

Critically compare
and contrast karl
marx's attack on
capitalism with susan
mendu...



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Capitalism and Individualism Karl Marx, the founder of Socialism attacked the system of Capitalism as one that generates inequality and causes recessions. He saw it as a system that deepens the rift between the social classes by accumulating more wealth for the rich and sidelining the majority, who possess the actual labor power to ensure that the mode of production is maintained. According to Marx, the upper classes that exploit the poor, are the bourgeois and he supported the empowering of the proletariat - the working masses. In this way, social equality would be the result.

In a similar way, Susan Mendus also rejects individualism on the basis that “the language of domination and subordination is a central factor to individualism”. She also argues for equality between men and women, believing that individualism does not generate equality (Mendes 1993). She equates the individualists to the bourgeois, who elevate themselves at the expense of others.

Marx states that a person’s spirituality is the labor power he has. He argues that a case of alienation develops when man is deprived of the opportunity to exercise this labor power. He believes that religion is the “ opium of the masses” and states that religion is the response of the oppressed person, trying to find heart in a heartless world and the soul of soulless conditions (Marx 1970). He views religion as the means by which people try to deal with social inequalities. Mendus on the other hand, believes that religion is brainwashing to make people believe in certain things, but merely because they espouse such beliefs, it does not necessarily indicate that they are true. She believes that applying moral rules to love and relationships is basically flawed.(Mendus 1996). While Marx believes religion is purely palliative and

<https://assignbuster.com/critically-compare-and-contrast-karl-marxs-attack-on-capitalism-with-susan-mendus-attack-on-individualism-how-would-ward-churchill-evaluate-their-arguments/>

does not achieve anything constructive, Mendus on the other hand states that individualism cannot serve the cause of religion or the common good. Ward Churchill launches an attack on the “ pious” Christians of America who have been at the forefront of their leaders’ war initiatives, unleashing death and destruction upon the less fortunate world. (Churchill 2001). He would perhaps agree with Marx, who viewed religion as the opium that drugs the majority, so that they can be led to their slaughter. Similarly, religion is also functioning as the opium that dulls the individual American’s ability to think clearly and rationally about the concepts of equality and justice among people. Marx’s views on the power of the proletariat are relevant here, because it is the collective dulling of the American proletariat that has resulted in the human rights abuses by their leaders, which in turn has widened the gap between America and the less fortunate nations – the gap between rich and poor. Churchill would also support Mendus’ tirade against individualism, because this is the vehicle that thrives on domination and subordination. Terror and retribution is the result of the widening social gap between developed and developing countries, through oppression of the masses by those in power. According to Marx, religion is the opium which people use to cope with the social gap. Churchill would support the truth of Marx’s views because it is religion that is being seized as the opium by Islamic terrorists in order to redress the social inequalities. The inequalities that exist between men and women as a result of individualism, which Mendus condemns, is also the cause for the atrocities unleashed on the weaker sections of the population. Churchill would support Mendus and Marx’s antipathy to religion and he would support their view that religion is

an agent of prejudice and evil, especially when deceitful religious leaders propagate false messages to the majority.

References:

* Churchill, Ward (2001). "Some people push back: On the Justice of roosting chickens"

[Online] Available at: <http://www.kersplebedeb.com/mystuff/s11/churchill.html>;

accessed 11/28/2005.

* Marx, Karl. (1843, 1970) "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right"

Cambridge University

Press.

* Mendus, Susan. (1993). "Kant: An honest but narrow minded Bourgeois?"

Farzaneh. The

Journal of Women's studies and research in Iran and Muslim countries. Vol 1, No: 1.

[Online] Available at: <http://www.farzanehjournal.com/archive/Download/abs2n1.doc>;

com/archive/Download/abs2n1.doc;

accessed 11/28/2005

* Mendus, Susan (1996) "Some Mistakes About Impartiality," Political

Studies 44, 319-327.