

ANTIDOTE FOR COMMUNISM ON AND OFF THE CAMPUS

By NOAH D. ALPER
President,
Public Revenue Education Council

S-1148

The following article reached our desk and elicited in our minds so many questions that we thought we would like to present it to our readers. This is written as one man's antidote to a disease that may destroy the very existence we have in this hemisphere. We are asking our readers to let us have their opinions on this article.—The Editor.

Since Communism is said to attract much of its leadership from the wealthier and better educated strata of society, which so largely accounts for its acceptance, the question is often raised: Can we either defeat or prevent Communism by political and social programs designed to raise living standards in areas where this ideology threatens? Some years ago in a column entitled, "The Growth of Empires," George E. Sokolsky, a man of unusual and significant experience with Communists and Communism, expressed the opinion that such a program "would not drive off the Communist menace." Admitting the appalling low economic standards of living in many countries, Mr. Sokolsky said that "This does not explain why in every country, the Communist Party does not emerge from the masses but from the middle classes and intellectuals."

Why Communist leadership is largely derived from these more favored and better educated classes has been widely discussed by anti-Communist writers and others. In a booklet, "Communist . . . tactics . . . strategy . . . objectives," prepared by a special committee of the American Bar Association and reprinted from the Congressional Record by America's Future, Inc., of New Rochelle, N. Y., we read: "Communism does not originate with the poor, the uneducated, the exploited, or the working class. Every major world Communist figure who became a Communist did so as a student intellectual, materialistic in philosophy and anti-elastic in faith."

American Opinion, Belmont 76, Massachusetts, in a booklet, "Why People Become Communists," gives a number of reasons for this defection from the Freedom-Way of our forefathers and its Free Enterprise system of economy. Among these is that Communism has "an appeal to the idealism of its prospective converts." Then we read: "For historically—though not currently—this has been the movement's greatest drawing card."

Other reasons given for affiliation with Communism are the desire to "belong," "snobbery"—to be considered intellectual, "The Green Sickness" (envy), desire for power, promotion and higher pay due to Communist influence, fear of exposure because of habits of perverse nature or a criminal past, and a capacity to hate.

There is no need or intent to deny that Communists use these methods and appeals, or that anti-Communist aims are achieved through publicizing such information. Yet, a most serious question does arise. Are we failing to inquire into and to emphasize more basic and important reasons for the emergence of Communism in our country and in the world? Why don't we make anti-Communism more constructive and, at the same time, much more effective? Isn't it possible that we can do more to condition our country for such natural and vital economic and social health that this will serve as an antidote to the emergence of Communism, just as the sanitation we can achieve serves to prevent infestation of our communities by rats, flies and mosquitos, and the ills these pests can cause?

In this presentation we wish to consider two main ideas: One, that "the appeal of Communism to the idealism of its prospective converts" is not only historically but is in fact, Communism's greatest drawing card today, and two, that serious faults

in basic economic education have made it impossible to give students and others a satisfactory explanation of why Free Enterprise, as a system, has seemingly failed to ward-off or prevent the existence of and stimulate increase in social problems which stunt the growth of Communism. These problems have multiplied in spite of our material and scientific progress which should naturally reduce them. Furthermore, economic education, even as given in the more conservative schools and by private groups concerned with these problems, does not explain why there is so much intellectual acceptance of the idea of the decadence and obsolescence of Free Enterprise; and why there is increasing faith in the social-political trends that make up the Paternalistic or Welfare Statist patterns of social action now being coercively imposed upon us by our own Government. Truth-seeking students are really compelled either to accept the New Economics social-welfare type of answers, or to find more scientific answers than those given in the great majority of our economic and social studies courses, in and out of schools.

Today, education in our schools and churches, and through the publicity of "United Funds" and other welfare organizations, conditions our young people to feel strong and generous sympathy for the depressed economic classes. Such education often makes the children of some rich families ashamed of how their family fortunes were acquired and to feel a need to atone for this unfairly secured wealth. Thus, without seeking to understand the very privileges which so often gives great wealth and power to a few, they seek to atone by redistributing the "loot" with good "causes," both privately supported and paid for by taxes.

