Be that as it may (and therein lies a long, long story), the Marxist doctrine is opposed to every nausea ad nauseam by our old friend, the quondam dyspeptic and sometimes wondrous-wise Carlyle. Perhaps you will recall these lines from "On Heroes and Hero-Worship": "... the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at bottom the history of the Great Men who have worked here. They were the leaders of men, these great ones; the modellers, patterns, and in a wide sense creators, of whatsoever the general mass of men contrived to do or attain; all things that we see standing accomplished in the world are the practical realization and embodiment, of thoughts that dwelt in the Great Men sent into the world: the soul of the whole world's history, it may justly be considered, as the history of these." Strong words! Yet not too strong for Carlyle. Here was a man who relished his conclusions and who, apparently, could not resist the temptation to reveal in his own written word.

But if we take Carlyle with a grain of salt, it is only fitting at the same time to seek for the soul of truth in Marx. That is, it were wise not to allow Carlyle's engrossing self-assurance to prove too seductive, nor Marx's consciousness to become too forbidding. The happy medium, and possibly the simple truth is that the world is, in its inscrutability, working toward a natural goal; that goal means to be supreme abundance and extreme heterogeneity; and that in the course of events great men appear to fulfill special roles in this natural process. However, the same as there are blights in nature which often at a single blow, destroy years of careful construction, so in the world of men there are Hitlers, Stalins and Mussolins who destroy, distort and hinder.

Fortunately there are also Georgists—not many of them, of course, but enough to shed light and spread inspiration, to the end that one may reasonably hope for a happy outcome of the present world imbroglio.

Socrates believed that virtue consisted of knowledge—that is, knowledge of what is right. The evil that men do is attributable, according to his doctrine, to their lack of understanding of what is right and their consequent failure to distinguish between good and its opposite. Perhaps you have noticed that Henry George, too, has a great failure in the power of knowledge. "Until there be correct thought," he said, "there cannot be right action; and when there is correct thought, right action will follow." His optimism is shared by a good many present day Georgists—and also by a number of schismatic Marxist groups, as well as by innumerable bodies of "idealists." The colloquial phrase, "Believe me!" is a serious imperative in every social appeal, for every reformer believes, in the spirit of Max Stirner, that "my truth is the truth!"

You will find no yardstick in the U. S. Bureau of Standards by which to measure and establish the acceptability of ideas. Nor can there be, until such a yardstick is forthcoming, social movements will have to stake their final success on more aggregative efforts than the development of slow educational processes.

Which leads me, quite deviously, to a little book entitled "Hunger and Work" (by Jurgen Kuczynski, International Publishers, $1.50), for in this volume the author adduces statistics which prove, statistically, that millions of members of the "working class" in Great Britain are undernourished (the fact did not have to be proved realistically) and deduces, not too connectedly, that the years to come may bring "progress"—under pressure of mass action in a Popular Front.

Of course anyone with half an eye open will recognize in such phraseology the trade mark of the communist "line," and since the Communist movement has become predominantly political (as opposed to philosophic), it is doing but simple justice to make exceptional allowances for the language of the hothouses. But once we have done that, it is only sensible to attempt a penetration into deeper principles. What is the meaning of this undernourishment of Englishmen? How does Mr. Kuczynski, who is introduced to his readers as "a noted Marxist economist," explain this contradiction: an increased productivity, which he is careful to point out, and a decreased relative reward to labor?

Karl Marx would turn in his grave could he but read the author’s answer! Indeed, the patriotism of "scientific" socialism would take on the appearance of a whirring derision were he able to note the innumerable conflicting interpretations bespoken in his name.

I quote Mr. Kuczynski: "Unemployment was low as long as society was ruled by progressive forces. (Scl!) These progressive forces were represented during the greater part of the nineteenth century by pure capitalist bourgeois society. To-day the progressive forces are represented by labor and still a considerable part of the bourgeoisie, chiefly the petty and middle bourgeoisie. There is no doubt that a Government corresponding in its composition and its backing, let us say to the first Blum Government, i.e. to the first Popular Front Government in France, backed by wage workers, the blackout workers, the small farmers, tradesmen, craftsmen, a considerable part of the above, and a fair sprinkling of the middle bourgeoisie, could reduce unemployment to an low a level as prevailed usually in the nineteenth century."

Books like "Hunger and Work" prove graphically how common it is to interpret significant facts insignificantly.