Marxist criticisms of wealth, arguing that they are very similar.

One of the first arguments Miranda makes is one of Biblical translation. He argues that the Hebrew word, צדקה (Tzedakah), commonly translated in the Bible to

² Donald R. McClarey, "Feast of Saint Joseph the Worker and Victims of Communism Day – The American Catholic," *The American Catholic*, May 1, 2013, section goes here, accessed March 7, 2017, <http://the-american-catholic.com/2013/05/01/victims-of-communism-day-2/>.

³ Marx, "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right," pp. 1.

⁴ Karl Marx, *Alienated Labor* (Committee for Marxist Direction, 1844), pp. 226-227

mean almsgiving, literally translates to “Justice,” and where it is used in the Bible it draws a connection between “Justice” and charity or the giving of alms. He directs us, for examples, to Psalm 112:5 and Matthew 6:1-2.⁵ Take Psalm 112:5, then: “Good will come to those who are generous and lend freely, who conduct their affairs with justice.”⁶ “Justice” in this verse has been translated from the Hebrew *הַדָּקָה*, and is clearly used to draw a connection between charity (giving alms) and justice. In Matthew 6: 1-2, we are told:

Be careful not to practice your righteousness in front of others to be seen by them. If you do, you will have no reward from your Father in heaven.

So when you give to the needy, do not announce it with trumpets, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and on the streets, to be honored by others. Truly I tell you, they have received their reward in full. 3 But when you give to the needy, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, 4 so that your giving may be in secret. Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you.⁷

When compared to the original Hebrew, Tzedakah has been translated in this verse to mean both righteousness and to give to the needy, and even absent arguments about translation giving to the needy is clearly being described as righteous – the righteous act we are told not to announce is giving to the needy. The argument that charity is righteous or just is drawn out further in Ecclesiasticus, and made an imperative: “There can no good come to him that is always occupied in evil: nor to him that giveth no alms.”⁸ In all of this, we see a Biblical theme of finding justice in giving to the needy, a proposition consistent with Marxist teaching because if it is true that the labor of the worker is stolen to produce the wealth of the Bourgeoisie, it must be true that the worker getting some of what their labor produced back is a good thing. However, while alms are not wage labor, the presumption that capitalism can be made just via charity only

⁵ Jose P. Miranda, *Marx and the Bible: A Critique of the Philosophy of Oppression* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1974), pp. 14-15.

⁶ Ps. 112:5

⁷ Matthew 6:1-2

⁸ Ecclus. 12:3

produces capitalism as it exists today, not any system consistent with Marxism. However, Miranda takes his analysis much further than the argument that the Bible says that the wealthy should be charitable.

Complementing his analysis of charity, Miranda draws on the writings of early leaders in the Church to make the argument that Christianity identifies the accumulation of wealth as fundamentally unethical in a way that parallels Marxism. He first quotes the Homily “On 1st Timothy” by Saint John Chrysostom, in which Chrysostom argues that the “beginning and root” of wealth are in injustice.⁹ Here we see an obvious connection to the ideas of Marx about private property and alienation as explored above; wealth cannot be accumulated ethically given that its “beginning and root” are also in injustice – wealth cannot be produced without exploiting the worker. If we look more closely at the Homily, we see that Chrysostom also argues that “so destructive a passion is avarice, that to grow rich without injustice is impossible.”¹⁰ There is a clear parallel, then, between Marxist thought and the teachings of Chrysostom, a Saint and early Christian leader: for Marx, wealth cannot ethically be accumulated because to do so requires the exploitation of the worker, while for Chrysostom, wealth cannot be ethically accumulated because of the destructiveness of avarice, of which exploiting workers and the poor would logically be a part. Miranda then moves to consider the perspectives of early Church leaders on the question of stolen wealth – important because a central conception of Marxism is that the value of the worker’s labor is stolen by the Bourgeoisie. He first uses a different Homily by Chrysostom, “On First Corinthians,” to argue that both Christianity and Marxism understand the value of the worker’s labor as stolen; Chrysostom tells us, “Do not say, ‘I am spending what is mine; I am enjoying what is mine.’ In reality it is not yours but another’s.”¹¹ Here, then, we see another consistency between Christian thought and Marxism. Chrysostom was not alone in his proto-Marxism, however. Following his analysis of Chrysostom, Miranda quotes “de Nabuthe” by St. Ambrose: “You are not making a gift of your possessions to the poor

⁹ Miranda, *Marx and the Bible*, pp. 15.