While church and school, and other social or educational groups, have produced commendable charitable impulses in our people they have signally failed to give them, or even to specifically encourage them, to seek, more understanding of the causes and remedies for these seemingly insoluble problems. For example, what are called Economics or Economic Principles courses, as generally offered, have failed to explain in any acceptable way why, in spite of man's unlimited wants for wealth and services, and the existence of ample land space and natural resource matter, together with man's increasing scientific achievements in producing capital equipment and teaching labor skills, millions of our people, both willing and able to work—and many do work hard and save what they can—are in dire need. In depression years this condition is both more widespread and more intense.

Our youth is not satisfied with the answers of those "Conservatives" who, when they had the political power in their hands, failed to prevent the development of Paternalism, or Welfare Statism, or of Communism—a failure that prevented us from becoming a world model of Free Enterprise as we might have been. They do not want to go back to the same policies which produced so many problems and the current futile solutions. Furthermore, they are dissatisfied with the modern economic doctrines of those known as Liberals and Progressives who attempt to conjure up schemes of social and political planning whose purpose is limited to achieving various degrees of coexistence with evils, with little or no serious effort given to seeking out and eliminating causes through truly scientific inquiry, which would of certainly lead to corrective actions. Thus, multitudes of these "educated" young peo-

ple are falsely led to believe that many of our distressing and unsocial conditions are natural to Free Enterprise and that nothing can be done about them within the framework of that system. On the other hand, because social problems grew in numbers and magnitude under the various "deals" of so-called Liberals and Progressives, many have come to the conclusion that they have only been liberal with other people's money and progressive like a cancer.

What hope have students (and others) of achieving a just and scientific analysis of Free Enterprise from the Marxist advocates of the public ownership and operation of the "Instruments of Production"—Land, Capital, and the controlled direction of Labor—(the one really hard core or hub principle of their economic and materialistic social philosophy)? We can be certain there is no chance at all. Some young people are bound to hear such reasonable sounding, easily grasped slogans as the following: "Production for use and not for profit." What a ground-gainer this has been for the Socialist-Communist cause! "From each according to ability, to each according to need"—another winner. How human and Christian-like this "brotherhood" doctrine sounds! What a familiar and home-like appeal it has since the churches, many private schools, and leaders of good "causes" and "crusades" seek, and expect to raise their money on a voluntary basis of "ability to pay." Yet, how utterly unchristian are the coercive actions of Government as it seeks to apply this principle by use of "legalized" force to rob Peter to pay Paul! Another socialistic slogan that dupes many people is this: "Employees should earn more than they are paid, else how could an employer make a profit."

A vital fact that far too many anti-Communists fail to emphasize is that the Freedom-system of economy is the one system that can produce and has produced, in so far as it has been allowed by Governmental interference to do so, a thriving, world-wide "commune" of people serving one another. This takes the form of a free, voluntary, peacefully cooperating people-to-people society, knitted at the grass roots level by the will and actions of the people themselves. This universal and natural "cooperative" in which each and all can participate, is founded on one of the greatest moral-social principles of all times and on the natural basis of effective Civilization—"Association in Equality." This means all are to have equal natural opportunity to produce and to retain privately what they produce; that none shall have a special privilege to legally "loot" another in any way.

Such a naturally produced voluntary organization of people, both within and between nations, must and will, if allowed to do so, largely by-pass government and its administrators whose principal business now seems to be to prevent such a society from flowing into existence. It is a system of freedom and justice ordained by God, Himself, in the Creation of His Children on this earth, and of their material universe; and in the provision of almost unlimited natural laws which man has grouped into various sciences; and which makes possible man's practically unlimited ability to produce—and to communicate, to trade and to travel and associate together as general and special interests may dictate. Such a voluntary association which is beyond the power of governments or man-planners to organize, is magnificent in scope and means a marvelous projection of free choice and freedom for individual man everywhere. It is self-evident that students and others, with their amazingly fine, sensitive and good impulses developed in school and church, and by association with other social institutions, must somehow be helped to see how a "truly free" Free Enterprise economy unchained by bad tax and other man-made laws, or by conspiracies of organizations of men of like economic self-interest whether termed labor or owner, can evolve such a national and world freedom society.

In recent years many writers on world affairs, as well as a few understanding and informed officials of Government, have pointed out the need for tax and land reform in underdeveloped countries. Historically, this subject is known as "the land question." It is not by any scientific consideration a question of capital. Left festering and unsolved, this land question ultimately produced the revolution in

(Continued on other side)

Tzarist Russia and in the China of the Manchus that led to the establishment of Communism in those "underdeveloped countries."

