

, ;

I DI ,.- Iv)

PHILOSOPHY AND

CLASS STRUGGLE

by Dialego

The basic principles of Marxism as seen in the

' context of the South African liberation struggle

Published by Inkululeko Publications

39 Goodge Street. London W1P 1FD (1987)

CHAPTER ONE:

WHY - REVOLUTIONARIES. NEED MARXISM

Revolutionaries regard themselves first and foremost as practical people dedicated to changing the world. They are rightly suspicious of those who merely talk about the injustices of apartheid and the evils of capitalism and then turn their words into action. 'By their deeds ye shall know them' is an old saying which admirably echoes the emphasis which men themselves place upon the importance of putting things into practice: not contently waiting for everything to be done according to the mad notion of itself. Why then should we bother ourselves with the study of philosophy?

Philosophy 'What is the nature of the world, the concept that 'the philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point however is to change it', and then those who claim that this support: the argument that since revolutionaries are concerned with changing the world, they can and should do away with philosophy together.

To show why philosophy is important and why we need to make a thorough study of Marxist philosophy - dialectical materialism - in particular, we must first tackle the question of

0) Revolution and the Need for Theory 7

Those who imagine that all revolutionaries need to do is act, forget that

1

_J

action on its own is not enough. (Strictly speaking, it is not even possible). No matter how passionately we hate oppression and wish to see things change, there is only one force capable of eliminating colonialism, capitalism and reaction, and that is the oppressed and exploited masses led by an organisation of revolutionaries. The organisation of a 'popular movement, the organisation of a disciplined communist party around a political programme able to unite and co-ordinate various forms of struggle and direct them towards a common goal, is essential?

Yet once we talk about a movement, a party and its programme we are not simply talking about action, we are talking about action which has been thought out, for the only way in which anyone can plan activity and produce its programme is through revolutionary thinking - the development of revolutionary theory which, if it is properly worked out, does not hold back our practical activity but rather serves as a compass which enables us to move in the direction we want to go. This is why Lenin correctly argued in his classic Work What is to be Done that the tasks facing revolutionaries, the more developed and carefully worked out their theoretical perspectives need to be. Take as an illustration this point, the South African Communist Party's programme, The Road to South African Freedom. While the iniquities of the whole apartheid system may be pretty obvious, the strategy and tactics needed to eliminate them are not. The programme analyses the particular struggle in South Africa in the whole context of the African revolution; the special character of the colonial-type oppression from which the African, Coloured and Indian people in South Africa suffer; the role of the national democratic revolution as the vital first step along the road to socialism, and the importance of carrying through immediate proposals in a democratic South Africa is to be developed and consolidated. This programme is not simply the product of years of revolutionary experience in southern African conditions: it is the product of years of experience translated into revolutionary theory so that the people can be shown that the ideal of a democratic and liberated South Africa is not simply a beautiful dream but is a realistic and attainable objective which can be worked out and planned for, step by step.

But if we require revolutionary theory so that, in Lenin's words, we can substitute 'science for dreams', why do we need a special philosophical outlook as well? Why do we need to base ourselves on the principles of dialectical materialism which is the only logical and consistent philosophy a communist can possibly hold?

To answer this question, it is important we understand

(1) Philosophy is the Basis of all our Thinking

The construction of a theory is like the construction of a house; not only

2

the walls must be sound, but so must the foundations, and it is in the realm of philosophy we must turn if we want to make sure that our theory has solid foundations. For the truth is that all theory, even if it has only been worked out in relation to one particular problem, is rooted in philosophy, some overall view of the world, and even if we are unaware of the existence of an underlying 'world-view', it is there nevertheless, serving as the basis, the very foundation upon which all thought and activity rest.

But why should this matter? . . .

It matters because in the last analysis, policies and actions which are based upon a false or inadequate philosophy can only lead us into defeat and despair, for even if we hit upon a particular policy which is correct in itself - for example, the need under South African conditions to conduct armed struggle - unless the philosophical basis of our policy is also correct, we will make serious mistakes in carrying it through.

To explain, Dialectical materialism as the philosophical outlook of the Communist Party, enables us, as The Road to South African Freedom puts it, to understand the world as it really is -- and how to change it. And there are two interrelated elements involved here: . . .

Firstly, the need 'to understand the world as it really is -- which is, broadly speaking, a materialist approach, an approach which treats the world as a material force in its own right that exists independently of what we may think or like it to be: and

Secondly the need to understand this material world, either in nature or society, as a world of interrelated change and development, a world of universal conflict and contradiction between what is old and

dying and what is new and struggling to be born -- an approach we call dialectical.' . y ' .

Fused together into a single philosophy, dialectics and materialism enable us to increasingly change the world once we have understood the laws of motion which are at work in its development. Dialectic: alerts us to the need for change. materialism to the importance of bringing this change into line with the objective circumstances which actually prevail.

Supposing. for example. we misapply dialectical materialism by stressing didaQticsat the expense of materialism. what is likely to happen? We Will come to imagine- is Bllrtbftists .tvpically.d9. that our mere desire or 'will' to changethings is much more important then thgactuai conditionswhich have to be changed. The result? A tendency to pay insufficient attention to the ?r ise character of the situatignjn Which 9C _ m.- .__._ ._-..._-

we lind ourselves. the kind 0 populaisuppoggwhigheigstsggggagticulgr time toga MWAQILITI Theiieal'balance oijorceg between ourselves Shaina enemy. etc.

This kind of mistake, though based in philosophy, may have and on occasion has had. practical consequences of the most damaging kind.

For example. on October 1. 1865. some leaders of the Indonesian Communist Party took part in a suicidal coup intended to oust reactionaries in the armed forces. lanan'natherealpolitical 69.114199"? in the coun-
Wammmnnvmaomaa the mr.-
ty, the remmmnnmgmdm. The right wing were able to
seize the initiative and unleash one o! the worst waves of counter-
revolutionary terror ever seen. Literally hundreds oi thousands oi corn-
munists and democrats lost their lives.

a substitute for the actual task of carefully studying the real world. The general principles of dialectical materialism act as a framework to assist us in our search for the laws of development at work in a particular situation so that we become more sharply in tune with the main features of objective reality and understand how they fluidly inter-relate as a process of change. The stress placed upon the importance of the national liberation struggle as the particular form of the class struggle to be waged under present South African conditions is a good example of the creative application of Marxist philosophy to a specific situation. One of the great achievements of communists like Moses Kotane was that he immediately grasped (as Dr Yusuf Dadoo puts it) the need to indigenise Marxism so as to give it meaning for the millions of our workers and peasants, for it is the specific feature of the South African situation that there can be 'no working class victory without black liberation and no black liberation without the destruction of capitalism in all its forms'. The general principles of Marxism-Leninism have to be concretely applied and it is simply not good enough to speak in the abstract about the contradiction between worker and capitalist as though thus

is all the class struggle involved!

Lenin put the question well when he said that:

'It is not enough to be a revolutionary and an adherent of socialism or a communist in general. You must be able at each particular instant to find the particular link in the chain which you must grasp with all your might in order to hold the whole chain and to prepare firmly for the transition to the next link ...'

'For this is the essence of the dialectical materialist approach: to discover both the particular links in the revolutionary chain and to work out how these links fit together as a whole, so that the constituent elements in the struggle - 'The African revolution', 'the national democratic revolution' and the 'struggle for socialism' - are properly integrated into a coherent and overall revolutionary strategy.

Under no circumstances can dialectical materialism serve, as Engels 'once put it, 'as an excuse for not studying history' or as a pretext for skating over the complexities of a particular situation. Indeed, why this is so will become clearer once we understand the character of

(v) Dialectical Materialism as a

Philosophy of a New Type ,

Marxism is the first philosophy in history to thoroughly grasp the inevitability of change and the dynamic and historical character of nature and society. For the Marxist, in the words of Engels, 'nothing is stable except instability, nothing is immovable except movement': in fact, the only thing which cannot alter in the universe is change itself! No wonder the white supremacists in southern Africa fear Marxism like the plague itself, for like all ruling classes, they wish to believe that their privileged way of life will last forever!

This stress upon movement and contradiction as the basic force in the universe makes dialectical materialism unique as a philosophy and sets it apart from the various philosophies, popular and ruling class, which preceded it.

To elaborate this point, it will help to distinguish:

(a) Philosophy as it has existed from time immemorial, as a way of looking at the world and understanding it in general terms; and

(b) Philosophy as it has been conceived of by ruling class

philosophers who have sought to work out their theoretical principles in a purely abstract way in a world which seems remote from the experience of the people and their social activities.

Philosophy in the first sense is part of everyday thought and speech and (as we have already seen) all our ideas have a basis in philosophy whether we are aware of this fact or not. Indeed, this kind of philosophy existed long before people calling themselves 'philosophers' arrived on the scene, and in its earliest forms, for example in primitive communist society, such a philosophy had a quality and a richness which

6

was lost in those countries where people began to philosophise in an abstract and over-specialised way. A LeRumo comments that

1 'the forms of primitive communism existing in Africa before European conquest embodied cultures, values and traditions in many ways far superior to those of the representatives of capitalism who invaded and destroyed them ...'

This point also applies to the vivid and lively tradition in early philosophy where ideas about truth and morality, nature and universe were expressed through song and dance, storytelling and drama and in the democratic popular assemblies - part of the living fabric of social practice itself. .

Of course, this kind of philosophy suffered from the fact that it was a limited and parochial (as common sense often is today) and naturally reflected the narrow basis of tribal society, but at least it had the virtue of being in touch with popular feeling and social needs.

