

Comment

(Continued from Page 8)

suading Vichy to send Juin to North Africa, are none too sure that his promises of "collaboration" are sincere.

The American State Department always considered Weygand as a balance to Darlan and Laval, capable of persuading Marshal Petain to refuse collaboration, military and naval, with the Nazis.

However, upon the insistence of Germany's Herr Otto Abetz, Weygand has been "relieved" of his command. For months, the United States had permitted Weygand to receive food, fuel and equipment for his armies, hoping no doubt that Weygand would double-cross Hitler. With Weygand's dismissal, however, the fuel, arms and food supplied by the U.S.A. might easily fall into the hands of the Nazis.

• • •

In the light of our knowledge of the Nazi general staff's plans for the Winter campaign in Africa, the dismissal of Gen. Weygand is easily understood. It seems to this observer that his dismissal should indicate that the Nazis are planning to land troops at French ports and to use the French fleet.

For, as soon as Weygand was dismissed, the British general staff launched its current African offensive under the Cunninghams and Coningham. The British, as we said before, were forced to try and knock out the Nazi-Italian armies in Libya before trained troops and supplies could arrive. It does not look as if they could do it.

Army Doesn't Make Foreign Policy

THE RECENT assurances of Chief of Staff General George C. Marshall that the U. S. Army is not planning another American Expeditionary Force have, we believe, done very little to curb the suspicions of a large portion of the American public.

There is, the General emphasized, "no foundation whatsoever for the allegation that we are preparing troops for a possible expedition to Africa or other critical areas outside this hemisphere."

Possibly, the General is correct, although we have read statements of at least two other high Army officers who said bluntly that the United States is preparing to fight Germany.

But General Marshall would not be revealed as a prevaricator were American troops to be sent to North or West Africa, despite his present assurances. For, strictly speaking, the Army's job is to get ready for war. Where the war will be fought, and against whom, is up to the Government. The Army prepares its men to fight anywhere it is ordered.

True, certain troops and medical units are trained for action in tropical regions and others for Arctic regions. In addition, both groups may be trained for service in

temperate zones. Mountain fighters may also be instructed in swampland tactics. Briefly, the policy of the U. S. Army is simply preparedness for action wherever it may occur. Theoretically, at least, the Army and Navy have nothing to say in the matter of diplomacy, policy-making or war declarations.

Hence General Marshall's statement, as far as it concerns Army policy, might be technically correct. The fact that the War Department is recruiting men for 3-year enlistments and for service overseas need mean nothing ominous according to the General. Regular army troops are needed, he says, for duty in Iceland, in American possessions outside the Western Hemisphere and on the Atlantic bases acquired from Britain.

But every action of the administration policy makers leans toward further intervention in the war against Hitler, to say nothing of the newer belligerent attitude toward Japan.

Then, too, Britain's increasing demands for more manpower, as seen in Winston Churchill's call for 3-million new conscripts, is paving the way for an eventual cry for American troops. No longer do the British emphasize that they will "do the job" if we furnish the "tools." On the contrary, sections of British opinion are openly calling for an A.E.F.!

British Workers Strike

ACCORDING to the *Progressive Miner* (Nov. 14) British workers enjoyed the luxury of a strike, losing 744,000 man hours of labor during the month of September.

The American labor paper goes on:

"These figures, released by the British Ministry of Labor, showed that even though that nation is actually at war it has been unable to prevent occasional strikes.

"No one denies that British workers have rallied to their nation's emergency in an out-standing way and have succeeded in maintaining production under severe hardships, but the official report from London should make labor critics in this country appreciate better the fine service which has been rendered by American workers.

"Taking into consideration the number of workers employed in defense industries in both countries, the facts indicate there were just as few strikes proportionately in this country, which is still at peace, during September as in war-torn Britain.

"The London dispatch stated that stoppages involved workers in three British aircraft factories and in one aluminum mill supplying the aircraft industry. The strikes were short-lived in most cases but the total number represented an increase over the number of strikes in the same month last year."

Harry Bridges vs. K. of C.

OUT ON the West Coast, the Knights of Columbus of San Francisco are embarrassed. Their K. of C. building has been taken over by the C.I.O. under Harry Bridges!

The *San Francisco Leader* comments as follows:

"It is a double blow to think that Harry Bridges, supposedly awaiting deportation as a Communist, will make his headquarters in the building, as coast leader of the C.I.O. To think that the K. of C., stalwart enemies of Communism, should give way ignominiously to the alleged pivot of Communism is sickening!