¹⁰ John Chrysostom, "Homily 12 on First Timothy" (speech), accessed March 7, 2017, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/230612.htm>.

¹¹ Miranda, *Marx and the Bible*, pp. 15.

person. You are handing over to him what is his.”¹² This passage is absolutely transformative in how we understand the connection between charity and justice as explained above – if it is true that the Christian understanding of charity is one which understands that wealth is fundamentally the stolen value of the labor of the poor (hence why the poor man is being given what is his), the charity of Tzedakah is not charity in the way charity is most commonly understood now – as a rich person giving away a bit of their money but retaining most of it and remaining rich. Rather, the charity, and thus the justice, of Tzedakah is one which recognizes the need for radical redistribution of wealth – a fundamental part of communism and the Marxist argument. Miranda leaves an important part of Ambrose’s homily out of his quotation, however. Immediately following the quote above, Ambrose writes that “for what has been given in common for the use of all, you have arrogated to yourself. The world is given to all, and not only to the rich.”¹³ What Ambrose seems to be telling us, then, is that not only is the wealth of the Rich man not his – which, Marx would argue, is because it was stolen from the worker – but that the Rich man has taken for himself what should from the outset have belonged to all. Ambrose is calling for the abolition of private property. Given the apparent consistency of Marxist and Christian thought, it may strike the reader as strange that nothing similar to Communism ever emerged from Christianity – when we begin from the premise that the rich man’s wealth is rightfully the poor man’s, and that the world should be communally owned, one of the few logical conclusions is that the system which exploits the poor and gives the world to a few, against the will of God, should be overturned. Surprisingly enough, this is the conclusion reached in the Bible, and the outline for the “Kingdom of God” is apparently very similar to communism.

To explore the connection between the Bible’s vision for early Christian society and communist society, we first must understand what a communist society looks like; while Marx never provided an exact blueprint, a few things must be true: that the means of production, and thus wealth, are concentrated in the hands of the workers, that

¹² Ibid, pp. 16.

¹³ Aurelius Ambrosius, "On First Corinthians" (speech), accessed March 7, 2017, <http://www.catholicsocialteaching.org.uk/themes/human-dignity/resources/encyclical-statements-poverty-2/>.

private property be abolished, and that each works according to his ability and is paid according to his need. Miranda explores the apparently communist nature of the Kingdom of God to come in a later book, *Marxism in the Bible*. To aid our understanding of why it is that the Kingdom will be communist, Miranda points us to two passages: Acts 2:44-45, and Acts: 4:32-35.¹⁴ In 2:44-45, the fellowship of the believers (Christians immediately after Jesus) is described: “All the believers were together and had everything in common. They sold property and possessions to give to anyone who had need.”¹⁵ This vision of society seems to satisfy the parameters explained above: the believers have abolished private property in favor of a society in which all things are held in common (the rich man has given to the poor man what is his, in satisfaction of Ambrose), and have given up their possessions in to ensure that the needs of the poor are met – each has given according to his ability, and taken according to his need. The believers’ society is explained in greater detail in Acts 4:32-35:

All the believers were one in heart and mind. No one claimed that any of their possessions was their own, but they shared everything they had. With great power the apostles continued to testify to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. And God’s grace was so powerfully at work in them all that there were no needy persons among them. For from time to time those who owned land or houses sold them, brought the money from the sales and put it at the apostles’ feet, and it was distributed to anyone who had need.¹⁶

Here again, that private property has been abolished among the believers is apparent, and we receive a glimpse into the political organization of the society of the believers. Wealth is put at the apostles’ feet to be redistributed – the closest possibility for Christians at the time to redistribute wealth via the state given that they had no state. We are also told that the reason no one has need is because “God’s grace was so powerfully at work” in their society.¹⁷ The reason that there is no need in the fellowship of the believers is the redistribution of wealth – we are being told here, then, that the redistribution of wealth is the grace of God. This has massive ramifications for the

¹⁴ Jose Porfirio. Miranda, *Communism in the Bible* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1982), pp. 2.

