

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم

بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد  
از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

*European Languages*

*زبانهای اروپایی*

By Sergi Burgos  
25.02.2022

## *Approach to the class struggle*

Sources: Rebellion

During the past centuries many philosophers apart from the socialist current, has expressed the value of the class struggle in social development, from Machiavelli, Vico, Rousseu, Adam Smith etc. Thus in the same course of history the thread that runs through the class struggle over the centuries is shown, from the secessio plebis or the stasis, the social wars and the servile wars in Antiquity, the jacqueries and peasant revolts in the Middle Ages, to all the conflicts that arose since the beginning of capital. But focusing on the development of the concept within Marxism and anarchism is where the class struggle takes on its most practical and concise meaning in society. Thus we understand the class struggle as the result of the social struggle, this is because in all modes of production, that is, in the way in which a society is economically organized, certain relations of production are established, differentiating the social agents that own the productive means and the social agents in charge of making these means of production work. Within this differentiation established by the social roles that each group occupies, antagonisms are formed, or oppositions that arise from this differentiation, because the group possessing the means of production condenses most of the political and economic power, leaving a small part to the dispossessed group. Thus the class struggle is established as the catalyst of these struggles for the organization of society, so that the class struggle is something that in every society has its relevance and that has a central function in social development.

Starting from the above, when understanding history and the development or social change exposed in it, one should not fall into the error of understanding it as something emptied or given in itself, which arrives at a certain moment. If not for social development to emerge, it is preceded by long historical periods of struggle, of pulse, between divergent social actors. A struggle that takes place beneath the surface, and that when it becomes a strong enough social movement, flourishes on the surface. The historical facts or social changes that occur within a society do not appear because, from one day to the next, but are mediated by the social facts within these societies themselves. History is therefore a continuum of social events, of social struggles that do not cease, between the different social actors, with opposing interests. So isolating or separating a specific social fact, to try to judge or understand it is a mistake. Thus the social action that the political-social agents execute, that is, the class struggle, expressed through the movement and the social demand, is the only thing that causes the change in society, when this struggle decays, also the rights and demands also decay. All social development, then, does not start from nothing, but is the reaction to other adverse phenomena that occur within society itself.

Progress and social peace in a strict sense are a mere illusion of social democracy, born at the same time as the theory of evolution. Changes in society do not happen gradually by the mere overcoming of historical stages, and with it the conception of considering that it is possible to advance socially through parliamentary politics and the reformism of certain parts of capital, which achieves only partial social reforms in moments of crisis, which vanish once capital is reorganized. Social reforms that only affect a superficial part of the problem but not its core, and therefore keep intact the social relations that underpin the current social order. Social changes are only the product of social struggle, of praxis, where in each place and historical moment it has its socio-cultural and political-economic framework, particular in which social movements develop. Thus understanding the development of society as the result of the struggle of opposing political-social actors is a central part of historical materialism and dialectical materialism and, therefore, the importance of the class struggle in society is fundamental to understanding its structure. You can't get anywhere without the class struggle, without the struggle of the people for their rights and demands, so all the events that have happened so far are the result of these struggles. Every social movement with political-social demands, is part in one way or another, of the class struggle, so it is understood how all the social changes produced in recent centuries have been possible through social action. Only through the class struggle

was universal suffrage achieved, only through the social movement of thousands of organized workers was it possible to claim a part of their rights, only through the struggle thousands of organized women managed to claim a part of their rights, only through the struggle of thousands of African Americans managed to claim a part of their rights etc.

The political-economic organ of society is a static organ, which implements its survival in the maintenance of the established order, and which only changes its position as a socially immobile entity, when social movements reach sufficient relevance to force social and political change. Therefore, the state as a political entity is not a mediator of any social change, since it is never a neutral entity, which will respond to social problems or demands. If not that it is an entity that within the class struggle aims to keep the status quo and social organization intact. It is an entity that within certain limits moves from one side of political circumspection to the other, which as a greater goal hopes to keep the ownership of the means of production intact, and all the social organization that this entails. Its birth and that of capital are intimately linked and therefore the state silences or simply refuses to give voice to the actors and social mechanisms that remain outside its logic, because the state as a guarantor of citizen representation, of the sovereign will of the people does not exist. Bourgeois politics or state, only represents bourgeois political-economic interests, these bureaucratic-political groups are their own underclass within the bourgeoisie, hoping to maintain their own status, and trying to keep away the political-social possibilities that any social movement can have, to maintain the fiction of presenting itself as the only organ capable of being able to guide people towards the common good and the right organization. Thus, bourgeois politics captures the organizational notion of social actors by declaring them outside the law and without dominion over the decisions of society, only gives voice and vote to the elements that it can establish within its logic. But once these social movements become strong enough, the state assimilates them to its mechanism, snatching away their revolutionary and emancipatory connotations that they have had up to that point.

To keep social development alive it is essential to maintain the class struggle with vigor, social change is only preceded by an independent and strong social structure, with a social organization based on direct democracy, self-management and capable of establishing political struggles against the state machinery. For this it is necessary to create a counterculture and an art on the margins and in the vanishing points of capital, totally

separated from the bourgeois strata and their interests, a counterculture that arises by and for the interests of the dispossessed classes, that arises from necessity and from the place that is occupied with respect to the social relations of production. Departing from the dominant customs and logics, that is, from the entire cultural construct arising from the bourgeois superstructure. In short, a proletarian culture that contravenes the dominant cultural hegemony, where places are created in which it is possible to establish a new production of space determined by the process and social movement itself. Only from the creation of a culture outside the social reproduction of order will it be possible to achieve a social consciousness about the proletarians strong enough to achieve that "the emancipation of the workers will be the work of the workers themselves or it will not be".

Thus to look at history is to look at social development, its advance and retreat, this historical echo, these images of the struggles in the past, are the vindication of the same past struggles that have to guide the path of the future, and show how only through social action, through praxis is social change possible. This process of social development is made possible by these struggles of the past, where through the effort, suffering, demands and defeats of previous people it is possible to glimpse the present. History and social development is therefore not something written or dictated in advance by historical-productive processes, but is the result of class struggle and the historical-social use of productive means. History is open and capitalism itself is nothing more than a historical stage of social development, a mode of production, just as before this era feudalism, which succumbed to the emergence of a new social class, that is, the bourgeoisie that undertook a social struggle against the clergy and the nobility, to establish itself as a ruling class. Changing social relations from the transformation of labor power into commodities, unlike feudalism where social relations were marked in relation to feudal ownership of land through these causes.

Just as each previous mode of production and historical stage has evolved or been transformed by a mixture of causes and circumstances, such as class struggle, productive development, and environmental factors, the capitalist mode of production will also be transformed into a new mode of production.

Just as Benjamin quotes Nietzsche in thesis XII in "On the Concept of History," "We need history, but we need it differently than the spoiled slacker in the gardens of knowledge needs it."

**Rebelión has published this article with the author's permission under a [Creative Commons license](#), respecting his freedom to publish it in other sources.**

Rebellion 24.02.2022