How did philosophy acquire its reputation as a body of thought remote from the world of reality?

The historical division of society into antagonistic classes brought the development of the division of labour to the point where manual and mental activities became sharply segregated from one another. In the days when, with their hands, only the nobles exercised their minds! .

The philosophical product of this social division was the development of idealism: the theoretical outlook which places the spiritual world above the world of matter and looks upon reality as the immutable work of an Ideal Creator, an attitude which has always formed the dominant current in ruling class thought. _

Although this kind of idealism seems to be so remote from reality that it is simply irrelevant to political struggle. in fact its very 'remoteness' and abstraction serves the ruling class as an important ideological weapon: '

(a) in its efforts to perpetuate the division of labour between workers and those who are supposed to think for them - hence the notion that 'ideas create reality'; and .

, (b) as the philosophical basis to its propagandist assertions that exploitation and class divisions are part of a divine and timeless order which nothing can change.

it. When Dr Malan replied to a demand for democracy and an end to apartheid presented by the ANC in 1962 by saying that the differences between white and black 'are permanent and not man made' ". he unconsciously revealed the practical role which idealism plays in defending racism and exploitation by placing them above the forces of historical change. In other words. his argument demonstrates how important it is that we not only embrace a philosophy of the new type. but continue to struggle against philosophy of the old. ruling class type. for the origins

'1 of this philoeophy in the division of labour and its role in perpetuating class barriers and all forms of prejudice reveal that even the most metaphysical philosophy helps reactionaries in the class struggle. That is why we must fight it!

Of course it is true that viewed historically, idealist philosophy has played a part in developing human thought, but its significance must not be exaggerated. For dialectical materialism not merely incorporates into its outlook the best of ruling class philosophy (for example, Hegel's brilliant theory of dialectics), but it also draws upon the long anti-imperialist tradition of philosophy as it has existed from Eamon time - that is, philosophy which is intrinsic to our thought and action which is part and parcel of everyday life. Dialectical materialism, that is to say, creatively combines both the old philosophy we have referred to in a synthesis and that provides a philosophy of a new type. While it tackles the basic questions which the ruling class philosophers were the first to present in a universal way - the nature of our ideas and their relation to reality - it does so, not in an abstract or speculative manner, but only in the light of our knowledge of history, our experience of the class struggle and the latest development in the world science.

Dialectical materialism is the only philosophical outlook which enables us to approach the world correctly and in a way which helps us link up our problems with the struggle to liberate society and mankind as a whole. It is therefore the natural and logical philosophy for all revolutionaries who have completely dedicated themselves to this struggle and have nothing to fear from change.

Notes

1. These: on Feuerbach. No XI. as an appendix to The German Ideology (Moscow/London. 1964). p647.
2. Collected Works 8 (London/Moscow. 1961). p370.
3. Frederick Engels. Collected Works: 2. (Moscow/London. 1960). 920.
- 4 n. M to 80% m Freedom. p8.
8. The term dialectic: was originally used by the ancient Greek philosopher to denote a method of debate and discussion in which the truth was reached when one thinker disclosed the contradictions and divided in the argument of another. In this way, a position was turned upside down and forced to 'change'.
6. in an article in the journal Comm. Lenin speaks of 'the very gist, the living soul of Marxism' as 'a concrete analysis of a concrete situation'. Collected Works 31. (Moscow/London. 1966). p166.
7. introduction to B Bunting. Moeke Kotane. South African Revolutionary. (Inkululeko Publications, 1975). p1.
8. Ibid
9. The Immediate Tasks of Soviet Government, Collected Works 21. (Moscow/London. 1965). p 273.
10. Engels to Schmidt. 5/9/1890, Selected Correspondence. (Moscow, 1953). D496.
11. Engels made this comment in the article on Turkey in 1853. cited by M Loewy. Marxists and the National Question, New Len Review 96, pm.
12. I'm Fighting Years. (Inkululeko Publications. 1971). p3
13. Moeke Kohne. op cit. p183.

CHAPTER TWO:

WHAT IS DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM?

In the previous chapter on 'Philosophy and Class Struggle'

we saw that dialectical materialism is the only logical and consistent philosophy

(or a revolutionary today to hold Understood concretely)

... and applied

creatively. Dialectical materialism has a crucial role to play in helping revolutionaries formulate their strategy and tactics in such a way that they reflect the needs of the situation and take all the relevant factors into account.

Those who stress materialism at the expense of dialectics in their political practice will ignore the pressures for change steadily building up (Witness the dramatic escalation of popular protest and struggle as the attempts by the Botha-Malan government to 'retort' apartheid have explosively backfired). While those who see only dialectics and neglect materialism inevitably overlook the concrete realities of the particular stage of the struggle. A situation and

This is why a proper understanding of dialectical materialism is a necessary part of our correct political practice; it furnishes the Communist Party and the liberation movement with an essential weapon in the on-going struggle and is a vital ingredient for success.

My basic objective in this chapter is to show that dialectics and materialism - the two aspects of Marxist philosophy which give it its name - form the two halves of a single whole. Just as a chemist mixes hydrogen and oxygen to form water, so Marx and Engels reworked the theories of dialectics and materialism which previous thinkers had

10

developed. In order to create a revolutionary philosophy of a new type. For the first time in history a materialist theory of the universe was worked out which was thoroughly dialectical in character, and a conception of dialectics developed that was squarely based on materialism.

The result is a highly explosive revolutionary mix!

To explain how this took place and why it was necessary, we must first get to grips with

(1) Materialism Versus Idealism:

"10 Basic Question of Philosophy

It is sometimes thought that a 'materialist' is a person who simply looks after one's own selfish interests whereas an 'idealist' is one who is prepared to sacrifice for a worthwhile cause. Yet, if this were so, it would be the conservatives of this world who are the 'materialists' and the revolutionaries who are moved by 'idealism'!

In fact, of course, 'materialism' and 'idealism' do not refer to vague moral attitudes of this kind. They are terms used in philosophy to describe the only two basic interpretations of the world which can be consistently held.

Everyone who studies the world around them seeks to find the origin of things. What causes things to move, or to act or to behave in the way they do? Are the forces spiritual in origin or are they produced by the material world?

Some years ago a Calvinist minister ascribed earth tremors in the Western Cape to the growing disquiet of the Almighty towards modern forms of music and dress! Whereas a materialist seeks to explain the world of society and nature according to the material conditions and processes at work, the idealist believes that events take place because of the existence of spiritual forces or 'ideas'.

An idealist might argue that apartheid in South Africa has been brought about by the 'ill-will' or 'evil intentions' of white people who don't wish to face up to reality. For a materialist, on the other hand, this 'ill-will' or 'evil intention' still needs to be explained, and the real reason for apartheid is not to be found in people's heads but in their pockets, in that material system of capitalist exploitation which makes apartheid highly profitable for financial investors, factory owners and the giant farms. It is here that the roots of the system lie.

We often talk about the way in which (or example 'anti-communist ideas' weaken our movement by creating divisions in its ranks and this of course is true. But we must never forget that these anticommunist 'ideas' don't simply fall from the skies: they reflect and arise out of the material interests of monopoly capitalism and unless they are firmly

rebuffed. they are likely to make an impact on those whose stake in society. however small. makes them vulnerable to anticommunist scare-mongering.

1 1

Thus we can say that whereas idealism looks for an explanation of the world in terms of 'ideas', intentions or 'will' of people, materialism considers that the source of all events and actions is to be found in material causes or, as they are sometimes called, 'the laws of nature'. It is true that cruder forms of idealism ascribe things in the world to the 'will of God' whereas more subtle forms of idealism put the cause down to the ideas which exist in the heads of individuals on earth. But in neither case do idealists seek an explanation in material reality. Whereas idealism believes that the ideas in people's heads exist outside of and independently of the world of matter, materialism contends that people's ideas, like all other aspects of their behaviour, are the product of material causes and can only be properly understood when these causes are discovered.

Materialists in fact argue that humans were neither created by God nor is their origin a sheer mystery. They developed out of the world of nature through a long process of evolution and their ideas are the product of the mental activity of the brain. It is a highly developed and complex form of matter.

This does not mean that materialism are not concerned about people's ideas. On the contrary, materialists are the only philosophers able to really explain them. What materialism reject are not ideas, or their immense importance in influencing the course of events. What materialists reject is the idealist theory of ideas because this treats ideas as mystical forces that somehow exist independently of material reality.

It is true that many people generally look for the causes of events in material rather than spiritual force: while retaining beliefs about the world of the supernatural or some other 'autonomous' realm of ideas. But this merely means that they are not being philosophically consistent. The fact still remains that it is impossible to hold that matter is the product of mind (the idealist position) while at one and the same time contending that mind is the product of matter!

Materialism and idealism offer interpretations of the world which are irreconcilable. Which of the 'two great camps', as Engels called them, we choose still constitutes today, as in the past, the basic question of philosophy.

But why should this be important? What political consequences are likely to follow if we opt for one camp rather than the other?

To answer this question we must turn to consider the question of

(II) Materialism as a

Political and Democratic Outlook

1. We ascribe, as the idealists do, events and actions to the will of God, or to the ideas which people carry around in their heads. Everything which happens is either a mystery or some kind of accidental 'change'.

2.

means of course, that they cannot be scientifically examined or rationally understood.