¹⁵ Acts 2:44-45

¹⁶ Acts 4:32-35

¹⁷ Ibid.

debate over the consistency of Christianity and Communism; the defining aspects of a Communist society – the abolition of private property, concentration of wealth in the hands of the worker, and each being paid according to his need and giving according to his ability – are described as not only consistent with Christianity, but as the grace of God! We later learn that the penalty for a believer who violates the principle of redistribution – as the Kulaks did in the Soviet Union – is death. We are told of a man named Ananias and his wife Sapphira, who sell property and secretly keep some of the money for themselves; Ananias leaves the rest at the feet of the Apostles, and is immediately confronted by Peter for his treachery: “Ananias, how is it that Satan has so filled your heart that you have lied to the Holy Spirit and have kept for yourself some of the money you received for the land? Didn’t it belong to you before it was sold? And after it was sold, wasn’t the money at your disposal? What made you think of doing such a thing? You have not lied just to human beings but to God.”¹⁸ Ananias instantly dies, and his Wife later suffers the same fate when Peter asks her if the money left by Ananias is all the money they were paid for the house; she says yes and also dies instantly.¹⁹ The lesson we are left with, then, is that when one chooses to be a part of the fellowship of the believers, communism is a mandatory condition; the Bourgeois treachery of resisting redistribution of wealth is a crime punishable by death, as in resisting redistribution the capitalist resists the grace of God. Jesus himself substantiated this; when addressing a large crowd of people desiring to be his disciples, he said that “those of you who do not give up everything you have cannot be my disciples.”²⁰ If giving up all of one’s possessions and acceding to the redistribution of wealth is a condition of membership in the Kingdom of God, the question of the Christian imperative of communism seems cut-and-dry. The question, which Miranda identifies as raised by critics of Communism, is whether that kingdom is to be actualized on Earth in the form of a communist society or in some other world.

Whether the Kingdom of God will be built on Earth or if believers will be taken to the Kingdom of God in Heaven is relevant to the question of Marxism and Christianity’s consistency in that it determines how we respond to the communist imperative explored

¹⁸ Acts 5:3-4

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Luke 14:33

above. Critics of communism use the argument that the Kingdom of Heaven is to be realized in Heaven to justify (metaphorically) not laying their possessions and wealth at the feet of the apostles. They argue that while communism may be the condition of the Kingdom of God, that Kingdom is to be realized in the next life, and as such communism can be embraced then but not for now. This argument faces two important problems: first, that based on what is written in the Bible it seems much more likely that the Kingdom is to be on Earth; and second, the importance of the inevitability of judgement day before the righteous are taken to the Kingdom of God before in heaven. Miranda directs us to Jesus' parable of the weeds to disprove this, and it brings together both arguments.²¹ In it, Jesus compares the Earth to a field which has been sowed with both weeds and wheat, in which Jesus has sowed the wheat (good people) and Satan has sowed the weeds (evil people). Judgement day is the harvest: those working on the farm in its case, or angels in the case of judgement day, are sent to harvest both the weeds and the wheat, but told to burn the weeds.²² Jesus here makes the argument that the Kingdom is to be on Earth; Earth is the land upon which both He and Satan sowed their seed, and on Judgement Day angels come to Earth for harvest, and to burn the weeds. In Matthew 13:41-42, this process is described as one in which "the Son of Man will send out his angels, and they will weed out of his kingdom everything that causes sin and all who do evil. They will throw them into the blazing furnace, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth."²³ The Angels are weeding out God's Kingdom, which was planted on Earth by Jesus. The second problem for the transcendence argument lies in that it does not assume the importance of Judgement Day: the wicked are to be thrown into the fire, and if it is true that communism is the grace of God, capitalists in exploiting workers and accumulating wealth resisted God's grace and caused the suffering of untold numbers for their own benefit. Whether the Kingdom of God is to be actualized on Earth or in Heaven is irrelevant, then, because those people in all likelihood will not be taken to the Kingdom of God in Heaven; after all, they cannot be expected to give up private property in the next life if they couldn't bring themselves to do it when they were given a chance.

