ter changes from one relatively stable configuration to another. Marx thus constructed his philosophy of history in terms of efficient and material causes, without recourse to the final causality of Hegel's system. For Marx, matter is characterized by mass, extension, and inertia. It is the *subject* of all change, the principle of continuity in the world process. The states and configurations of matter in motion constitute the detail of the world system. This motion manifests a dialectical pattern. The dynamic configurations of matter tend to generate forces that undermine their stability and initiate new configurations markedly in contrast to their predecesors."

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Coming now to the concept of class struggle, Marx and Engels wrote that all history is the story of struggle between classes of people, between the ruling and subject classes. Now, as pointed out in a recent dialog article in this journal, Marx was not the first to perceive the somewhat obvious fact that all human societies *following* the dissolution of primitive society were composed of conflicting economic classes — rulers and ruled. But it was Marx (and Engels) alone who uncovered and made clear for the first time the not-so-obvious fact that "the class struggle," in conjunction with the conflict between the forces of production and the relations of production, "was the immediate driving force of history."

When speaking of classes today we allude to the owners of the means of production (mines, factories, etc.), the capitalists, and the non-owners, the workers, who actually produce all social wealth and in return receive a pittance, if that. Work, income, or what have you is not the criterion of class membership. On occasion one finds a capitalist working, and perhaps working very hard. But no matter. One is either a capitalist or a worker, depending on whether or not *one must work to live.* Excluded of course are various secondary sub-groups which, comparatively speaking, are minuscule. Now even as these two fundamental classes exist, owners and non-owners, the class struggle between them exist. And in the light of all written history and its Marxian interpretation, this struggle will eventually end victoriously for the working class.

THE M. C. H.

The Materialist Conception of History holds that the changes in social thinking in all realms follow upon changes of the material conditions of their generating environment. In other words, in each period of history the kind of society is determined by the material conditions that exist. But let Marx speak for himself:

"In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations which are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society — the real foundation, on which rise legal and political forms of social consciousness.

"The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life. *It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary their social existence determines their consciousness.*

"At a certain stage in their development, the material forces of production in society come into conflict with the existing relations of production — or — what is but a legal expression for the same thing — with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production, these turn into fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation, the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.

"In considering such transformations the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic — in short, the ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must rather be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social forces of production and the relations of production." (*Preface to Critique of Political Economy*)

In the light of the above, our minds are freed of the erroneous idea that the landed aristocracy and church dignitaries of Feudal society were suddenly struck from out of the blue with the thought that it was wrong to keep the serfs in bondage. Feudalism was produced by the economic conditions of the Middle Ages, and when these economic conditons changed, the struggle of the middle class (capitalists) against the Feudal lords produced capitalism. And following this dialectical pattern of history, capitalism will be superseded by socialism.

The Marxian theory of the Law of Value has suffered not a single dent since its conception. Its detesters avoid it as they would the buconic plague. Over the years several theories have been put forth by capitalist apologists to supplant the Law of Value, but all have collapsed because they did not factually describe the actual, non-verbal source of surplus value. In short, their maps did not accurately describe the territory.

THE LAW OF VALUE

The Law of Value, on the other hand, squarely pinpoints the source of capitalist profits which are an aspect, and a highly prized one by capitalists, of surplus value. The source of all surplus value is at the point of production and nowhere else. All value is created by Labor, and by Labor alone. Labor receives in turn (wages or salaries, it makes no difference) only a small fraction of the value it creates — receives only enough to sustain itself and to procreate its kind. The worker sells his labor power (chattel slavery in this country is presently prohibited) to the employer-capitalist, say, for a period of eight hours. The worker's first two hours of labor on the job, generally, produce the equivalent in value of his sustenance. Does he stop work then? Of course not. Remember — he sold hs labor power for a period of eight hours. Hence, he spends another six hours on the job producing surplus value for his benevolent employer-capitalist. After paying off other employer-capitalists from this pile of surplus value, and contributing to the maintenance of his state, the worker's employer-capitalist pockets the remainder — his Profits.

* * *

And there you have the Synopsis of Marxism — with many dangling ends for lack of space. If you would tie them together, write — now, not tomorrow — to the World Socialist Party of the U. S.

Just a brief footnote to you disenchanted, alienated youths: Get off "the establishment is to blame" "establishment," by abolishing its lord you vent your spleen is no more or less than the collective factotum of the capitalist class. Remove it just as quickly as you can, by whatever method, and it will just as quickly be replaced. You would change the palace guards and leave the throne untouched. Wasted, futile efforts! Join us and consciously and politically destroy your whipping boy, the "establshment," by abolishing its lord and paymaster, the capitalist class, and with it — class society.

—REN

Critics of Socialism

We welcome your views in the columns of THE WESTERN SOCIALIST