This is why idealism is not only mystical but generally conservative and elitist in character. To look for the source of movement in the world solely to people's 'ideas' or the power of their 'will' is to ignore the practical experience of the mass of ordinary people as they go about their daily lives - the real force which moulds our thought. Differences in outlook appear for the idealist, not as particular reflections of a given set of material circumstances, but as the product of mystical forces which nothing can change. Plato, the ancient Greek idealist, believed that men viewed the world differently because they had been 'made' differently - he likened them to different metals like brass, iron and gold - and these were 'differences' which nothing could change. The men of 'gold' - a philosophical elite - were naturally intended to rule over the cruder multitudes of brass and iron -- the unfortunate many! It is surprising that Plato's idealism has often found a sympathetic hearing among apartheid's supporters? Racist nonsense about the 'genetic' differences which are supposed to make some 'races' more intelligent than others is simply the logical product of the idealist's search for 'causes' which lie beyond our control, and cannot be rationally understood.

For materialists, people are the product of their material circumstances: their 'human nature', their outlook on life and their general psychology reflect the conditions under which they live and work. To change people you must change their circumstances. If, as the materialist argues, we draw our knowledge and character from our practical experience of the material world, then everyone is able to learn from life

and play their part in running society (a democratic view which rejects the need for mystical 'fuehrers' to govern the 'dumb' masses). Moreover, by changing our material conditions of life we can rid society of poverty, crime, exploitation, war and all the other evils which conservatives blame on 'human nature'. Marx and Engels comment that it people are shaped by their environment, then this environment must be made human,' and proceed to add that the 'teaching of materialism' is 'the teaching of real humanism and the logical basis of communism'.a For materialism is the only philosophy today which can rationally explain the world of nature and society and thus enable people to control their own lives and rid humankind of the injustices, inequalities and exploitation of capitalism.

But how is such a philosophy of materialism to be developed? Before materialism can serve as 'the logical basis of communism', it must solve the problem which I now wish to consider, the problem of

(III) Metaphysics and Mechanics

In Earlier Materialism

in W ' ' e communist or tribal societies, people generally explain

movements in nature and relationships in society according to 'spiritual' forces at work in the universe. but it is worth noting that the old legends and customary practices contain many germs of materialism in the way that they carefuuy mirror the features of objective reality. it is, however, only when trade and advancing technology open up the world. as it were. that science develops. demonstrating that what people had thought of as 'spirits' is simply the movement of matter in the universe which can be studied and understood. This discovery led early philosophers in many parts of the world to assert that the universe was solely composed of hard, material particles. out of which all forms of life. including human consciousness. were constructed. Although theories like this were a great advance. the materialist outlook which they expressed was incomplete and inconsistent. Early . Creek philosophers. for example. saw changes in the world as the result of shitting combinations of 'atoms'. but these 'bn'cks of the universe' were themselves immutable. This static feature of their theory Marxists call 'metaphysicall because these basic material elements in the universe were thought of as something 'above' change and hence to all intents and purposes. 'divine'.

This problem was also evident in the materialist outlook of the great 1701 and mm century thinkers in Western Europe. Although they were able to deal many crippling blows to the mystical and hierarchical concepts held under ieudalism (the 'divine right' of kings. for example). the leading science of their time was mechanics and we' call them mechanical materialists because they treated nature and society as if it were some kind oi giant machine. This helped them to understand how things 'worked' but it was unable to explain their origins and how they had developed. It was simply assumed that some god-like force had set the world in motion. and it had never basically changed since! Yet change was precisely that feature of the universe which it was becoming more and more difficult to ignore. The rise of capitalism graphically demonstrated this. As Marx and Engels wrote, constant revolutionlsing of production. uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch (rem all earlier ones ' and this made a great impact on the natural sciences. As Engels noted. the discovery of the cell, the transformation of energy and the theory of evolution named after Darwin' showed that movement in the material world was not merely machine-like. but embraced many different forms of matter-in-motion. encompassing heat and light. electric and magnetic tension. chemical combination, lite and finally human consciousness. All the new sciences pointed to the importance of development and change. it was no longer necessary to bring in some metaphysical force from outside to explain why new elements were continually arising and old ones passing away. The time had come to bring materialist philosphy into contact with

14

sh

(iv) The Theory of Dialectic:

It is one thing for natural scientists to increasingly use concepts of change and development in their scientific work. quite another for these ideas to be worked out systematically as a general world outlook so that they can be consciously used to help us understand all areas of reality,' including of course developments in society. This is why Marx and Engels turned to the work of a great idealist philosopher. Hegel. who had developed the theory of dialectics as an overall philosophy. This theory of dialectics can best be understood in opposition to what we have called 'metaphysics' and the main features of the theory can be formulated as follows: whereas metaphysics sees the world as a complex 0'! things. dlaectcls examines these elements as part of an inter. connected whole in which everything is related to and determined by everything else. '

Thus for example: a dialectical approach does not simply observe mat Africans in South Africa are oppressed by the pass laws. work for star- vation wages. farm the worst land. live in terrible housing conditions etc. Each of these elements is related to the other and can only be pro perly understood as part and parcel of the whole system of apartheid which links them together.

Whereas metaphysics sees the world statically, looking simply at things as they are, dlaectcls is concerned with things in motion, as a process, ceaselessly coming into being and passing away.

Thus. for example. it is not enough just to see how apartheid 'works'

today. We must understand how it developed. how people lived before the Nationalist Party came to office. the great battles they fought against those who came to steal their land and destroy their indigenous institutions. how apartheid was developed as a much more systematic and ideologically fraudulent form of racist domination as a response to an awakening African national consciousness, etc. Understanding how apartheid arose is essential to an understanding of its specific features and how we can get rid of it in all its forms. for the world is continually changing. and a dialectical approach highlights the fluidity of every situation.

Whereas metaphysics regards change as an accidental occurrence. brought on by some chance event from outside, dialectics sees change as a natural and necessary force which comes from within. Thus for example, the tidal wave of strikes. boycotts. demonstrations and popular anger which is increasingly melting South Africa ungovernable and paralysing apartheid. has not been created by external 'troublemakers'. masterminded (as the regime never tires of parroting) by the ANC in exile and the 'communist' perpetrators of the 'total onslaught' who have 'accidentally' managed somehow or other to escape the bombing raids into the Front Line States. This revolutionary process is an inevitable development that springs from within. as a
IS

necessary part of that struggle which has taken many different forms and reached many different peaks, ever since the racist oppression began. Like all change, it can only be properly understood as the necessary outcome of a developing situation: it is not merely some dramatic explosion which accidentally 'happened'. It is true that outside conditions may 'spark' off events so that they take place at one particular time rather than another: but these external circumstances 'condition' the event. whereas the basic cause of its development comes from within.

These features of the theory of dialectics form the basis for a number of general laws of dialectical development which Hegel was able to work out. Marxists consider these general laws to be of great importance for they elaborate upon and help to clarify the features of dialectical theory as noted above.

We turn therefore to briefly examine

(v) The laws of Dialectical Development

Marxists considered that these laws can be reduced in the main to three:

(1) The law of transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa

This law expressed the fact that change in nature and society does not simply involve a slow and continuous increase or decrease in the growth of things. At a certain point, new qualities emerge as a sharp 'break' with the past or 'leap' into the future occurs. Bourgeois thinkers often say that 'there is nothing new under the sun' as though all we can do is strange different hands from the same old pack of cards! Marxists disagree. Just as in nature gradually decreasing or increasing the temperature of water (a change in the quantity) causes it to turn into something quite different, ice or steam (a change which is qualitative), so in life generally, gradual changes of degree which do not affect the essence of a thing reach a point when the thing itself changes its character and a new entity emerges.

Thus in South Africa. for example. for a long period of time the old tribal system slowly disintegrated as the people were forced to leave their homes and work down the mines. on the farms and in the factories. until a 'leap' occurred and a new identity was born. People now saw themselves not merely as Tswanas. Zulus, Xhosas etc. but as Africans, a qualitative change in the people's outlook. This made it possible on the one hand to form the ANC as a national political organisation and to: the ANC. once formed. to fight for the development of a national consciousness among wider and wider sections of the people. This qualitative change in the people's outlook giving them a new sense of - identity did not simply take place overnight: it had been building up gradually, bit by bit, for many years before. But changes in degree do not take place forever. A point is reached when they become changes

16

in kind and something new is created.

But what causes this change to build up in this way? This aspect is focussed upon in

(b) The law of the unity and struggle of opposites

We have already noted that change arises from within things as a necessary part of their development. The elements which make up an object in nature or in society are at once connected with one another and at the same time. in a state of constant struggle or. as we often say. 'contradiction'. Capitalists. for example. cannot exist without exploiting - wage workers. while these workers cannot survive without selling their labour power to a capitalist. They are at once 'united' -- for each depends upon the other - but as the class struggle shows. they are also 'opposites'. for this unity is manifest through an ongoing struggle. This is an important law of dialectics because it helps to identify the reason why everything in the world must continue to develop. Of course. not all 'struggling opposites' or contradictions should be looked at in the same way and Marxists generally distinguish between antagonistic contradictions. when a struggle cannot be resolved without victory to: one side and defeat for the other. and non-antagonistic contradictions. when differences are resolved in a way which leaves all the constituent elements intact. Thus. whereas under capitalism. the contradiction between worker and capitalist is an antagonistic one. under socialism contradictions remain but with the gradual disappearance of classes, antagonistic. i.e. mutually destructive relationships. die out. At all times. in other words. the unity and struggle of opposites continues. for without operation of this law in nature and society. no real

change could take place at all.

But what is the relationsz between the old and the new as change occurs? This is demonstrated by 1

(c) The law of the negation of the negation :4

Negation in dialectics. as Engels has pointed out, 'does not mean simply saying no, or declaring that something does not exist. or destroying it in any way one likes'.

