them upside down, as he called it, and changed them in such a way to make a philosophical basis for his theorizing which he calls dialectical materialism, it rules out God, and divine force, just a world process working and in this world process we have the exploiters who are taking away from the people that which they are producing and we must get rid of the exploiters and let all the people have everything.

Chapel 2. $(\frac{1}{4})$

... more and more of them until the end of-the there will be a few exploiters left and a great many people who have nothing, he called them proletariat, who have nothing, and the would then just take over everything, and everything would be in their hands with hardly any force. But the time came when he thought it would be good to speed the process a little bit, which he thought would come naturally and in 1848, when there was a revolution over in Europe, he issued the Communist Manifesto, which is today the rallying ground of the Communists everywhere, and it ends with the words, Proletariat of all nations, unite, you have nothing to lose but your king. Well, Marx started this but Marx, in my opinion, while very, very important to Communism, is not the real Communist of present-day ommunism. He gave a theory and this theory was studied by many who felt it was extremely brilliant, and thought it described the world just as it is, and showed how things ought to be done, and they claimed there was $(1\frac{1}{2})$ who were the true Marxists among different but Marx was their great matron saint. We have many who claim to follow Marx today but the real/founder of Communism as it is in t the world today is a Russian named Vladimir Ilyithh Ulyanoff, but when he wrote he signed himself Nikolai Lenin so we know him/Lenin. Lenin/from 1870 to 1924, thus you see he was only 13 years old when Marx died, he had no direct contact with Marx but much contact with Marx's writings. But Lenin was a tremendous thinker. Lenin was a man of tremendous ability and Lenin made a contribution to the Communist movement which is beyond what any other man made, he made it by his study, not of Marxism and in my opinion, though he studied that a great deal and presented it in such a way as to make people think he was a great master of it, but by his study of what I would call the