²¹ Miranda, *Communism in the Bible*, pp. 13-14.

²² Matthew 13:36-43

²³ Ibid. 41-42

The Christian critique of Marxism as too concerned with the material deserves to be discussed not because of its theological merit or explanatory power, but because it is one of the few points that criticizes Marxist theory rather than the way communism was being executed at the time outlined in the “Decree Against Communism.” Miranda explicitly answers this argument in *Communism in the Bible*; he directs us to Matthew 25:34-36, in which Jesus tells the righteous “come, you who are blessed by my Father; take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me.”²⁴ We see in this that *every condition* established by Jesus as the reason the righteous are saved is connected to their charity (what they give up so that others may suffer less,) which was explained above as being inextricable from Marxism in the biblical context. The connection to charity is further substantiated when those to be saved ask Jesus when they did those things for him, and he replies that “truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.”²⁵ Those sent to Hell on Judgement Day are those who did not follow what Jesus outlined; after all, as we explored above, the righteous are those to be rewarded on the day of judgement *because* they gave to the needy. As such, there is little argument to be made that communism or Marxist thought could be “too concerned with the material;” the conditions of salvation are material. Let us not forget that the redistribution of wealth is considered in the Bible to be the grace of God; the “Decree Against Communism” contradicts and attacks what was already canon.

Having examined why Christian critics of Marxist thought find it to be inconsistent with their own, we now turn to examine why Marxist critics of Christianity find the two ideologies to be incompatible. The most obvious starting point is Marx himself – in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, he argues that:

²⁴ Miranda, *Communism in the Bible*, pp. 4.; Matthew 25:34-36

²⁵ Matthew 25:40

Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness. To call on them to give up their illusions about their condition is to call on them to give up a condition that requires illusions. The criticism of religion is, therefore, in embryo, the criticism of that vale of tears of which religion is the halo.²⁶

A common misreading holds that when Marx refers to religion as “the opium of the people,” he levels an aggressive attack on religion as directly oppressive or complicit with capitalism. While this complicity exists, it seems fairly clear in Marx’s writing that Religion itself does is not some institution oppressing the proletariat; rather, it is a response to capitalism on the part of the working class. Living in a system which thrives on their exploitation, religion provides a point of solace; it is the “heart of a heartless world,” and in the same way an Opium addict may use it to cope with their pain, so the workers use to cope with the pain of exploitation. Marx thinks this is an ineffective response to capitalism because it does not change the conditions causing that pain, hence his juxtaposition of illusory and real happiness. As Denis Janz puts it in *World Christianity and Marxism*, “religion in the end is a symptom, the pus of diseased world, [and] the fever of a sick society.”²⁷ This need not be so. Christianity along the lines of Biblical Communism, beginning at the assumption that abolition of private property and redistribution of wealth is God’s grace, and that to enter the Kingdom of God one must be willing to enter a communist society, should function more as cocaine than as opium. Some argue that to overturn the existing social order, one must destroy religion – according to Dale Vree’s work *On Synthesizing Marxism and Christianity*, for instance, Marx’s critique of religion holds that we must reject “the world of the present, the alleged goodness of that world, and the goodness of that world, and the God who allegedly

²⁶ Marx, *Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, pp. 1.