'Negation' involves the movement of something from an old stage to a new and higher stage, so that the elements of the old are carried forward and reworked into the new. Just as capitalism 'negatecl' feudalism by using the former serfs and anisans in its new labour force. so socialism 'negates' capitalism by building upon its social production and advanced technology. When we speak therefore of the 'negation of the negation' we do not merely mean that something has changed twice over. We mean that there has been a spiral development upwards. carrying the past into the futuxe. remaking it in the process.

Negation therefore has a negative side which conservatives ignore when they think that there is no real tbreak' in development, so that, for example. they forget that African workers. both men and women. who

have spent years of their life living and working in the cities, struggling with their comrades for more money. better conditions and the right to belong to an effective trade union. are very different from their grand. parents who lived in a tribal community farming the land in the period before colonialism. Ironically white supremacists are often acutely conscious of the force of this 'negation' when they argue that Africans are supposedly 'too primitive' to understand the complexities of trade unionism and would therefore use their trade unions as political weapons in the struggle against apartheid! But its negation has a negative side, it also has a positive side, which anarchists and ultra-leftists ignore when they fail to see that revolutionaries must build upon the traditions of the past. carrying over what is healthy and democratic and discarding what is backward and reactionary. This is clearly a crucial task for African revolutionaries to undertake.

Hence the law of the negation of the negation helps us to understand change both as a break with the past and yet at the same time a development from it. Having looked briefly at the three general laws of dialectical development, we are now in a position to consider my final point relating to

(VI) Dialectic; end Materialism: the Marxist Synthesis

Just as earlier materialism was weakened. as we have seen. by metaphysical and mechanical ideas. so the theory of dialectics and its laws of development as conceived by Hegel suffered from one insoluble problem. Hegel was an idealist and hence treats dialectics as movement in the realm of ideas or as Hegel conceived it. the development of a 'World Spirit'. Contrary to his theory of dialectics which looks at the world as a process of infinite development, the Hegelian 'World Spirit' was assumed to have a 'beginning' (the reason for which no one could explain) and 'an end' (which quite arbitrarily had come to rest with the creation of the capitalist system!) It is not too difficult for Marxists to see that the earlier materialists were not completely materialist and the earlier dialectical thinkers were not consistently dialectical, because in both cases. the uncritical acceptance of a system of exploitation and the division of society into classes made these philosophers unable and unwilling to see everything. including 'human nature' and private property, class privilege and social inequality. subject to the necessary forces of change.

Marx and Engels were able to bring dialectics and materialism into a fruitful synthesis because they were the first thinkers in history to base their philosophy on the revolutionary needs and aspirations of the working class, the only class in history which has absolutely nothing to lose from change. This is why other sections of society. the peasants and shopkeepers. the intelligentsia, the unemployed and the small traders (who will also benefit from revolution) need to ally themselves with the working class and its Communist Party and follow the philosophy of the working class, dialectical materialism.

As early as 1845 Marx and Engels commented that the standpoint of the old materialism is 'civil' (or bourgeois) society; the standpoint of the new is human (or communist) society ... for the 'new' materialism is dialectical materialism and dialectical materialism is the only philosophy which, in guiding us in the long and difficult struggle to win a national democracy, build socialism and enter into the epoch of communism. will always welcome change.

Notes:

1. Ludwig Pernerbech and the End of Classical German Philosophy Marx. Engels. Selected Works, (Lawrence and Wishart. 1968). p. 604. This is an invaluable piece to read for anyone seeking to learn more about the development of Marxist philosophical thought.

2. The 1100 family in Collected Works 4, (Lawrence and Wishart. 1975). p.131

Ibid

. Manifesto of the Communist Party, Collected Works, op. cit., p.38. In Africa the effect of these expanding waves of capitalist production was traumatic. As one writer recalls, 'the 19th century hurled at us the economic and adventurous restlessness of Europe. and subsequently the mania called 'Scramble for Africa' shattered the subcontinent. The sheer physical impact of the assault was enough to stagger the edifice of tribalism. I can almost see my infinitely great-grandfather. leaping to his feet on a rock and gaping at a sailing ship seeking harbour - all his patriarchal dignity forgotten. as he exclaims. 'Haul'. - Can Tembs. 'The Bottom of the Bottle', Africa South in Exile, 1961. p.53

Engels expands upon these points in his introduction to the Dialectics
of Nature and in his chapters of philosophy in Anti-Duehn'ng.
Dialectic: of Nature, (Lawrence and Wishart, 1964). p.63
Cited in The Fundamentals of Marxist-leninist Philosophy. (Progress
Publishers. Moscow, 1974). p.153
Theses on Feuerbach reprinted as an appendix to The German Ideology,
(Lawrence and Wishart. 1965), p.653

Me

90:49.05

19

CHAPTER THREE:

MARXISM

AND THE

THEORY OF

KNOWLEDGE

Previous chapters have dealt with the importance of dialectical materialism in helping revolutionaries both to formulate and to put into practice effective strategies (or change). It is now necessary to examine more closely the area of Marxist philosophy which tackles the question of knowledge and ideas: how they arise, and how we assess the thorny issues of truth and falsehood, appearance and reality, freedom and necessity.

It is true that these sort of questions are very much 'taken for granted' and not considered worthy of serious study, particularly by those who feel that they have enough on their own hands with the day to day pressures of political struggle. Yet it is important to remember that the objective of this political struggle is revolutionary - a far-reaching change in our present way of life and world outlook - and if a social revolution represents, in the words of Marx and Engels, 'the most radical rupture with traditional property relations', it is hardly surprising that its development involves the meeting and rupture with traditional ideas.

We can only eliminate apartheid and white supremacy, establish a national democracy and prepare the road for the advance to socialism if reactionary ideas in all their forms and at all levels are consciously combated. This ideological struggle - a crucial part of our political work - requires more than simply understanding what is wrong with this idea or that idea. It also requires an overall understanding of what ideas themselves are, how they develop in society, what makes them true or false and how we can effectively make use of them in our political struggle.

20

t

In 1976 the epic uprising in Soweto ushered in a new era of street battles and popular resistance - an intensification of the struggle which made it all the more important that we have a clear-headed conception of where we are going and what we want to achieve. In the ringing words of the ANC newsletter circulated shortly after the events: 'It is time to hit back at the enemy 'with everything we have got. It is time to be more skillful and strike at him in places where he is weak and least prepared. Let us avoid concentrating in big numbers and deprive him of visible meetings.

Vital practical advice which has helped to create a situation ten years later where it is now possible for a communist to write:

'Today, our approach to the theory of state and revolution in South Africa must proceed far beyond an abstract projection of a remote 'ideological' future in the coming years. Our method must establish guidelines for immediate revolutionary practice, because our revolution has already called forth organs of popular self-government. We must begin by seeking solutions to immediate and pressing practical needs in the actual men of struggle in Outlook, 'l'unahle, Thenbise, Mondlo, the Vael Triangle and the Reef.'

But whether it is practical advice of the kind which the ANC offered in the wake of the Soweto Uprising or the pressing need today 'for some positive and creative ideas' about organs of popular power, in both cases a correct theoretical approach is necessary in order to make practical advance. Although general philosophical study may seem remote from the burning issues of the day, in fact an overall grasp of the nature of knowledge and theory can only assist in putting our revolutionary ideas on to a firm and consistent basis.

Indeed just how politically relevant questions of what we call the theory of knowledge really are, will become evident as I turn to examine I . the Development of Ideas In Social Production

How do ideas arise and what are they? For thousands of years people have observed that humans, unlike animals, have a unique ability to think and religious people have explained this capacity by saying that God created us 'in his own image' and thereby endowed humans with certain qualities which animals do not have.

Marxism, however as the scientific theory of the working class focuses its attention upon material production in order to explain the development of human thought, for while it is always possible, as Marx and Engels put it, to distinguish humans from animals 'by consciousness, religion or anything else you like' they themselves begin to distinguish

themselves from animals u soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence. a step which is conditioned by their physical organisation.

The activity of production requires the evolution of the species to the
El

point in which our immediate ancestors began to adopt an upright posture. to develop manual dexterity. vocal cords capable of articulating speech sounds. and a complex nervous system in the brain, so that the formation of abstract ideas becomes possible. Indeed. the simplest act of production - the manufacture of stone tools. for example - is only possible if there is the co-ordination of all mental and manual faculties. To make something, we not only have to use our hands. we must also be able to identify the objects in our environment. and describe them with words and ideas to those with whom we co-operate. for production is and always has been a social activity. This means - the question which particularly concerns me here - we must develop the capacity to think. Just as natural evolution enables us to understand how it became physically possible for men to actually produce their means of subsistence. so the act of material production makes it possible to explain why humans need to think as a necessary part of their social activity as producers. In a famous passage on 'The Labour Process' in Capital, Marx comments: A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver. and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this. that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. The use of ideas is an essential part of the activity of production. for as Marx adds. at the end of every labour process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement.'

It is true that we are able through our imagination to conjure up ideas which bear no obvious connection to the external work, and it is (or this reason that idealists argue that ideas exist as 'other worldly spirits' originating in a world all of their own. In fact, there is no mystery about the origin of our ideas. even in their most fantastic and unreal form: all ideas arise as a necessary part of our social activity. our relationships to one another and to the world around us. Because our outlook on life has its roots in the way we produce. Marxists reject all attempts to explain the differences between people simply in terms of their religion. nationality or 'race'. The thoughts people have. the culture they develop. the society they build arise in the last analysis from their activity in social production.

