cannot be identical as long as they are opposites, and to say that one cannot exist without the other is not very illuminating because a thing cannot be opposite to nothing. It must be opposite to something that is opposite to it. Marx didn't mix unity with identity. Writing of the two poles of the expression of value in the first chapter of Capital, he said: "The relative form and the equivalent form are two intimately connected, mutually dependent and inseparable elements of the expression of value, but at the same time are mutually exclusive, antagonistic extremes, that is poles of the same expression." That is Marx's wording and that is the essence of the matter. Mutually dependent, inseparable but mutually exclusive. Identity of opposites is just nonsense.

And referring to the inner contradiction in opposite sides of society, Guest makes the folowing remarks:

> "Marx found the basis of the class struggle to lie in a contradiction between the methods of production and the existing social relationships. It is this contradiction which, during a certain historic period, gets expressed in an external antagonism of classes. When this is so, one class represents the force of production seeking to expand and another class represents those social relations which are hemming in the productive forces. *But the basic contradiction will continue to exist in classless society and will cause a progressive development of social relationships as the productive forces themselves develop.*" (emphasis ours)

In this last sentence we can see the creeping paralysis of Russian propaganda. The basic contradiction is the contradiction between the method of production and the existing social relationships but, according to Guest, it will continue to exist under communism. In his breathless pursuit of contradictions he makes the mistake of thinking that they must always be of the same kind, and he has missed the basic contradiction which will be solved for good and all — the contradiction between social production and private ownership which originated in primitive society, developed during succeeding centuries and will be finally solved by socialism.

Now let us take two examples of Conzer's interpretation of dialectical materialism as contained in his book: "An Introduction to Dialectical Materialism." Conzer is also in a jam over the question of opposites as can be seen by this gem: "I know no general reason why opposites always must be united. The study of scientific method is not yet advanced enough to give us proof of this kind." Conzer has evidently walked up the wrong street. The human race in its wisdom has decided that when two things turn up in a certain relationship to each other they will be called opposites. As long as the human race sticks to this view we can't have one opposite on its own. Conzer is apparently prepared to concede that all the black door handles that have so far turned up have been black, but does not rule out the possibility that some day a black door handle may appear that is white!

## LOVE AND HATE

On another page, Conzer, with the backing of Freud, gives us this information:

> "Freud has shown that we can have no feeling of love towards anyone without simultaneously having a more-or-less feeling of hatred toward the same person. And vice versa. No hatred can exist without containing some love. Love is the regular component of hatred, even if the quantity of love is sometimes microscopic."

That is a peculiar way of looking at the unity of opposites. On the basis of this we can prove anything and get nowhere.

But let us see if we can translate it into something more obvious. A wooden stick has two ends. They are the names we give to two opposite parts of the stick, and while the stick exists as a stick the ends exist as separate, antagonistic, mutually dependent opposites. As long as we remain outside a lunatic asylum the ends will appear to us as two different parts of this piece of wood, and we can't have even a microscopic bit of one end existing alongside, let alone inside, the other. Of course we can throw the stick in a fire and put the same end to both, but this is a different end altogether. Let us use language reasonably and for its purpose.

Love and hate are two opposite expressions of a common human emotion. They cannot both exist at the same time for the same object, but they can alternate, or they can both dwindle with the dwindling of emotion.

But let us look at love and hatred from the point of view of the development of these two poles for the expression of emotion and not their temporary equilibrium in an individual who both loves and hates. Human emotion develops until it becomes differentiated into what we call love and hatred. In its earlier development the distinction is blurred but in the course of time it become clearly defined and it is love and hatred as such, and as opposites, that Conzer is writing about.

Love is love and not hate, and in a given situation they are mutually exclusive. Mixing interpenetration with identity seems to be the cause of the confusion. If we pass our finger along the stick we come to a point where it is neither one end nor the other; but we never have our finger on a little bit of one end and a large part of the other. What happens is that one end passes into the other.

There is a progressive change in nature, and thought, and evolution. What does this mean? It means a movement from the simple to the complex, an evermore complicated mixture of a comparatively few elements. An example might make this clearer. A modern piece of highly developed mechanism such as an aeroplane engine, is a mystifying sight to the uninitiated, and yet it is made up of a multitude of simple movements that taken by themselves, would mystify nobody. The human mind thrives by learning and contriving and thus craves for an evermore complicated life. It is more satisfying, and therefore progressive, to the majority in the long run.

## EVOLUTION OF SOCIETY

Let us now complete the picture by an illustration of the laws that Marx borrowed from Hegel and applied in his own investigations. We will take an example from the evolution of society, as that is our particular concern. In prehistoric times man lived in small communities beset by forces of nature he was not yet able to control or to which he could not adjust. But the simple means of production were commonly owned. These means of production were barely sufficient to enable each member of the community to sustain life and reproduce his kind.

In the course of time, man multiplied, but the means of production multiplied at a greater rate until what was produced was more than sufficient to supply each with the necessaries of life. When this expansion had reached a certain point, the idea was born into the minds of men that it was possible for some to live without working if they could persuade or force others to work for them. In order to accomplish this, a portion of the means of production that belonged to the community had to be converted into the private possession of some members of the community. An internal struggle then began that ended in the establishment of private ownership of the means of production.

Since that time a constant struggle has been carried on during which the whole of the earth has become populated and private property has run a course from the ownership of a few acres of land, a small herd of animals, and a few tools, until it has reached dimensions that can no longer be controlled by one individual or one family. Property ownership has undergone a development and transformation until private property in the means of production has reached a point where it has become uncontrollable and threatens society with disaster.

But the development of this private property also engendered the development of those who used the means of production. This development has now reached a point where the producers monopolize all the positions in