ANTIDOTE FOR COMMUNISM ON AND OFF THE CAMPUS

By NOAH D. ALPER
President,
Public Revenue Education Council

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 athiestic 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 constant increase in social problems which stimulate growth of Communism. These problems have multiplied in spite of our material and scientific progress which should naturally reduce them. Futhermore, 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. Futhermore, 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 certainty lead to corrective actions. Thus, multitudes of these "educated" young people 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 "Implements 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 flowering 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 magnificant 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)