This land question does not arise because of the custom of allowing private title privilege, the existence of which assures private, exclusive and inheritable use of land—perpetually, and the ownership of all added to it. Actually this right involved in land title; and, under just economic arrangements many more people would possess this privilege. The problem arises from an absolute abuse of this privilege by holders of title to income or speculative income land, not by owners of house lots or owners of hard-work farm land, as a class. The former have misarranged the people's public revenue system so as to secure (and they have secured) far more than their title was originally intended to convey. They seek a peculiar and special profit, not as the result of their labor or by employing labor and capital on land, but by a scheme to pay less in taxes than the privilege is worth to the people generally, through their "agent" government, who do create and earn the rental value of land. The difference is their so-called profit. To do this they must manage to shift the burden of taxation from the *publicly earned* rental value of land to the *privately earned* income of all who labor and provide honest capital. Evidence of the amazing and frightening success of their total propaganda, miseducation, and political pressure tactics is to be seen in the host of non-property (i.e. non-land value) taxes imposed on the people in recent years, such as income, earnings, sales, gasoline, profits, excises, inventory et al. The result is staggering—almost unbelievable—high prices of land, which had no labor or capital cost, and tax-inflated high priced products. Worst of all is the drawing forth, continuing and compounding of the (so-called) social problems which provide unending and appealing propaganda opportunities to the Communists, their fellow travelers, and those who constantly sell Free Enterprise short in favor of Government intervention in the lives and economic affairs of the people. But, equally bad, is the incentive given economists, educators and others, to frame a pattern of tax-education which is, by its nature, both anti-Labor and anti-Capital; and which supports such schemes of getting wealth without producing it for generations on end; and discourages tax-education which would end such economic and moral nonsense.

Communist intellectuals, unlike anti-Communist intellectuals, seemed to understand "the land question" that had been created in countries of Western Civilization and in which many of the more wealthy anti-Communists had a great part. They have taken and now take full advantage of such opportunities to say to the underprivileged denied just and fair access to land all over the world: "We will give you land." That fraud and deceit attached to the promise, since under Communism land was not to be individually owned for productive trade anyway, in no way seriously reduced its effectiveness. The only alternate choice of millions of landless people who wanted private and exclusive use of land was continued exploitation by those who had always exploited them. It was when running away from such situations that the Communists got them.

So effective was this "We will give you land" promise of the Communists that the anti-Communist governments in many countries—South America, Central America, Italy, Japan and others—were forced to hurriedly plan and implement limited schemes for land redistribution by equally immoral and deceitful "agrarian" land reform. These agrarian type land reform schemes, as any economic scientist worthy of the name could foretell, could, at most, benefit only a few—if any—in the long run. These land redistributing countries generously offered to "share" with a few people the worst and least valuable land—the hard-work agricultural land. Land of the urban, industrial and commercial nature, and natural resource land of very special and greater value, was not included in these deals. Yet it is an undoubted truth that all people, including farming people, are exploited far more by the possessors of such land than they could ever be by possessors of farm land—however good it may be. However, even such miserable fragments of "agrarian" land reform produced some good anti-Communism effect,

as in rural Japan where Communist membership in one governmental body fell from a sizeable group to one, after such land redistribution was forced on the Government by the United States during the occupation of Japan.

In spite of all the ancient and modern historical records and practical evidence of glaring economic injustice and social evils in the land tenure system due to faulty tax planning of the countries of Western Civilization, and especially the United States, we have dared suggest that other countries engage in land and tax reforms as a basis of "foreign aid" we might give them. Further, in spite of the facts, most anti-Communist intellectuals and leaders have been able to ignore, or lull and delude students and others, from more basic inquiry into our own failures at reform which have so encouraged Communist penetration and growth. Many people have been led to believe by such people that Communism—State ownership and operation of the means of production—is, under the circumstances, so lacking in economic appeal to the underprivileged and poor of all countries that we would have little to worry about today were it not for some advantage seeking dupes of the middle and upper classes who are Communists or who give aid and support to Communism. It is obvious that the Communist intellectuals have made no such errors.