"Here in this City of St. Francis, supposedly a stronghold of Catholicism, we view with disgust and shame the spectacle of the man who has probably done more to hurt the prestige, prosperity and good name of this city throughout the world, taking over the occupancy of a building consecrated to the service of God and country.

"We are reliably informed that it would not have taken a king's ransom to save the building from the fate it has suffered," the *Leader* continues, and the editor asks: "Where are the scores of present-day tycoons and civic leaders who can thank the K. of C. order for their existing power, through fraternal success in the chairs and activities of the order 10, 20 and 30 years back?

"We realize fraternal organizations have declined in recent years," says the *Leader*. "We know the young men of today are no longer attracted to the old-time 'lodge,' because it's out of date and fails to offer them anything practical or helpful. In these days of old age pensions, of social security, unemployment insurance, hospitalization and care for the aged, the material worth of fraternal orders has deteriorated.

"That of the K. of C. today possesses in the nation less than half its virile membership of a decade or two ago is not surprising. That the same order has slipped into the oblivion of skeleton membership divided into a half-dozen impotent councils here in S. F. is likewise not unexpected.

"Lack of objectives, the absence of worthy purposes, and the failure of the councils to justify their existence, in these demanding times.

"True, the order did itself proud in World War No. 1. Against the Bible-passing Y.M.C.A. secretaries, who made the war a great money-grabbing institution for themselves and their association, the smiling K. of C. secretaries did a great job. 'Everybody Welcome — Everything Free,' the slogan of the 'Caseys' of those years has been allowed to sink into limbo, and with its disappearance has gone the strength and prestige of a once great order.

"A year ago, when the so-called United Service Organizations, U.S.O., came into being, with the . . . Y.M.C.A. again heading the scheme, an inconceivable offense, elimination of the Knights of Columbus, the greatest agency in the previous war, should have prompted an outraged American public to demand recognition and reinstatement of the K. of C. Supinely, the heads of the order accepted a fate that their predecessors of a quarter-century ago would never have taken. They allowed the erstwhile great order to be shelved, and become the 'forgotten man' of the present emergency . . .

"But, now, the K. of C. is out of its building, and Harry Bridges and Co. have taken over. 'Tempus Fugit,' Brother Knights — what a tragedy!"

Christ vs. Karl Marx—Part 2

THE FIRST ARTICLE of "Christ vs. Karl Marx" was concerned chiefly with (a) the *bourgeois* versus the proletarian class; (b) the Marxian objective of destroying capitalism; and (c) the recitation of the ten-point objectives expressed in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" (1848).

This second article will confine itself to the Marxian theory about (a) class struggle; and (b) economic doctrines.

As for class struggle: Marx observes that in any given society the lives of some of the members conflict with those of others. He points out the obvious contradictions which obtain in the different classes of society. He affirms that history discloses a struggle among people and societies both within each nation and outside each nation. To him, history records an alternation between periods of revolution and reaction; between peace and war; between stagnation and rapid progress. The one law found, therefore, from the beginning to the end of history as we know it is the law of class struggle—a class struggle arising from differences in the situation and modes of life of the classes in which society is divided.

In 1848, Marx wrote in his "Communist Manifesto": "The history of all human society, past and present—except the history of the primitive community—has been the history of class struggles . . . (Classes) carried on perpetual warfare, sometimes masked, sometimes open and acknowledged. It was a warfare invariably ending either in a revolutionary change in the whole structure of society or in the common ruin of the contending classes . . . Modern *bourgeois* society, rising out of the ruins of feudal society, did not make an end of class antagonisms. It merely set up new classes in place of the old."

According to the teachings of Marx, our modern age represented a complete victory of the *bourgeoisie* with the subsequent rise of representative institutions, of extended right to vote, of cheap newspapers widely circulated among the masses, of powerful and ever-expanding organizations of workers and employers, of the gradual rise of the proletariat to power.

Class struggle is a basic theory of Communism. In fact, the class struggle is the only key which can open adequately the doors of history.

Shall the class struggle go on forever? The "Communist Manifesto" indicates that it will subside only when the proletarian class will achieve final victory. From the beginning until now (with the exception of the earliest society), the proletarian class has been fighting an up-hill battle. When the final battle will have been won, peace will reign. So teaches Marx.

We pause to remark that peace comes, according to Marx, through the human agency of the workers of the world and not through any divine agency identified with God, or Christ, or religion. In this sense, the Marxian concept of life is thoroughly materialistic; thoroughly anti-supernatural.