But if the roots of our ideas are to be found in the world of material production. what relationship do the ideas in our head bear to the objective world of reality? This is a vital question to answer if we are later to tackle the whole question of 'truth' and 'falsehood'. To explore it more fully. it is necessary first to go into the problem of

2. Ideas as Reflection of Objective Reality

In an immediate sense thinking is of course the activity of the brain as

22
'matter which thinks' but the brain itself only functions as part of human activity in general. relying upon the stimuli it receives (via the nervous system) from our practical contact with the world at large. In fact. without this practical contact with things around us. we would have no ideas at all: the brain would remain a mere fossil. embryonic and undeveloped. it is because the source of our ideas lies in our social activity - the relationships we have with other people and surrounding nature - that the character of our ideas takes the form of reflections in our minds of the objective world outside of us. It is obvious that a peasant farmer whose life is spent herding cattle in some remote district of the Transkei will have a very different outlook on life from someone who lives in one of the large townships on the outskirts of Cape Town or Johannesburg. Small shopkeepers who work by themselves with the help of their families will see things quite differently from men who work down a mine or women who have to leave their own children in the rural areas in order to look after the offspring of the 'white madam' instead. If the practical experiences of people differ, so too must their ideas because these ideas are basically a mental reflection of the world around them. it is true that this concept of ideas as a reflection of reality is sometimes taken to imply a rather static concept of the mind as a 'mirror' which passively 'reflects' the objects around it. Now if this were the case. then, as some philosophers rightly argue. we would never be able to acquire any real knowledge about the world our ideas reflect. since all we would have would be a series of contradictory images rather in the way that a coin sometimes looks circular. sometimes elliptical. sometimes large, sometimes small. It all depends on how you look at it. But this version

of 'reilection theory' rests upon a completely mistaken attitude to the way our mind actually works and produces its reflections of external reality. The fact is that ideas only arise as part and parcel of our living practice. They are not drawn 'mirror like' from the world in a passive way. but are derived solely from the practical activity through which we discover things. learn to identify them and understand how they work. 'opening them up'. so to speak, altering their character. even nuk-ing them ourselves so that we are able to understand what life is really like. The 'sceptical' position which questions whether the real world actually exists outside of our reflected images. wrongly assumes lltut thinking simply involves 'contemplating the world from afar'. Of course this is how the activity of thinking may appear to bourgeois philosophe it: who live off the wealth which others produoe. but it is not how thinking actually takes place.

It is important here that mental reflection - the basic property oi human ideas - should not be confused with mere 'sensations' or tim-pressions' as they are sometimes called. A sensation simply refers to a stimulus that our senses receive from the outside - a reaction by our body to extremes of hot and cold. for example - whereas a mental

mnection involves some degree. however minimal. of conscious understanding so that we can identify objects through language and express out thoughts through speech. The first is an instinctive activity which we share with animals; the second is a specifically human act which has to be learnt through social practice. Naturally. as people develop they become able to perform many quite complicated acts - like riding a bicycle. driving a car. writing their name - almost unconsciously. but all these activities have had to be learnt through practice: they develop as the result of an infinite number of daily experiences which our mind continually reflects.

indeed. this concept of an idea as a reflection of the real world is vital if we are to tackle the question of '

3. Distinguishing Truth From Falsehood

1! ideas arise in our minds as reflections of the external world. then the extent to which these ideas are true or false depends upon the accuracy with which they reflect or 'reproduce' in our minds. the relationships. processes and objects of outside reality. But how can we tell? How can we say. for example. that the ideas of a factory worker may be more valid or truthful than those of a shopkeeper or a farmer when all ideas derive from the particular experience of those who hold them?

The answer lies. once again. in the question of practice - in the active way in which we develop our ideas. it is because our knowledge is being continually put to practical use through production, in waging the class struggle. in performing scientific experiments. that we find. as the well-known saying has it. that 'the proof of the pudding is in the eating'.

When our plans fail, when our experiments backfire. when our way of life crumbles. when our strategies are wrecked. we soon discover which ideas match up to the outside world and which do not. We learn the truth by continually testing our ideas in practice - the practice of operating a machine correctly. of producing a leaflet which expresses the mood of the people at a particular time. of successfully hitting the enemy 'where he is weak and least prepared' etc - and because our ideas enable us to change the world through an infinite variety of practical activities. we learn in this way how things really function. what is true and what is false. ,

But if we judge the validity of our ideas by the extent to which they accurately reflect external reality. how do we account for the existence of ideas which are false? if. in fact. all ideas derive from practical experience and there is no other source (despite what idealists think). why should these ideas not always reflect the real world correctly?

The problem is that 'truth' and 'falsehood' are not the simple black and white categories that they sometimes seem: the Calvinist 'dominee' may imagine that everything his bible tells him is absolutely true and that everything someone else's bible says is absolutely false. but the fact

24

is that once we remember that all ideas are drawn from our practical experience of the world. it is clear that even when ideas are basically false. they still relate to aspects of the real world. and even when ideas are basically true. they will still have elements which are false. Why? Because all ideas, without exception. represent some kind of reflection of what is going on.

Take the concept of apartheid as an extreme example. This concept is regarded by the vast majority of people in South Africa and by world public opinion at large as one of the most deceitful and warped political and social policies ever to be implemented in modern times. And yet. although it is obvious to millions of progressive people that 'separate development' or what is now fashionably called 'group rights' serves merely as a cynical justification for denying democratic freedoms to those who live and work in an integrated economy. to a minority of die-hard reactionaries and white supremacists (whether pre- or post-Rubicon) apartheid appears as a 'moral' even divinely ordained. solution to the country's problems. Why should this be? Looked at from the standpoint of the Marxist theory of knowledge. the answer can only be that the doctrine of apartheid is not merely a distorted theory of society. it is a distorted theory which reflects a warped and distorted way of life. The theory is inhuman because the practice is inhuman. For the financier who wants to draw vast profits without any 'problems'. (or the industrialist who wants a supply of cheap labour which can be turned on and off like a tap. for the labour aristocrat who wants to keep his job and privileges at his fellow workers' expense. in short. for all who look upon the black people of South Africa as more objects to be exploited.

the doctrine of apartheid has a perverted logic which reflects one at the cruellest forms of capitalist exploitation anywhere in the world. This is why eliminating apartheid is not, as liberals seem to think, merely a question of a 'change of heart' or a 'change of mind'; on the contrary, it is because distorted ideas must reflect a distorted reality that a revolution is required which will radically restructure the social relations of production in South Africa, nationalising the major industries and restoring the land to the people, so that the exploitation can be first checked and then eliminated. To change false ideas we need to alter the conditions which give rise to them. This is the Marxist approach to the question of truth.

It follows that just as false and reactionary ideas contain superficial elements of the 'truth' in them, for they exist as the reflections of a real world, so likewise do ideas which are basically correct, contain elements of distortion and one-sidedness. The truth, in other words, is both absolute and relative, it is real and yet never complete. This is why serious revolutionaries constantly find it necessary to observe and study, to investigate both theory and reality. Political consciousness needs to be advanced by conscious effort as a regular part of political struggle.

Precisely because we acquire our knowledge through our practical experience in the objective world, this knowledge is always developed as part of an on-going process of discovery. in which, as Lenin puts it. incomplete. inexact knowledge becomes more complete and more exact'. We continually deepen our understanding of the real world as science advances. technology improves and our understanding of politics and society grows. and yet, although our expanding body of knowledge increasingly approximates to objective reality. nonetheless as Engels stresses. each mental image of the world system is and remains in actual fact limited, objectively by the historical conditions and subjectively by the physical and mental constitution of its originated

Such images or reflections are absolutely true to the extent that they correctly reproduce elements of an objectively real world. but. they are also of necessity relatively true in that the knowledge of any one individual. like the collective knowledge of all mankind, can never be more than a part of an infinite world which is always changing and developing. This unity of the absolute and the relative holds also of course for our Marxist world outlook. for while the basic principles of dialectical materialism are true and correctly reflect reality. their truth is dynamic rather than static. for these principles are continually being applied to new circumstances and in new conditions. New aspects of Marxist theory - like the concept of a path of socialist orientation for the developing countries of the third world - develop to take account of new situations and possibilities in a changing world. This is why all . our ideas have a relative as well as an absolute side to them. Political tactics which may be correct at one time - like the ANC's policies of peaceful resistance pursued until the end of the 1950s - have to be _ altered as conditions change: the reason by the Nationalist government . to acts of bloody repression like Sharpeville and the introduction of police terror and torture on a massive scale, all made it necessary to develop a strategy of armed struggle. What is true at a particular time , is not necessarily true forever. , .

in order to understand more 0! what is involved in this process of deepening our knowledge of the world through the progress of science, technology and the class struggle. It now turns to briefly examine the question of 4. Scientific Knowledge and the

Movement from Appearances to Reality

Marxists argue that all our knowledge arises through the activity of our senses and the impressions which our mind receives from the outside world are generally called sensations, or, to take another word philosophers commonly use. perceptions. But although these perceptions form the basis of our ideas - and we can only develop thought through the action of our senses - on their own. perceptions or

26

sensations. as already noted. are not ideas in the strict sense of the term. Ideas only emerge when perceptions develop into what we may call judgments (where we can 'conceive' as well as 'perceive') so that objects around us can be named and described. Indeed. even the simplest words in our vocabulary involve an element of 'abstraction' or 'conception' for the word 'chair'. for example. requires us to be able to identify all chairs. irrespective of shape. size and location. Learning to speak. therefore. involves more than 'perceiving': it involves learning to think. The movement of perception to ideas. of sensations to 'judgments' is often called the movement of our thinking beyond 'appearances' to 'reality' - a penetration beyond our first 'impressions' of what things are like to correct understanding of their reality: how they arise. develop and relate to other things around them. Indeed, this movement of our thought beyond 'appearances' is the precondition for knowledge as a science. for the development of a serious and systematic body of ideas. Man: made the point that our everyday experience 'catches only the delusive appearance of things' whereas scientific investigation looks towards the inner connections and relationships which explain why things develop as they do. Appearances may be highly misleading as we know from the fact that whereas the earth appears to be flat with the sun moving around it, in reality the opposite is true. We can only go beyond superficial and often deceptive impressions by. as it were. 'digging beneath the surface' so as to probe the underlying reality - a method which Marx employs with great skill in Capital by showing that the exchange of one commodity for another simply appears to be an exchange of 'things'. whereas in reality. people have to enter into

social relationships to produce the commodities. 'Behind' the rosy appearance of the Cape apple or the glittering golden ngerrand, lies the 'hidden' misery of sweated labour and low wages. just as the labour contract in which worker and capitalist 'mutually agree' to exchange wages for work masks the brutal realities of exploitation. The acquisition of knowledge is a process, therefore. as Lenin describes it. of going 'endlessly deeper' from appearance to essence. from essence of the first order, as it were. to essence of the second order. and so on without end' and indeed it is precisely this restless search for the truth beneath appearances which makes it possible for us to learn from mistakes and adjust our plans so that they reflect more accurately the realities of the situation.

