

**College Unbound!: The MRC's Liberty Learning Program**

*"Saving Liberty Requires Knowledge of Its Enemy"*



**[College Unbound!: The MRC's Liberty Learning Program](#)**

**Series 1: Marxism-Collectivism**

**Episode 02: The Intellectual Tactics of Marx**

**Teaching Text**

Part One of this new series shed light on the fact that Karl Marx filled vast tracts of his personal landscape with envy, contempt, and hypocrisy. But how did those troubling qualities become the core of his world-damaging communist ideology, and how have they attracted generations of predatory collectivists?

First and foremost, through Marx's use of envy.

Following in the footsteps of his predecessor, French socialist Jean Jacques Rousseau, Marx in his "Communist Manifesto" attempted to win over and agitate the revolutionary masses by appealing a sense of inequality, that feeling of righteous indignation upon seeing that someone else has more at one's perceived expense.

## **College Unbound!: The MRC's Liberty Learning Program**

*“Saving Liberty Requires Knowledge of Its Enemy”*

It's purely emotional, but Marx grounded that emotional lever in a popular and ill-informed economic concept called the “Labor Theory of Value” to give it more clout — and, the marriage has lasted for nearly two centuries.

This “Labor Theory of Value” is important to understand. Its proponents actually claimed that the worth of something was determined by the *labor* behind making a thing, including all the labor that went into making the underlying tools. And this allowed a propagandist like Marx to appeal to the so-called “worker”, to claim that only those depicted as physical laborers were infusing something with “value”. Thus, by adding up all the effort *he* called work, VOILA, Marx claimed to divine the worth of a product – a worth always allied with the so-called “proletariat” or worker.

But in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century, Austrian economist [Carl Menger](#) shattered that myth by doing something we can do, which is to ask a simple question...

If an artist works ten hours on a sculpture he attempts to sell for \$100.00, but no consumer buys it, how much is it worth?

The answer, clearly, is that it's not worth \$100.00, no matter what the laborer claims.

In fact, as it stands, the unsold piece is worth ZERO.

## **College Unbound!: The MRC's Liberty Learning Program**

*“Saving Liberty Requires Knowledge of Its Enemy”*

It's possible the artist could sell for less, but, thus far, no one has shown that he or she is willing to pay for it.

Menger was right. The principle to remember is that value is determined by the *consumer*, not by the amount of work that went into something. The consumer must agree to buy, the consumer determines the price, and *all human valuation is subjective*.

Which turns Marx's envy tactic on its head.

Indeed. Despite his envy-based claims about “labor” and his attempt to inspire feelings of contempt in the hearts of physical laborers, it's not the supposedly evil “business owner” who runs the economy, it is the *consumer*, who can trade or hold his money at any time. The “owner of the means of production” is at the mercy of the consumer. The market caters to consumers. We're all TRADERS, peacefully offering something one has for something that one *values more*.

The supposedly “evil” employer offers a place to work, tools, and the other resources that his accumulated capital can acquire and that the young worker might not be able to get because he or she has not saved. The worker offers physical or other forms of resources to the employer so the employer can utilize his or her own skills most efficiently.

## **College Unbound!: The MRC's Liberty Learning Program**

*“Saving Liberty Requires Knowledge of Its Enemy”*

And the person seen as the *typical* consumer actually is the final employer – of both the business owner, and his or her staff.

But Marx’s foundation was *envy*, and so he avoided those facts about value, the blessings of the Industrial Revolution, and voluntary trade, in order to portray the worker as exploited, and, in the end, attack private property.

He avoided the fact that the growth of trade in the Industrial Revolution was bringing greater prosperity for all. He avoided the reality that, by the mid-1800s, the Industrial Revolution had all but wiped out the Feudal royal peerage system. And he avoided the fact that the per-capita death rate was plummeting, that wealth and property were no longer functions of corrupt monarchical preference and connections, and that prosperity was becoming a function of success in ideas, hard work, and pleasing customers.

Instead, as Rousseau had done, Marx vindictively called the new business people “The Bourgeoisie”, which is actually derived from the feudal German, “Burgher” — or royally-appointed governor of a town.

Imagine. In criticizing *peaceful market capitalism*, Marx erroneously and unfairly redefined a term that had applied to the *politically privileged royal peers* of FEUDALISM. He made it apply to people who had created their wealth by catering to consumers in a free market. Marx actually made the term “bourgeoisie” apply to the very liberating force that had *brought down* the bourgeoisie!

## ***College Unbound!: The MRC's Liberty Learning Program***

*“Saving Liberty Requires Knowledge of Its Enemy”*

And, in so doing, he preyed on *envy*, giving rise to mass feelings of contempt: a toxic revolutionary culture that thrives in America.

Indeed, it's the same terrible envy and contempt that sees Marxists in Black Lives Matter (BLM) and Antifa transmute possibly valid arguments about police brutality into class warfare, rioting, and calls for more redistribution of wealth.

And it's the same baseless contempt that blinds Marxists from seeing their own hypocrisy.

Imagine, Marxists believe that by punishing productivity and prosperity, by literally stealing property, they can increase prosperity.

They claim that they can promote human liberation through the extirpation of individual will. They promote the “mass” or group. But any group of people is, by definition, composed of, and always reducible to, individuals, who never lose their free will just by being around others or by being categorized with a label.

It's a lie. It's a falsehood promoting envy and contempt in order to overlook its own self-defeating hypocrisy and economic faults.

## **College Unbound!: The MRC's Liberty Learning Program**

*"Saving Liberty Requires Knowledge of Its Enemy"*

To negate the individual while claiming to protect the individual, to put the individual at the mercy of the mob while shouting about "the minority" and "the underclass", is obscene.

But it's precisely what Marxism has done.

In Part Three, we will quickly and efficiently break down the ten planks of his Communist Manifesto to understand our enemy at the gates, and see just how many of those planks already have been implemented in the supposed land of the free.

Be sure to take the [Episode 02 Knowledge Assessment here!](#)