²⁷ Denis R. Janz, *World Christianity and Marxism* (New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998), pp. 12.

created and sustains that world,” because “if there were a God he would have to be an evil God to have created and sustained such a wretched world.”²⁸ This argument falls apart in the face of Biblical Communism and the Bible’s understanding of communism as the grace of God. That evil exists in the world is a fundamental fact of Christianity – it creates the necessity for Jesus to come again to judge the living and the dead. The question, then, is how we respond to evil; the answer is the revolution. The revolution need not be secular – if we strip Biblical Communism of its arguments about the construction of the Kingdom of God, we are left with Communism as Marxists conceptualize it. Christianity itself is not oppressive in the view of Marxists; it is the way it acts as a palliative that causes the masses to be complicit in their own oppression. However, if Christianity is used to mobilize rather than soothe the masses – if the working class are taught that they can construct the Kingdom of God on Earth and in doing so stop their exploitation, communist revolution should follow. This is especially true given that we are told in the book of Titus that “the grace of God has appeared that offers salvation to all people. It teaches us to say “No” to ungodliness and worldly passions, and to live self-controlled, upright and godly lives in this present age.” Communism, then (the grace of God), “offers salvation to all people,” and Christians are taught to “say ‘No’ to ungodliness” (capitalism).²⁹ Christianity has incredible political power in and of itself, after all. As Engels put it, Christianity “brought the Roman Empire into subjection and dominated by far the larger part of civilized humanity for 1800 years.”³⁰ Having examined the consistency of Christian and Marxist ideas and some of their reciprocal critiques, then, we turn to the question of what a Christianity consistent with Marxism would look like in the modern world.

Liberation theology emerged in the twentieth century as a theology consistent with Marxism intended to meet the demand for a Christianity that could genuinely focus on the plight of the oppressed. As Leonardo and Clodovis Boff, two of the original proponents of liberation theology, put it in their book *Introducing Liberation Theology*,

²⁸ Dale Vree, *On Synthesizing Marxism and Christianity* (New York: Wiley, 1976), pp. 126.

²⁹ Titus 2:11-14

³⁰ David McLellan, *Marxism and Religion: A Description and Assessment of the Marxist Critique of Christianity* (Houndmills, England, 1987), pp. 39.

“liberation theology was born when faith confronted the injustice done to the poor.”³¹ Liberation theologians call for the use of Christianity as an upper rather than opium in much the same way as the previous paragraph, arguing that in the poor Christians should see the face of Christ, referencing Matthew 25:31-36 (explained above – that Jesus rewards the righteous for doing Justice to him by doing justice to others) to argue that in the face of massive poverty, hunger, and death “what is needed is not so much contemplation as effective action for liberation. The Crucified needs to be raised to life. We are on the side of the poor only when we struggle alongside them against the poverty that has been unjustly created and forced on them.”³² This is not to say that we, those who suffer less, should lead the vanguard; as Gustavo Gutierrez writes in *A Theology of Liberation*, “the process of liberation requires the active participation of the oppressed; this certainly is one of the most important themes running through the writings of the Latin American church;” as such, the sort of Christian proletarian vanguard described previously, that uses religion as a motivator rather than as a coping mechanism, is an important aspect of Liberation Theology.³³ As such, the role of the pastor is, according to the Boffs, to be both an “organic intellectual” and a “militant theologian,” with “one foot in centers of study, but their other foot ... in the community.”³⁴ This is what we see in Peter’s Kingdom of God on Earth; the apostles have a foot in their centers of study, in that they are dedicated to better understanding and expounding the word of the Lord, but also have a foot in their community, redistributing wealth and aiding in the enactment of justice where justice is due (as in the case of Ananias). That is not to say liberation theology is defined by some group of religious elite guiding uneducated masses; quite the opposite. According to Boff, liberation theology is found “at the base” of the community, “in any slum, shantytown, or rural parish,” because it is defined in large part by its presence “there alongside the people, speaking, listening, asking questions, and being asked questions.”³⁵ The members of a

³¹ Leonardo Boff and Clodovis Boff, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (Tunbridge Wells (Kent): Burns and Oates, 1992), pp. 3.

³² *Ibid.* pp. 4.

³³ Gustavo Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1973), pp. 113.

³⁴ Boff and Boff, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, pp. 19.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

community and their reflections on their own faith and the implications of those reflections are hugely important in Liberation Theology, and serve to democratize it to an extent largely unseen in religious institutions such as the modern Catholic Church.