Thus we find that the South African Communist Party was able during the Rand strike of 1922 to grasp the importance of the class contradiction between the miners and the government but failed to penetrate sufficiently into the particular nature of this contradiction. Hence while the party was critical of the racist attitudes of the white miners. it still neglected the interests of the African miners and the importance of taking a vigorous stand in support of equal pay and conditions. As Lemma

comments. these omissions cannot be ascribed only to the objective conditions, but also to the theoretical analysis made at the time.''. Indeed, it was only with the experience of the 1922 strike, a better understanding of the reactionary nature of the South African Labour Party (which had been misleadingly compared to the Labour Party in Britain) and the growing African influence in the Party. that a more precise understanding of the character of class contradictions in South Africa came to prevail. The 'appearances' of White labour militancy had proved highly deceptive.

The importance of always searching for the reality beneath appearances brings me to the final point I want to consider in outlining the Marxist theory of knowledge, and that is

5. Freedom and the Understanding of Necessity

When we look superficially at what I have called the 'appearances' of things, the world appears to be governed only by chance and accident. As we probe beneath the surface. we begin to understand how things are related to one another so that what initially seemed to be accidental now reveals itself as the work of necessity. the inevitable result of the forces at work. Thus a worker may think in the first instance that he or she is being exploited simply because they have a 'bad' employer. but further experience and study teaches them that all employers exploit their workers because exploitation is a necessary rather than accidental feature of the capitalist system. Reality can only be scientifically understood when we discover the 'laws' or necessary forces which make things what they are.

This does not mean. however, that because everything is basically determined by laws of development there is no room in the world for accidents. On the contrary. just as reality always presents itself to us as a particular and often deceptive appearance, so the basic laws of motion at work in any particular process or situation can only realise themselves through a particular set of circumstances, the precise formation of which is always accidents! in character. ,

Thus we can say that while the great eruption of protest and demonstration that began in Soweto on 16 June 1976 was no accident in the sense that it was the necessary product of unbearable oppression, the particular character of this protest - against the compulsory use of Afrikaans in the schools ... was 'accidental' in that many other grievances could have served equally to spark off the protest. The fact that popular protest spread throughout the country in the wake of the uprising, the fact that today. ten years later. the masses are more militant. more organised and even more united in their opposition to oppression, shows that in 1976 it was not simply the language question which was under attack. It was and of course still is the whole system of apartheid which is on trial. While therefore all relevant factors need to be taken into account when

28

we examine things. the accidental aspects of an event can only give us the surface causes or superficial reasons. A scientific analysis requires that we try to discover the laws of development at work which enable us to explain why an event or process is necessary and inevitable. But if it is true that everything which takes place must be understood in terms of the 'inner, hidden laws' which work themselves out through the 'surface accidents'. how can we have any place for 'freedom' or 'free will' in our theory? Indeed. many critics argue that it is absurd to see. for example. a revolution as historically inevitable. a necessary product of social forces, and yet organise and mobilise the people to bring this revolution about.

In fact this contradiction between 'free will' and 'necessity' only exists for those who cannot understand that real freedom requires us to exercise real control over the world around us and the only way in which we can extend our mastery over the forces of nature and society is through a clear-headed understanding of the laws of development, the forces of necessity which are actually operating. How else can we bring about change. so that what we want to happen does in fact take place? To change anything. whether it is a faulty machine or an unjust social order. we must understand why it is what it is: the forces which determine it. This is why the Communist Party and the ANC base their strategies for revolutionary change upon a close and careful analysis of the historical laws which govern the development of apartheid and white supremacy. Understanding the way the system necessarily works is a precondition for getting rid of it altogether! Indeed. the more ambitious our plans are to liberate society. the more soberly and scientifically

ly we need to examine laws of necessity which affect the situation. One is essential if we are to achieve the other. This is why a thorough grasp of the question of 'freedom and necessity'. 'appearance and reality'. the nature of truth as a reaction of the objective world is so important at this particular time. For who can deny that as the popular offensive against apartheid continues to intensify and the regime desperately battens down the hatches with one state of emergency after the other in a futile attempt to resist the inevitable. lessons which may take years to learn in more 'normal' times, are now compressed into months. weeks. even days as a result? In the great challenge which faces the liberation movement as the national democratic revolution unfolds. the Marxist theory of knowledge has an important role to play. for never before has it become so important to scientifically analyse events and be crystal clear about where we are going.

FOOTNOTES:

1. The Manifesto of the Communist Party, Collected Works, 6. (Moscow/London. 1976). p504.

- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.

The African Communist 3rd Oumer, 1986. p56 and The Attica:

Communist tth Quarter, 1976. p12.

The Gonna Ideology. Collected Work 5, (Moscow/London, 1976). p31.

Capital. (Lewrence end Wishan. 1970), p178.

Mum end W Collected Works 14, (Moscow 1972),

p103. ,

m-Duehnlm (Moscow. 1962). p57.

Wages, Prloe and mm, Selected Works in one volume (Moscowl-london. 1968). P209.

W Notebook; Collected Works 38, (Moscow/London, 1961).

p258.

F131 Fighting teen (Inkululeko Publications, 1971), p52.

CHAPTER FOUR:

THE

MATERIALIST ,

THEORY

OF HISTORY

What are the forces at work in society which bring about revolution?

Why do we say that social and political upheavals are inevitable in class-divided societies?

These are vital questions for revolutionaries to think about today. At a time when the imperialist world is desperately trying to salvage the interests of multi-national capital in South Africa by seeking to drive a wedge between the ANC and the Communist Party, a scientific understanding of the nature of revolution is essential indeed, for the world of political struggle is a harsh one and it is not enough to tackle questions of social change simply in terms of what we would 'like' to , see happen or may 'dxeam' about. Effective leadership of the forces of liberation rests upon an ability to creatively combine a careful and continuing analysis of panicular events (9.9 the development of the international campaign for sanctions against apartheid with the varying response which this is receiving within the Commonwealth and iii the capitalist world). with an overall understanding of the nature of revolution itself and the reasons for historical change. i

It is because communists seek to link the particular with the general in this way that they can claim, in the words of the Manifesto. to 'always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole': it they form an advanced and resolute section of the movement. that is because theoretically they have over the greet mm o! the projetuiet the advantage of clearly understanding the line of much, the conditions and the ultimete general results of the proletariat movement.'

A precise understanding of particular events must be linked to an understanding of history and society itself. Previous chapters have looked at the principles of dialectical materialism and the way in which Marxist philosophy helps us understand the world in general: what must now be tackled is the way in which we relate dialectical materialism to the development of society - the study of what is generally called 'historical materialism' or 'the materialist theory of history'. An analysis of this theory must begin with a consideration of:

(I) The Nature of Humans as Social Producers

All theories of society and history must operate with some conception of human nature' for they are theories which seek to explain what happens in all societies and what determines the way people behave. It is sometimes said that Marxists do not believe in human nature. but this is only true in the sense that we reject any conception of a static or unchanging 'human nature'. for we know that people's ideas, behaviour and institutions are constantly changing - that human nature can be found in many different forms. But the question still needs to be posed: what is it about people and their society which makes this change both possible and necessary?

It is the fact that human beings have to produce all the things which they need in order to survive: they cannot simply 'live off' nature in the way animals do. The animal, as Engels notes, merely uses his environment and brings about changes in it simply by his presence; men by his changes makes it serve his ends, masters it. This is the final, essential distinction between man and other animals and it is only in terms of such a distinction that we can understand the historical 'nature' of the human as a being who produces.

But do not some animals, particularly higher primates like apes and chimpanzees, use their hands to build nests, grasp sticks and even hurl stones at their enemies? The truth is that human beings, even at the most primitive technical stage of their development, can accomplish something which no ape has ever been able to do, and that is to make tools with which to produce and to use their tools to alter the world around them in a conscious and deliberate way.

Humankind, Engels was to say, must first of all eat, drink, have shelter and clothing. Hence it can make music, science, art, religion, etc.: and this need to produce is described by Marx and Engels as a fundamental condition of all history, which today, as thousands of years ago, can only be met merely in order to sustain human life.

