but different synthesis — may be reduced to a definitely stated law: From conditions arising outside of man's consciousness, the social and natural environment (thesis), there come into being certain human needs and corresponding purposes which act upon the possibilities of the given situation (antithesis), and therefrom arise purposive responses which resolve the possibilities into a new situation (synthesis). The process of change from situation to situation and social system to social system exhibits certain inevitable features; there is **unity** between both phases in that certain features of the old are preserved and carried over into the new; e. g., the technically developed processes of production and highly specialized division of labor under capitalism will be carried over into the new society, socialism. Secondly, there is a **difference** in that certain features of the old do not appear in the new; e. g., the slave status of labor and private ownership of the means of social existence along with the coercive state will fall into desuetude under socialism. Thirdly, the quality of **novelty** appears. New forms, activities and purposes arise out of the new combination; and these further change the meaning of whatever is retained of the old. The novelties are something more than a simple sum of the old plus the new: there is a reorientation of moods and purposes; e. g., the monarchy in feudal society was a bulwark for the landed aristocrats against the encroachments of serf, freedman and burgher; under capitalism it becomes a figurehead for commercial expansion and international salesmanship and more too, the deathless champion of "democratic liberties."

The process of social change, interchange and development goes on forever. The only law that never varies is the eternal, immutable law of change itself. And contrary to anti-Marxian socialists who wilfully or ignorantly misrepresent socialists as ignoring the factor of consciousness and human nature, Marx never wearied reiterating that the characteristic mark of social development, as opposed to biological or natural development, was the increasingly greater part played by human consciousness.

W. C. CURREY

PARTY NEWS (Cont. from p. 2)

during the panic of 1921-22 that capitalism was in a state of decay. The Technocracy movement, a product of the 1929-33 depression, also maintained that the capitalist system could not survive this depression. History has proved all to be wrong, and history will also prove Gen. Holdridge to be wrong when he stated that the system is tottering so badly that it has already ceased to exist.

Certainly hunger and unemployment abound under capitalism, Evans continued but if these be reasons for collapse, the system would have been done for a long time ago. The only thing that will bring an end to the system will be the understanding of capitalism by the workers and their intentions to form a political party of their own, a revolutionary, a Socialist Party, to disarm and disposses the nonproducers and introduce socialism. It is this lack of knowledge of the society under which they live plus the head-fixing industry of the capitalist class (schools, church, radio, television, etc.) which makes it possible for the wealth of the capitalists to be secure and their profits to continue.

READERS' CORRESPONDENCE

G. C. H. of Baltimore writes as follows: "With regard to the Soviet Union, nobody has to tell me that that country is perfect. I happen to be an astrologer and I know that there are a lot of selfish, no-good so-and-sos in every country. I simply say that the Soviet Union Government is blazing 'the cooperative trail' for the rest of the World, and that the Soviet Union has gone along this road much further than any country. At least the Soviet Union Government has stopped the selfish people from throwing their fellow-men out of jobs. Even this hasn't yet been stopped in the United States . . . I actually feel that there are so many people who are no damn good, that every country needs a dictator — that is, somebody to force all the people to cooperate for the general good."

Our Corresponding Secretary answered this as follows: "You mention that 'at least the Soviet Union has stopped the selfish people from throwing their fellow-men out of jobs.' It is important to keep in mind in considering this question that in the Soviet Union the economy is yet at a very low level of development compared to the rest of the capitalist world. The problem of overproduction resulting in depressions and unemployment has not arisen there yet. Altho, in Russia at the present time as in the United States the unemployment problem has been counteracted by the vast defense program in process.

"The United States as well had 100% full employment during the war. Nor must the 10-20 million slave labor battalions be overlooked in analyzing the matter. The crux of the question is that although capitalism may differ in operation in Russia, in that the state is the exploiter of the workers instead of private capitalists, the same old conditions of capitalism remain, and will remain until an enlightened majority of workers see fit to make a **basic** change in the social relations of society. It has been established that the standard of living in Russia now is lower (in terms of real wages) than in 1916, despite the 'full employment.'

"With regard to your remark that every country needs a dictator to force people to cooperate for the general good, what guarantee would there be that the one man would do this. Individuals are not responsible for the problems existing today, except to the extent that they tolerate the system that is responsible for them. It is futile to appeal to the politicians representing the system to help us out of the morass. Far more realistic would it be to appeal to the fellow workers in the socialist movement who can do something about them."

NOTE: The volume number has been corrected. This is the second issue of Vol. 17.

Chair Boy and Mike Boy

AMERICAN ROYALTY

As befits a king-size director, De Mille is constantly attended while at work by a retinue. One of these, I learned when I visited the "Samson and Delilah" set while the picture was in production, is called the Chair Boy. He is in his early 20's. His job consists solely in following DeMille around the set all day with a chair or a stool, so that the master can sit whenever he pleases, wherever he happens to be. Because his Chair Boy is at all times behind him, De Mille, with never a backward look, can always sit with confidence. What makes Chair Boy's job interesting (one drawback, of course, is that he never has a chance while working to look DeMille in the face) is the fact that he has full responsibility for deciding whether to trail De Mille with a director's chair, a low stool or a high stool. Though DeMille never converses with the man who is always behind him, the two have a satisfactory means of communication. When DeMille has stood in one place for a long time Chair Boy moves up with the high stool, nudges DeMille with it ever so gently from behind and DeMille sits. His mission accomplished, Chair Boy looks proud. Considering the consequences, no one likes to think of the black day when Chair Boy would falter in the line of his peculiar duty. Working along with Chair Boy is another DeMille retainer, a man of about 40, who is called the Mike Boy. His exclusive occupation from 9 to 6 is to walk around next to DeMille holding a microphone and putting it in front of the director's mouth whenever he wants to say something to the people on the set. Mike Boy and Chair Boy share an assistant, who takes over when either of them has to go to the drinking fountain.

LIFE, Dec. 5, 1949.