

## If You Want to Know Read the *Manifesto!*

By ALEXANDER M. GOLDFINGER

**T**WO men, Karl Marx and Lord Keynes, wrote books which have so influenced current thought that even in this country we find millions of people concurring on government control, distribution of products, etc. All this stems from Karl Marx.

The leaders in the Soviet Union are thoroughly imbued with the philosophy of Marx, and if we also were familiar with his writings we could understand certain actions and stalemates at the General Assembly of the United Nations, the various "treaty conferences" and more recently the Berlin conference. We might even discover that we were rather naive to believe that agreements could ever be made with the followers of Marx.

The psychological caliber of Karl Marx is now fairly generally understood—a brief outline will recall his personality to mind. He came from a middle class German family and was rather precocious, but his radical ideas caused him to be expelled from college. He fled to Paris where, without knowledge of the French language, he joined himself to other radicals and spoke against the government. Soon the authorities sent out a warrant for his arrest. Again he fled, arriving in London, penniless, again a stranger to the country and the language.

He turned to writing for a living and tried unsuccessfully to become a newspaper man. Throughout the remainder of his life, conditions did not change much for him. He rented two dirty rooms which became his home and the home of his family. One firmly convinced disciple, Frederick Engels, seems to have been his sole support.

The frustration and disappointments are easily recognizable in all his books. These are not objective documents, but are frankly propaganda, replete with loaded language. Marx

haunted the libraries in London and read literally everything. He was particularly influenced by Hegel who believed the world was dynamic, not static, and that any change was always for the better. Marx believed that the life (ideals and manners) of any people is governed by the way in which they produce their livelihoods.



Fawcett in The Providence Journal  
"From seeds of discontent."  
—Reprinted with permission

Alexander M. Goldfinger, Dean of the New Jersey Henry George School, maintains that for any who will take the trouble to read the writings of Karl Marx there can seldom be any doubt as to the outcome of such conferences as the one recently held in Berlin. The article on this page is a portion of an address given at the Henry George School in New York early in February, before it was announced in the press that "the position of those who thought we could deal with Russia was not correct."

The old methods contain the germ of new ones and old groups will come in conflict with new ones.

Karl Marx traced man's development by stages—from nomads to shepherds to farmers. Under the feudal economy men worked the soil as serfs of the feudal lord, but with the introduction of machinery he indicates a marked change. He said the conflict between the bourgeoisie and proletariat (two words of which he was very fond) could not be resolved until the workers used revolutionary methods and established themselves as supreme. Nothing could be resolved around a conference table because there could be no compromise!

It is certainly not surprising, in view of this, that Soviet leaders today who honestly accept Marx's dictum, should steadily refuse to compromise. One can even see how they could persuade themselves they were doing the "proletarian world" a favor by refusing to stop at anything less than a revolution.

Marx borrowed liberally from Ricardo in reaching his conclusions. Without thinking through Ricardo's concept of value, he accepted it as the labor time socially necessary to produce (under normal conditions of production, and with average condition of skill prevalent to the time). Eventually he had to account for skilled labor, but called it only simple labor intensified or multiplied. George's concept of value is not the time necessary to produce, but the time saved in not having to produce. Once we understand the Marxian concept of value, the rest falls into place like a jigsaw puzzle.

Marx said the value of labor power is determined by the cost of its production, the cost of producing it being the cost of maintaining the laborer at that time. From this he set forth his theory of surplus value. If the laborer produces a product but gets only half of it, the rest of the value of the product is surplus value (and stolen from him). A businessman employs one or two men and steals part of their products, which is surplus value and buys more machinery to employ more men so he can continue stealing part of their product.

### Marx versus George

Marx believed every advance in chemistry enhanced surplus value, Henry George said it enhanced the share of rent.

Marx made no clear distinction between land and capital. He said there was some distinction but "it was hard to see."

In a chapter on money in society, the author of *Das Kapital* and *The Communist Manifesto* says the circulation of a commodity is the beginning of capital. He conceded that it was necessary to make a three-cornered deal and in-

(Continued on Page Three, Column One)

(Continued from Page One)

clude a middle-man, and he knew money played an important function. He said however, that instead of money being used merely to facilitate exchange, it had become the goal and end result of the capitalist system—men bought on the market so they could use the product as the means of getting more money than they started with. He believed any income derived from capital was exploited from labor.

If a farmer used a machine for production that was all right, according to Marx, but if he hired a workman the machine became capital and the increment derived from use of it was surplus value. After a machine is bought, then capital uses labor by supplying labor with better tools, so it (capital) can produce more and steal more.

Marx described how advantageous it is for five men to work together rather than separately, but he thought this was an advantage only to the capitalist. Said Marx, the more you have been producing, the larger will be the surplus value.

Now for "The Secret of Primitive Accumulation," as outlined by Marx. How did capital start? Not, to be sure, because one person was more thrifty or industrious than another. He insisted that capital takes away from labor the means to produce. Marx tells graphically about men being driven to the soil as serfs, but seems to understand all along that where there is free land, people will not be kept down.

### Access to Land

In the final chapter "Modern Theory of Colonization" he makes note of the prosperity in the Colonies where free land was available. Seeing that men ceased to become wage earners and became individual landowners in the States, he closed his book *Das Kapital* with the statement, "When men have access to land, there will never be exploitation."

Marx believed that the production of wealth as practised would inevitably be replaced by a better and higher system, and that nations with the most industrialization would be the first to succumb to socialism. Revolt was the only way to bring it about. Force, he said, is the midwife that gives birth to a new society.

Now imagine for a moment that you are a resident of Soviet Russia. If you believed Marx's formula would lead to a better way of life for the U. S. and Great Britain, wouldn't you help in any way you could to bring it sooner? Isn't it clear why many Russians espouse fifth columns? Might it not be consistent with their thinking for them to feel sure they were the benefactors? Would they try to live in peace with their neighbors, trade freely, and let each other alone if they really believed in Marx? No, they are traitors if they do not use force or any other device possible, to prolong all peace treaties and conferences.

Stalin wrote that morality and religion are used by the industrial system to keep the proletariat in its place, and that truth telling is merely a weapon used to benefit the capitalists. Stalin said the Communists would not be bound by such out-moded morality but would use expediency, protesting friendship at times in order to deliver a stab in the back.

Soviet actions in the last 20 years prove rather conclusively how firmly they must believe that the end justifies the means.

How naive can we get?