But why should this approach to history be called 'materialist' in character? it is materialist

0) because the activity of production itself brings people into direct and

32 continuing contact with the forces of nature (or the world of matter); and

b) because production is necessary to human survival whether people are aware of this fact or not. Hence Marx often refers to production as a 'material' process which people enter into 'independent of their will'.³ With the development of classes in society so that a privileged few do the 'thinking' and an exploited majority have to create the wealth, the materialist basis to human existence is obscured by the philosophers and priests, etc, rather in the way that many white people in South Africa don't think very much about the importance of production and what it involves because they have black servants and employees who do the real work for them! Nevertheless, material production is the most important fact of human life and it explains why

c) people can only be understood as individuals who survive in society. Production is essentially a collective activity in which people have to work together so that when we speak about social production, we necessarily refer to the relationships which people enter into when they produce. Even the 'Robinson Crusoes' and the hermits of the world can only live in isolation because they have first acquired the ability to think, speak and produce by working in society.

But in order to explain how the nature of humans as social producers affects the way they act in society, we need to look more closely at the two aspects which constitute the production process:

(11) Productive Forces and the Relations of Production

The activity of production involves first and foremost the making of tools or the development of technology, whether we think of the manufac-

ture of spears for hunting or computers for programming. This technology includes not only the tools or machines themselves but all the raw material, technical skills and know-how which go into making and using them and it is described in Marxist theory as a force of production. It is obvious that every time a fresh invention is made, these forces of production change accordingly.

Tools, whether simple or sophisticated, have to be operated by people and since people must enter into a definite set of relationships in order to produce, the 'forces of production' are necessarily linked to the 'relations of production'. Since the way in which we relate to one another or co-operate in production depends upon the kind of technology we are actually using, we may say therefore that the relations of production into which people enter are determined by the forces of production which they have created.

As Marx puts it social relations are closely bound up with productive forces. (The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam mill, society with the industrial capitalist) Of course, working with tools or productive forces is only possible when humans

co-operate, so that it might be objected that productive forces and productive relations are indistinguishable from one another. Here we need to be as precise as possible: by productive relations, we do not simply mean what some commentators have called 'work relations' i.e. technical modes of co-operation in the use of tools. Rather we mean relationships which involve questions of power and control - the question of not simply how the technology is used, but how it is owned and who derives the chief reward from its usage. In hunting societies, for example, in the state of 'primitive communism', everyone not only works as a team but there is insufficient wealth produced to allow some to sit idly by giving 'orders' to others who have to work for them. The collective way in which people work together determines the collective or communal way in which they share out and own the wealth they produce. Productive forces determine the relations of production.

What happens when these productive forces change so that hunting gives way to agriculture and some individuals can accumulate, by fair means or foul, more wealth than they actually need? The relations of production must also change. For, to put it simply, a herd of cattle can be owned privately in the way that a herd of buffalo cannot. It is now profitable to systematically plunder your neighbours, make them work for you as slaves, and develop private property in crops and cattle. A clan or tribal society owning the means of production in common is gradually transformed into a society divided into classes: the wealth produced by one group is owned by another and although the development of class antagonism and exploitation had not developed to any significant degree in much of pre-colonial Africa, the changing relations of production can ultimately be explained by changes taking place in the productive forces. Every change in these forces - whether we think of the invention of the plough to till the land or the spinning jenny which mechanised the weaving loom - must transform production relations. Indeed, it is the dramatic change in the forces of production brought about by capitalism so that thousands of people work together in mines and factories using highly advanced technology, which makes it not merely possible but ultimately necessary for private ownership to give way to social ownership and, in conditions of growing abundance, for everyone to at once take part in production and yet at the same time enjoy a life of security and freedom. A socialist and communist society cannot, however, simply come about because people 'want' it: new forces of production alone make it possible. This is why it would be naive and utopian to try to establish socialist relations of production - where the means of production are owned in common - in a society where most people are still individual handicraft producers or peasant farmers working small plots of land in isolation from one another. The relations of production must, in Marx's words, be appropriate to a given stage in the development of their forces of production.'

34

It is only on the basis of developed industry and cooperative and collective agriculture that socialism can be built, and most African countries who have recently freed themselves from colonial and neo-colonial control suffer from serious technological backwardness, they need to pursue policies of socialist orientation in order to create the forces of production necessary to sustain socialist relations of production. In South Africa itself, however, things are rather different, and following the national democratic revolution, the mechanised agriculture and developed industrial base (already created by the capitalists) would make it possible to build socialism much more rapidly.

Although, as we have seen, the forces of production in any society determine the relations of production and changes in the relations are only possible because of changes in the productive forces, it should not be thought that these changes occur smoothly and automatically. In fact, the very opposite is true particularly when we are speaking of societies divided into antagonistic classes. Here not only do the relations of production 'lag behind' changes in technology and scientific understanding, but the production relations actively resist the need to adapt and change. They become obsolete and outmoded and enormous pressure has to build up in society before the transformation of production relations can take place and they are brought in line with the altered production forces. In fact, it is precisely this pressure which builds up to force old production relations to adapt to the new forces of production that is the basic cause of every social and political revolution.

In Marx's words, at a certain stage of development, the material pro-

ductive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production from the stage of development at the productive forces. These relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution.' _

Thus we can now formulate the basic propositions of the materialist theory of history by saying: .

a) Every alteration in the way people control production (the production relations) brings about a change in the way people co-operate in production and because changes in technology are natural and unavoidable in all societies, we can describe the need (or the relations of production to adapt to the forces of production as the most basic law of human history - the ultimate explanation for all social change. But

b) because the development of exploitation, class divisions and the institution of private property arises at a particular stage in history, the adaptation of the relations to the forces of production cannot take place 'gradually' and continuously'. A revolution is needed in order to take power out of the hands of one class and vest it in another in order to make it possible for the relations and forces of production to once again correspond.

-- 35

To understand more clearly why it is that class divisions have the effect of obstructing the adjustment of productive relations to productive forces. it is now necessary to introduce into the theory the concepts of (III) Basis and Superstructure

When people enter into a particular set of production relations. they do so through the entire range of social institutions which function to regulate, justify and protect these particular relations. Just as the forces of production cannot exist in the real world without the people who co-operate in a definite way to work them, so the relations of production only develop because people are also members of a family, are guided by a morality and sometimes a religion. accept certain cultural values. and in class-divided societies, have their lives ultimately regulated by the coercive machinery of the state. And just as productive forces determine the relations of production. so for their part. the production relations constitute what we call the economic basis of society which determines all the social institutions and ideas which make these production relations possible - the decisive force which moulds 'the general process of social, political and intellectual life'.

Marx describes this economic basis as 'the real foundation of society upon which. as he puts it. there arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness'

Marx uses the term 'superstructure' to describe society's institutions and ideas because he argues that these aspects of our life do not simply dwell in a self-contained world of their own but have their origin in the way we relate to one another in the realm of material production.

They are a 'superstructure' because they can only be understood, in the last analysis. in terms of a society's economic 'basis'.

Thus. for example. it is not simply a 'coincidence' that in South Africa you have the vicious exploitation of the black people in the factories, mines and (arms existing 'alongside' a political system which denies them any say in the government of the country existing 'alongside' social and religious prejudices which claim that inequality is 'natural' and that 'races' should be kept apart. Nor is it enough to simply note that all these facets of apartheid 'hang together' and are related. The fact is that it is not the ideas of a few eccentric professors from Potchefstroom or Pretoria which have brought about the nightmarish policies of 'separate development' - it is the demand for cheap black labour by the industrialists. mine owners and the big farmers. In so far as economic realities come into conflict with pet schemes of this or that apartheid ideologue. it is the ideas and not the realities which suffer! It is the basis which ultimately determines the superstructure. It is not. as Marx says. the consciousness of men that determines their existence. but their social existence that determines their consciousness." This is why. despite all the talk about abolishing the pass laws and doing away with

36

L

the outmoded system of apartheid, it is clear that the regime simply seeks to streamline racist domination so as to place profits and class power on what it hopes will be a more secure basis. The roots of apartheid are to remain 'non-negotiable'. i.e. securely intact.

The secret of every society is to be found neither in its politics nor in its ideas but in the precise character of its production relations and it is only by studying these that we can ultimately explain why a society has the kind of culture. family structure. political system and 'spiritual life' that it does. This is because it is the role of the superstructure in a class-divided society to justify and protect, to entrench and institutionalise a privileged and oppressive way of life so that the owners of the means of production - the ruling class - try to fossilise the kind of production relations which favour their interests and prevent these relations from smoothly adapting to the ever-changing forces of production. This is why an oppressed people fighting for their freedom cannot merely transform obsolete relations of production without at the same time radically altering the entire political and ideological superstructure which is rooted in and serves to perpetuate economic exploitation. It is sometimes thought (usually by the critics of Marxism) that concepts like 'productive forces' and 'productive relations', economic 'basis' and ideological 'superstructure' refer to easily separable slices of reality so that one can actually point to a 'basis' in one part of society and a 'superstructure' in another. This. in fact. is not so. In the real world, technology and social relationships. economic. cultural and political institutions all inextricably inter-penetrate and the concepts which

historical materialism employs have been separated out in the form of an analysis in order to produce a scientific theory of change. indeed. the very need for a scientific theory of change arises from the fact that what really happens when societies develop or revolutions occur should never be confused with what people taking part in the events may think or imagine is going on. The distinction between the 'basis' and 'superstructure' makes it possible for us to distinguish the real roots of a revolution - the conflict between society's relations and forces of production - and the events of the superstructure: the arena of politics and ideology in which. as Marx says. 'men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out'."I "

This does not mean that the superstructure can be ignored. for the political and ideological factors of the struggle help us to understand why events take the particular form they do. Thus. for example, in analysing the deep crisis which faces the Botha-Malan regime today, we need to analyse the divisions among the Afrikaner 'volk' with the emergence of openly Nazi organisations like the Airikaner Weerstandsbeweging; the splits in the PPP; the willingness by some sections of big business to speak to the ANC; Gatscha Buthelezi's desperate attempts to preserve some kind of credibility for Inkatha as an opposition movement. etc. All

these aspects of the 'superstructure' require our attention, but if we wish to penetrate to the heart of the situation we must follow Marx's advice and distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of a natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic - in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of their own existence and of their relation to their fellow-men."

From the superstructure we learn how the particular ideas and personalities, parties and politicians shape the event so that it turns out the way it does: from the basis we find why the event ultimately occurred in terms of the underlying, deeply rooted causes which exist 'beneath the surface'. as it were. In popular resistance to apartheid, each particular struggle reacts to an immediate aspect of the situation: the compulsory use of Afrikaans in the schools as a catalyst to the Soweto uprising; the occupation of the townships by the army and police in the Vaal Triangle in November 1984; a particular sacking by a particular employer; the execution of yet another heroic patriot; the death in detention of a trade union leader or community activist. Each event plays its part in shaping the course of the struggle, but for the basic cause of the people's war against apartheid we must look to the vicious economic exploitation upon which the apartheid system rests - the unbearable poverty, insecurity, joblessness and inflation, sanctioned by racial discrimination and protected by the machine guns and barbed wire of a ruthless dictatorship. The superstructure expresses the struggle as people battle in the streets, refuse to go to work and join the ranks of the liberation movement: the basis actually explains it as the uprising of the African, Coloured and Indian people who are robbed by a racist white minority of the wealth which they collectively produce. While millions work in the mines, factories and on the farms, 8 clique of monopoly capitalists privately own South Africa's immense riches - this is the root of the conflict, and of the protest, struggle and movement towards revolution, for it is here, in the economic basis of society, that the relations and forces of production collide with a raw and searing intensity. It is here that the events have their real source.

The fact that the economic basis of a society provides us with the ultimate cause of its development does not and cannot mean that it is the only cause of social development. for this would imply, for example, trying to study capitalism in South Africa without taking account, of the 'way in which the army, police, courts, judges, administration, propaganda are used by the ruling class to keep them in power. A basis and superstructure must always be examined together. for the superstructure not only arises out of a given basis but reacts back upon economic developments and decisively influences them. Is it not clear that the battery of racist laws in South Africa - a political factor -. gives economic exploitation its peculiarly vicious form? No account of development is

38

possible unless all the political, ideological and cultural factors are carefully considered, for the economic causes cannot be meaningfully understood 'on their own'.

The colonial character of South African society, the influence of Calvinism and Cape liberalism, the heritage of popular struggle against conquest and enslavement, the awakening of a national African consciousness - all these aspects of the superstructure help to explain why capitalism and the fight against it has developed as it has in the South African context. To simply ignore these aspects on the grounds that only economic factors 'count' - that historical materialism is some kind of one-sided 'economic determinism' - would lead to a grotesquely distorted understanding of reality.

What the Marxist theory of history argues is this: all factors are important and all need to be taken into account, but while the aspects of the superstructure - where people express their consciousness of what is going on - determine the form of the development, the economic basis is ultimately decisive for it is only here that we can understand why in the last analysis society develops at all.

It follows of course that the more clearly we understand the dynamics of history in terms of the relationship between basis and superstructure, the conflict between the forces and relations of production, the more consciously we can control the course of events through the strategies and tactics we adopt for revolutionary change.

(IV) Historical Laws and Modes of Production

The materialist theory of history, as I have so far outlined it, can be said

to apply to all societies known to us. for where people produce. so forces of production must determine production relations and a superstructure arise out of an economic base. But although production is a common feature of every society. the character or. as Marx calls it. 'the mode' of production differs from one historical period to another. 'In broad outline', Marx writes, 'the Asiatic, ancient. feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as epochs marking progress in the development of society' and as economic formations or 'modes of production'. each is more advanced than the one preceding it - technology has been more extensively developed and new and 'better' forms of exploitation have been devised. Clearly we are not talking about 'progress' in any straightforward moral sense, for as Engels has pointed out, every step forward in production is at the same time a step backward in the position of the oppressed class," so that although 'potentially' things may get better. in practice they get worse. let us look briefly at what each of these modes of production entails.

In what Marx calls

a) the Asiatic mode (so called because of its general geographical location) the land is still owned by the community but the irrigation system

39

-__h_____.

which makes it possible to develop agriculture is controlled and administered by kings and priests who rely upon slaves to produce some of the wealth; however, the use of slavery and the production of goods for sale in a market becomes much more dominant in

b) the Ancient slave mode of production (so called because it existed in ancient Greece and Rome) in which with the development of trade and commodity production, the land itself becomes privately owned; under

c) the feudal mode of production: the exploitation of slaves (in the sense of people owned like cattle by their masters) gives way to the exploitation of serfs who are bound to serve a particular lord by working so many days a year for him, lighting his wars and paying dues to the church, etc. The highest and most deceptive form of exploitation exists, however, in

d) the Capitalist mode of production in which not only is the production of commodities the overriding form of economic activity, but people who have no wealth of their own are forced by economic circumstances to hire out their services (or 'sell their power') to a capitalist, so that people themselves become commodities who are paid according to the amount of food and shelter they need to continue functioning as wealth-producing machines. When they are no longer required, the capitalist simply sacks them.

It is worth remembering that these 'modes of production' are extremely general categories and no actual society, past or present, will necessarily fit them exactly. They serve only as a guide to understanding the development of history and although as Marx puts it, each mode of production is an epoch marking progress in the development of society'. This does not mean that any particular society either has or has to progress through each of the four stages as though each society is pre-ordained to climb up the same historical ladder. In fact every society is in its particular form quite unique but these distinct features can only be appreciated when analysed through the general concepts which apply to all societies of a particular kind. Thus for example, the concept of a 'capitalist mode of production' - a general term - helps us to identify and explain the peculiar features of apartheid in the South African system. In other words, a general theory of history and society is essential to any 'concrete study of concrete conditions' because without it we would not know where to begin. The materialist theory of history should never therefore be thought of as a 'preconceived scheme' but rather as a guide to understanding historical realities as they really are. Because, for example, capitalist relations of production had nowhere developed in Africa before the colonial period, this does not mean that before the people can build socialism they must endure a capitalist epoch! What we call the 'historical laws' at work in a given mode of production relate to particular forces and relations of production which have to

developed and there is no reason why societies in Africa which are guided by a Marxist leadership and assisted by the socialist countries, cannot change these forces and relations so that they establish a socialist society based upon a socialist mode of production. There is nothing in the Marxist theory of history which says that everyone has to follow the identical path of development. ,

What the materialist theory of history seeks to establish is that while every society has its own specific features which fit generally into a mode of production ranging from 'primitive communism' to developed socialism, nevertheless particular laws of development are themselves-determined by the most basic and general historical law: the adaptation of a society's relations of production to their productive forces. The law lies at the heart of the Marxist theory of history and it explains the development of all societies without exception.

In class-divided societies, as we have seen, forces and relations of production come into sharp conflict, whereas in societies in which class divisions are disappearing (as in the socialist countries), this conflict or 'contradiction' between the forces and relations can be relatively smoothly and painlessly overcome (as for example happened in 1956/ '1 in the Soviet Union when new forms of planning were introduced, or indeed as is happening today when the USSR seeks to make its economy more dynamic and receptive to scientific and technological innovation) for now there are no entrenched class interests or privileged 'ways of life' which social change threatens. In a society in which, as Marx puts it, 'there are no more classes and class antagonisms', then 'social evolu-

tions will cease to be political evolutions'," but although the state as the embodiment of class conflict withers away. and differences can be settled through persuasion, debate and the direct action of the people themselves, change continues as it always has and always must. There will always be a continual movement in the growth of productive forces. This will require the continuous adjustment-of productive relations and society's superstructure and so we will need to continue studying the particular manifestations of the basic law of historical development which must rank as one of Marx's great scientific discoveries.

Those who claim therefore that Marxism contradicts itself by looking towards the establishment of some kind of 'perfect' communist society in which historical development 'runs out of steam' and grinds to a halt have not really understood what the materialist conception of history is all about. In fact the development first of socialism in which a planned economy is built and then of communism in which class divisions finally disappear and the machinery of the state dies out. represents the start of a new history - a history in which the forces of production can be consciously regulated and controlled, changes are made without wars or revolution and a new world arises which can be called human in the fullest sense of the term.

Notes:

1.
2
3
4
5.
6
7
B
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
42
The Multan: of tho Coimnunht Party, Collected Works 6,
(Moscow/London. 1976). p497.
. Didactics in Nature (Moscow. 1964) p182.
. Speech at tho Graveside of Ru! Mum. Selected Works in one
volume. (Moscow/London. 1963). p435.
. The Gem W Collected Works 5 (Moacow/London 1976).
P42...
Preface to A Contribution to tho Cddquo of Political Economy
(Moscow/London 1971). 920.
. The Poverty of Phillocophy Collected Watks 6. op. cit. p166.
. Preface to the Critique, op. cit. p20.
. Ibid.. p21.
Ibid.. p20-Z1.
Ibid.. p20.
lbid.
lbid.
lbid.
Ibid.
The Origin of tho Fwy. Punk. Property and the State. (Lawrence
and Wishan 1972). p231.
Tho Poveny of Philosophy, Collected Works 6, op. cit. p212.