The general attitude thus induced in anti-Communists or prospective anti-Communists, which leads to all-out fighting of the personnel of Communism and the political power moves of Communism—Welfare Statism or Paternalism—when there is no confession or consideration of our mistakes in our operation of our system—is shamefully unfortunate. It discourages people even from considering the historical and actual economic land basis of Communist appeal. Little or no public consideration is given to understanding how true land and tax reform on a scientific basis, which would result in more private ownership of land, would recondition our country for such amazingly generous new-found efficiency and prosperity, and basic economic justice, that it would attract the people of the world away from the low-quality behemoth Communist system, to one streamlined, effective and free—to one worthy of a free people who have so many times paid the highest price for freedom.

On the other hand, if we fail to improve our system as we so certainly can, we assure an ultimate victory for Socialism or Communism, or at the very least, we will have to coexist with Governmental Paternalism or Welfare-Statism for many generations.

What appeal can we make to our intelligent and truth-seeking youth—and our adults as well—in and out of schools, that can win them forever to Freedom and its essential Free Enterprise economy? Students and most adults are familiar with, and even fascinated by, science and the "Scientific Method" of inquiry; of getting, classifying, testing, and taking action based on verifiable facts. They know this method always works where cause, effect, and so, predictability patterns are involved. They know how well it has worked in the formulative years of all kinds of production—communication, transportation, building, factory production lines, and in the many health and sanitary areas of human needs and experiences. They know this system of progress "wears no man's collar."

Fortunately, there are groups of people with more independent and scientific attitudes who are working to achieve superior results by solutions to particular economic and social problems by the use of the scientific method of inquiry and of economic science principles. This means true growth in a free and non-Marxian evolutionary sense. One day these increasing and presently largely "off-the-Campus" groups will capture the attention of youth and adults of our country, who will thrill at learning that the scientific method can be used in economic and social fields as effectively as in other fields. They will appreciate the important but largely ignored fact, so far as most of today's economists, social and welfare workers, educators and politicians are concerned, that if government was not "caused" by the exploiters of special privilege created by law to do so much harm, it would not be forced to try so hard to do so much to help the people.

These newly educated, or reeducated, liberty loving and freedom seeking people will make correct basic political issues by exposing errors and by proposing ways in which they may be basically corrected. This is essential to achieving true and steady basic prosperity and freedom—freedom based on working with and not against the natural economic and moral laws and free Free Enterprise principles. The politicians will have to accept these principles and solutions or face defeat by those who do. They will no longer be free, as they have been for many years, to buy elections by promising tax-provided benefits or by merely promising economy and tax savings which are seldom delivered; and which would solve no real problems in any case. Enlightened political leadership will be widely available and will replace most of the present political leaders whose stock in trade is largely trapping votes with catch words, and empty or misleading slogans, with a better leadership based on well established, sound principles of economics and morals. When that day comes the Socialist and Communist intellectuals, as well as many of today's Conservatives and Liberals, will wonder what hit them.

Reproduced from News and Views, St. Louis Academy of General Practice, November 1961.

1 copy 10¢, 20 copies, \$1.00,
100 and over 3¢ each, postpaid.

The Public Revenue Education Council is a non-profit, non-political, Missouri, Inc., Federal tax-deductible educational institution. It offers a tax-education program that eliminates taxes and reduces taxation, that:

1. Reveals why TAXES are not SOURCES;
2. Shows there are only TWO BASIC SOURCES;
3. Explains the right source to use and why, to increase jobs, production and real wages.

You can get the basic tax-facts by writing for our free pamphlet: "Wrong-Source Public Revenue; The Greatest Obstacle to Free Private Enterprise and How To Correct It."

Noah D. Alper, President,
Public Revenue Education Council,
Room 308 - 705 Olive Street,
St. Louis 1, Mo. Ch. 1-4350

A LONG NEEDED FREEDOM MISSILE!

"The Effective Answer To Communism and Why You Don't Get It In College."

By Harry G. and Elizabeth R. Brown.

(Dr. H. G. Brown is Professor Emeritus of Economics, University of Missouri)

"Capitalism", says Dr. Brown in this book, "is indeed under heavy attack in a large part of the world. And the college graduates our economics professors have taught are but poorly armed against the bombardment of communist and socialist ideology".

Pocket-Size book. Paper back. 100 pages, 35¢; 3 for \$1.00, postage paid.

Order from: Public Revenue Education Council. Address above.