As such, the teachings of Christianity and Marxism can be aligned perfectly well, as their eschatology is nearly identical: in Christianity, the eventual end of history is a Kingdom of God on Earth, and for Marxism that end is communism. As we have explored in this paper, those two ends of history turn out to be very similar, with the Christian view of society appearing to be one which has abolished private property and distributed wealth according to need in much the same way as communism would generally be understood to. The question of how that eschatology can be fulfilled, and thus how Christianity and communism can be aligned, has no absolute answer. However, this paper finds that the Theology of Liberation put forth by such thinkers as Leonardo and Clodovis Boff and Gustavo Gutierrez offers a strong conceptual approach to how the two schools of thought can be combined moving forward.

Bibliography

Ambrosius, Aurelius. "On First Corinthians." Speech. Accessed March 7, 2017.

<http://www.catholicsocialteaching.org.uk/themes/human-dignity/resources/encyclical-statements-poverty-2/>.

Boff, Leonardo, and Clodovis Boff. *Introducing Liberation Theology*. Tunbridge Wells (Kent): Burns and Oates, 1992.

Introduction to Liberation theology written by two of the most well-known advocates of the theory. Brings together Christian thought and advocacy for solidarity with the poor.

Chrysotom, John. "Homily 12 on First Timothy." Speech. Accessed March 7, 2017.

<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/230612.htm>.

Gill, Robin. *Textbook of Christian Ethics*. 3rd ed. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

This book has been useful for figuring out the context of quotes from homilies and other Christian writing not part of the Bible- in particular, it was useful in reading Marx and the Bible.

Gutierrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1973.

I read this as well as *Introducing Liberation Theology* to introduce myself to the theory,

and from there plan to move to more nuanced analysis of its interaction with Marxism.

Janz, Denis R. *World Christianity and Marxism*. New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998.

Janz argues that Christianity's encounter with Marxist thought transformed it and changed how we understand it- useful for this paper because it helps address the question of how a school of thought expounding that "religion is the opiate of the masses" can be made consistent with religious thought.

MacIntyre, Alasdair C. *Marxism & Christianity*. London: Duckworth, 2001.

Argues that Marxism functions in part by taking and using ideas from Christianity. Didn't directly quote but affected ideas/the development of my argument.

Marx, Karl. *Alienated Labor*. Committee for Marxist Direction, 1844.

In *Alienated Labor*, Marx explains his theory of the alienation/estrangement of labor and the way that it's a constitutive element of private property. This matters for my paper because alienation and private property are both central to drawing connections to Judeo-Christian Morality.

Marx, Karl. *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Translated by Joseph O'Malley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.

McClarey, Donald R. "Feast of Saint Joseph the Worker and Victims of Communism Day – The American Catholic." *The American Catholic*. May 1, 2013. Accessed March 7, 2017.

<http://the-american-catholic.com/2013/05/01/victims-of-communism-day-2/>.

Page includes the text of the Decree Against Communism, used to quote

McLellan, David. *Marxism and Religion: A Description and Assessment of the Marxist Critique of Christianity*. Houndmills, England, 1987.

Explores the Marxist critique of religion- in doing research I realized I had focused too much on making Marxism and Christianity consistent and not enough on answering the Marxist counter-argument. As such, I found a book that explores that counter-argument in more detail.

Miranda, Jose P. *Marx and the Bible: A Critique of the Philosophy of Oppression*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1974.

Miranda references Christian canon including the bible and homilies as justification for Marxist ideas, intending to illustrate the possible consistency of the two. Miranda was a well-known advocate of Christian communism and a professor.

Miranda, Jose Porfirio. *Communism in the Bible*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1982.

Have yet to read this- I found it after reading *Marx and the Bible* by Miranda and doing some research on his background and other work.

Turner, Denys. *Marxism and Christianity*. Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1983.

Chosen largely out of curiosity because Turner more recently wrote a biography of St.

Thomas Aquinas and I was curious as to whether her past work on Marxism would bring him into the fold.

Vree, Dale. *On Synthesizing Marxism and Christianity*. New York: Wiley, 1976.