Throughout his historic work, "Das Kapital," Marx expresses his views on many subjects of abstract philosophy. These views we omit in this series of articles, preferring to confine ourselves to an exposition of his applied theories in the fields of production, money and land.

In the preface to the first volume of "Das Kapital," Marx writes: "It is the ultimate aim of this work to reveal the economic law of motion of modern society."

Because the author of "Das Kapital" maintains that the dominant factor in capitalist society is the production of commodities, let us begin by analyzing his theories related to the word "commodity."

A commodity is something that satisfies a human need. It is also something that is exchanged for something else.

The utility of a thing gives it use-value.

The exchange-value—theoretically different from use-value—is the proportion, or ratio, in which a certain number of use-values of one commodity are exchanged for a certain number of use-values of another commodity. (A dozen eggs for a peck of wheat.)

Daily experience shows us that exchange-value is constantly employed. Persons continually change one thing for another thing or several other things.

What is common in all these changes? Their one common denominator is that they are products of labor. Therefore, in exchanging commodities, or products, persons actually are trading labor for labor.

Marx admits that the element common to all commodities is not concrete labor in

If our readers are interested in these articles, perhaps they will indicate the advisability of our attempting to analyze the system of Hitler's National Socialism and Mussolini's Fascism.

At any rate, it is our plan to conclude these articles by setting down the remedies suggested in various papal and ecclesiastical pronouncements.

— Editor.

a definite field of production, but abstract human labor—human labor in general.

He concludes that all the labor power of a given state or society—represented in the sum total of values of all commodities—is human labor power. Consequently, each particular commodity—a bushel of corn, a pair of shoes, a suit of clothes, a surgical operation—represents only a certain part of socially-necessary labor time.

All labor of different kinds—be it expended on the farm, in the factory or in the laboratory—is necessary for the maintenance of society. One is not more necessary than the other; all types of labor, viewed socially, are equal.

If *bourgeois* society makes one form of labor appear to be more essential than the other, a falsity is being perpetuated in that one form of labor, or one group of laborers, have cheated by using a more pretentious material wrapping for their contribution to society.

In the above paragraphs we set down the two-fold Marxian character of labor as expressed in commodities—namely, the use-value and the exchange-value. Now we come to the Marxian theory of money through which commodities are generally exchanged.

Marx makes a study of the origin of money; a study of the historical process of the development of exchange; a study of the universal form of value in which a number of different commodities are exchanged for one and the same particular commodity; a study of the money form of value when gold became this particular commodity and the universal measuring rod.

He maintains that money masks the social character of individual labor; that it hides the social tie between the various producers who come together in the market for the purposes of exchange. He says: "Money . . . presupposes a definite level of commodity exchange. The various forms of money indicate . . . very different grades of the social process of production."

The author of "Das Kapital" assumes that, at a particular stage in the development of commodity products, money becomes transformed into capital. He says that the original formula for exchanging commodities was C.M.C. (commodity—money—commodity). In this way, one commodity was sold to purchase another commodity. But the formula of capital became perverted to M.C.M. (money—commodity—money).

In other words, capitalism purchased commodities for the purpose of selling commodities at a profit.

Thus, Marx designates this abuse as "surplus value" to describe the increase over the original value of money that was put into circulation.

In expressing the above thoughts, Marx indicates that capitalism has perverted the nature of exchange. It appears to him, if we read him correctly, that capitalism exists to exchange money and not to exchange commodities; capitalism exists to make profit, not to produce for use; capitalism exists for the few who hold and control money, not for the many engaged in producing commodities which capitalists exchange for money.

Marx investigates the three fundamental historical stages of the process whereby capitalism has increased the productivity of labor:

- (a) Simple co-operation;
- (b) Division of laborer and manufacturer;
- (c) Machinery in large-scale industry.

In the third stage, capital accumulated control of raw materials and the tools required to change these raw materials into finished products.

We re-assert that Marx regards capitalism as an economy designed to make money, not to create products. If products are made by capitalism, it is not for the purpose of making them but rather for the purpose of making money, of accumulating capital.

Marx pointed out the mistake made by earlier economists (e.g., Adam Smith) who assumed that all the surplus value transformed into capital became variable capital. Too often, he indicated, it became dead capital, or wealth accumulated in the hands of the few to satisfy the exaggerated needs or gratify the luxurious whims of the capitalists. However, it was money or wealth,

(Continued on Page 11)