

Communism NEVER Scientific

"Scientific Communism Disproved," your leading caption for June, looks like a concession that communism could have been scientific until a "disproof" was developed. It seems to me that the caption, without reference to the Oppenheimer text, invites a brief analysis from the Georgian standpoint perhaps as an offset to the usual Marxian confusion. Communism could never have been scientific since it proposes community expropriation of privately owned wealth, whereas science, being the formulation of natural

law, demands that ownership shall follow production or creation.

On the other hand, if communism could rid itself of the Marxian fallacy it could become scientific by taking on the Georgian interpretation of *application to community values only*. And then no "disproof" would be needed. So communism is in the position of being disproved in its own house; and by yielding to the common trait of overreaching, in demanding all when only half is due.

Communism is entitled to the epithet it has coined for individualism, for the word "rugged" applies equally. Each wants all when only half is due. Rugged communism will yield nothing substantial to the individual, while the same type of individualist—the Bourbon standpatter—does not know the word "social."

The drawing in of these extremes is the work of *Economic Democracy*; and, referring to the Oppenheimer writings in general, of which "Scientific Communism Disproved" is typical, there seems so much to do to make this obvious reconciliation, that going over Marxian ground in such finetooth detail seems a sabotage of time and opportunity. The reason why we need to entertain such fallacy as communism in its many forms and degrees, from the New Deal to the Comintern, is our modern "riddle of the Sphinx." The answer is that our system has broken down because our rugged element dominated and "social" was taboo. This brings a protest vote of 27,000,000 who, not knowing causes, back frank experiments—say \$300 billion dollars worth—including another world war. The breakdown also opens the doors to real communism using its two great weapons of unionism and New Dealism.

If there is anything in the Oppenheimer type of discussion that trends towards waking communism up to its opportunity of divesting itself of its "ruggedness" or unscientific demand for private property and wealth, it should be fostered. The opportunity is there, and I have not rid myself of the hope that some day some collectivist leader like Thomas or Sinclair will see the obvious and make communism valid, and thus put its hosts behind a valid individualism, since they will then be equals.

New York

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL