political affairs

AUGUST 1959 • 35 CENTS

Re-entered as second class matter January 4, 1945, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by New Century Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y., to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $4.00 a year; $2.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, $4.75 a year. Single copies CE cents.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Vol. XXXVIII, No. 8 AUGUST, 1959 **political affairs**

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: HERBERT APTHEKER

The Agricultural Workers in California

By Robert Wells

The AFL-CIO has announced that a drive will be launched this summer to organize the two million as yet unorganized farm workers throughout the country. Their national office in Washington will direct the drive in cooperation with the United Packinghouse Workers of America and the National Agricultural Workers Union. The former has a base in Puerto Rico and a scattered membership in this country, including a couple of thousand in Local 78 in California. The latter has a total membership of 1,500.

The plan apparently follows the strategy of the National Agricultural Workers Union. This union considers California as the starting point of the drive, because among the 400,000 hired there during peak employment there are more than 140,000 employed the year around. Also, in California some 80% of the farm workers are employed on the larger industrialized farms. Within the state, the area announced as the starting point is that adjacent to Stockton, where some 50,000 resident farm workers are available.

The union plans to establish its base among the resident workers in the industry. It has also stated that the organizing drive among the domestic workers will be accompanied by a demand for public hearings to prove there is no need for imported contract labor. And Governor Brown has announced a drastic shakeup in state farm placement policies. A ten-point program is aimed at keeping more domestic workers (and fewer Mexican nationals) at work.

C. J. Haggerty, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO California Federation of Labor, declared that the new policies are "a great improvement and I hope they will be carried out." He also announced that the Federa-

* This article is based on two Reports by the Agricultural Workers Subcommittee, Northern California District Committee, Communist Party.

tion was giving full support to the drive and called upon all unions in California to give moral and financial support to it.

This is the most serious organizing effort begun in recent years. However, a gigantic task and great problems confront the labor movement when it tackles this job.

CONDITION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The organization of the agricultural workers remains the major unsolved task confronting the labor movement in California. The farm workers are at the bottom of the economic scale insofar as wages, housing and other living conditions are concerned. There is wide variation in the wages earned in the three main categories: row crops (carrots, onions, peas, etc.); fruit, cotton and some others paid on a piece work basis; machine work, done mainly by full-time employees.

Row crops, especially in the areas of large-scale farming, pay least, with wages ranging between $2 and $7 a day. Fruit work comes closest to paying a living wage, although due to frequent periods of unemployment annual earnings are far from adequate. Machine workers are paid from $1.00 to $1.35 per hour, which is less than the piece rate, but they usually have a higher yearly income due to steady or near-steady employment.

The rate of pay is determined to some extent by the scale of farming. The larger farms generally pay least, and the smaller farms tend to pay more. Between crops, and especially in the winter, the farm workers have to depend on county welfare.

The agricultural workers also stand at the bottom of the ladder socially. They have no law guaranteeing them the right to organize or a minimum wage. Children are as brutally abused as adults, and are deprived of their right to learn and mature. No maximum hours law covers them; they are not covered by unemployment compensation; rules governing social security and work injury are consistently ignored.

The organizing task, therefore, has to overcome the migratory nature of the industry, the difficulties of putting economic pressure on giant industrial farms in isolated areas, the second-class citizenship status of these workers with regard to labor and social security laws, and the political stranglehold of the big operators on vast sections of the California Valley areas. In addition, the unions must contend with the complications caused by the fact that a large section of the workers are imported nationals, with all of the handicaps involved, as well as the problem of national chauvinism and the divisions caused by their presence in the industry.

Up to now, the unions have not had a good record of handling these complications, and have never successfully overcome the difficulties involved. And the opening statement

of the AFL-CIO that the first task is to replace imported nationals with domestic workers has the danger of getting the drive off on a divisive tangent which will play into the hands of the growers.

HISTORY OF IMPORTED FARM LABOR

From a very early date, California agriculture has used tremendous numbers of alien laborers.

Originally, Indians were an important source of labor, from the mission period through the era of great wheat farms. From 1860 to 1893, however, the Chinese became the main source. In 1880 there were 75,000 in the state, providing one-third of the agricultural labor force and a majority of the seasonal and casual farm workers. From 1890 to 1910 the Japanese population increased to 72,000—about equal to the Chinese. During this same period, 10,000 Hindustani workers were imported for field work. Beginning in 1923, some 30-35,000 Filipino workers were imported.

Then came the big rise in Mexican immigration. By 1920 there were 120,000 Mexicans in California, and it was estimated that at least 50 per cent of the migratory labor in the state was provided by them. Since that time, they have become the major source of imported labor and a large part of the domestic workers in the industry.

In 1939, Carey McWilliams, in his excellent *Factories in the Field,* summarized the use of foreign labor as follows:

> From an early date, a large percentage of California's huge army of migratory farm workers have been aliens. Although it is difficult, because of the lack of reliable figures, to approximate the exact percentage of aliens, it is nevertheless permissible to assume that, at various times, foreign groups have comprised 75 per cent or more of the total number of migratory workers. Over a period of fifty years, or perhaps even longer, say from 1860 to 1930, a majority of the migratory army has been made up of foreign workers, most of them ineligible to citizenship.

The workers of Asian descent have been subjected to violent, terroristic attacks involving white workers and sections of the labor movement. The Mexican workers, of both Mexican and American citizenship, have long been subjected to a second-class status in California. Race riots and vigilante terror have blotted the labor history of California labor, and in the center of this has been the special plight of the agricultural workers. This problem is deep-going and widespread, and has left remnants of splits and divisions which will be difficult to overcome.

The labor movement of today indicates a new awareness of this aspect of the problem. There has been announced the formation of a committee to aid the agricultural workers of the state. The makeup of the committee closely follows that of the state-wide committee for FEP. The

NAACP, Mexican-American, Jewish, Catholic, Quaker and other Protestant groups, and the AFL-CIO are represented, mainly by those holding top executive positions in their respective organizations. The Agricultural Workers Union and the Packinghouse Workers are also represented.

Such, briefly, is the history of the situation. The growers, besides citing this as a justification for current use of foreign labor, claim that domestic labor will not do agricultural work or that "Americans" will not do "stoop labor." They have cited, before many investigating committees, impressive statistical accounts of the alleged unreliability of domestic labor.

More fundamentally, the use of Mexican contract workers has these advantages for the growers:

1. Cheap wages — in California from about 70 cents to $1 an hour, and until very recently set unilaterally by the growers.

2. "Captive" labor—similar to indentured labor, with the worker having no way to change employers.

3. Ample labor—that is, a substantial excess of workers over the numbers needed.

4. Less organizable labor—less accessible, coming from non-union rural areas, and susceptible to deportation.

EXTENT OF THE CONTRACT NATIONAL PROGRAM

The President's Commission on Migratory Labor estimated that in 1949, of the one million migratory workers in the United States, 400,000 were so-called "illegal" Mexican citizens and about 100,000 were Mexican contract workers or *braceros*. The other half million included Mexican resident aliens, Mexicans who had become citizens, and Americans of Mexican descent, as well as Negroes, white Americans, Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, Asians and Europeans.

By 1954, mass deportations of the "illegal" Mexicans were occurring (from 1951-57, over 2.5 million deportations and "voluntary departures" took place), and there was a simultaneous increase in the contract program. In 1955-57, about 400,000 Mexicans were imported annually. It is not known how many "illegals" remained, but it must still be an appreciable number; thus the total number of Mexican non-resident aliens in American agriculture has apparently not changed much. What has changed, and continues to change, is the size of the contract program.

More important to this study is the number of contract workers at work at given times, rather than numbers imported over annual periods. In California, according to the California Department of Employment, there were only 5,300 at work in September, 1949. By September, 1951, the number had jumped to 36,200 and in September, 1956 it reached a peak of 89,700, dropping

to 84,600 the following year. In the same period, Mexican contract workers, who are mainly seasonal, rose from about 2 per cent of all seasonal labor in September, 1949 to about 30 per cent in September, 1957.

Now, this is quite a substantial proportion, but it represents an absolute maximum. The percentage would be lower if the year-round workers were included. Likewise, the proportion would be less for any other month of the year, for the yearly average, or for the figures for the country as a whole or any other state. This maximum figure of 30 per cent is deliberately chosen to refute the exaggerated (and sometimes fraudulent) claims of the contract "menace" made by some labor groups. For California, a more representative figure would be around 25 per cent of seasonal farm labor, and for the entire country between 10 and 15 per cent.

In California, at least, they are concentrated by locality and by crop. Carrots and lettuce are but two of many crops in which they are the overwhelming majority of the total labor force—from 90 per cent up. In these and other crops, they are not merely an important segment; they are the force.

ON WHAT AUTHORITY ARE THESE WORKERS IMPORTED?

Public Law 78 authorizes negotiations with the Mexican government for the importation of Mexican agricultural workers under certain conditions, mainly that there is a shortage of domestic workers and that the use of Mexican workers does not depress wages.

Under this law, a Migrant Labor Agreement has been entered into by the Mexican and American governments and amended with supplemental orders. This Agreement, consisting of 41 articles, covers the whole program from recruitment of workers in Mexico through their period of work in this country and transportation back to Mexico. Some of the detail is included in the Standard Work Contract, which is legally made part of the Agreement. Some items, such as transportation and housing, are dealt with in even more detail in supplemental orders.

Article 21, which deals with representation of Mexican workers, has been interpreted since 1954 to mean assurance "that Mexican workers are permitted to elect, by a majority vote, a representative for the sole purpose of presenting to their employers, only those complaints arising out of the failure of the employers to comply . . . with the work contract. The elected representatives may be an individual or individuals of the workers' own numbers, or from any legitimate and bona fide labor organization and the employer must recognize such representatives as spokesmen for the workers. . . ."

There has been no real exploitation of this specific permission of

union membership and representation. It does not even seem to be very widely known. Ernesto Galarza of the National Agricultural Workers Union, in his excellent pamphlet, *Strangers in Our Fields*,* does not even mention it. Nor is it included in the four-page tabloid Standard Work Contract which is furnished to each worker.

Are the law, agreement and contract enforced? Until very recently, the answer would have been a flat no. To be sure, the rights of the Mexican contract workers, as set forth in these documents, are many and impressive, and far ahead of any enjoyed by domestic workers. (Also, all laws applying to domestic farm workers are equally valid for the Mexican contract worker.) But as Galarza's pamphlet indicates, these rights have been extensively violated. However, there has been some change in this respect since his pamphlet was written, and now some of the more important rights are being partially enforced.

THE APPROACH OF THE TRADE UNIONS

Union approaches to this problem, in the main, have not been very sound. The basic approach for many years, was one of opposition to the entire program, often one of opposition to the Mexican workers themselves, coupled with Mexican- and alien-baiting (and often a little red-baiting thrown in for good measure). This has obviously not been successful. On a more realistic plane, they have fought for modification of P. L. 78, and here they have had some success.

From 1948 to 1951 (at least), the National Agricultural Workers Union flatly oposed the use of "illegal" workers and as a matter of policy regularly reported them to Immigration officials. Simultaneously they opposed the use of contract workers. In several places in California where this union had strength, there were riots between "domestics" and contract workers, sometimes with people of Mexican descent on both sides. The Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers Union, in its last days and in some areas, did similar things. And its eventual successor, the United Packinghouse Workers, made elimination of contract workers a precondition for organizing field workers, at least in Northern California.

There has been some change in the approach of the trade unions. In the Congressional hearings on P. L. 78 held in 1958, Gilbert Simonson, representing the UPWA, called for repeal of the law, policing of the borders to prevent "illegals" from entering, and securing of surplus farm labor among American citizens, particularly from Puerto Rico. On the other hand, H. L. Mitchell, president

* U.S. Section, Joint United States-Mexico Trade Union Committee, Room 504, 815 16th Street N. W., Washington, 6, D. C. 50 cents.

of the National Agricultural Workers Union, carefully straddled the question of whether or not the law should be renewed and asked for a "full-scale investigation" of the program and its effects. And E. P. Theiss, AFL-CIO regional director in Arizona and New Mexico, asked for the extension of the law for modest periods of time, stating that they unalterably support it over the old visa system which had no control over the number that may enter or their conditions of work.

The most startling testimony was that given by Paul Reed on behalf of the United States Section of the Joint United States-Mexico Trade Union Committee, the branch in this hemisphere of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He said:

> To meet the bona fide needs for foreign labor, we favor the kind of approach taken in P. L. 78 and would like to see this instrument strengthened so that it will attain its declared objectives of providing foreign labor, when needed, in such a way that U.S. farm workers are not adversely affected and that foreign workers are protected adequately against exploitation. We urge Congress, in fact, to extend the bilateral principles of the Mexican contract labor program to all programs for the importation of foreign agricultural labor into the U.S.

Theis and Reed seemed apprehensive that the Immigration Department would assume jurisdiction if P. L. 78 were eliminated. In fact, an Immigration spokesman said at the hearing:

> . . . we have on file in the Credentials Office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service now the records complete with documents and photographs, and the investigative agencies of the Government have checked out 650,000 persons who form a pool or reservoir of *braceros* who have previously been in the U.S. and abided by the terms and conditions of their admission.

In spite of the fact that unions claim concern with the problems and welfare of the *bracero,* even those unions which have directly grappled with the problem (in California the National Agricultural Workers Union and the United Packinghouse Workers) have not tried consistently to reach the contract workers themselves, though it seems obvious enough that the most fundamental way to change the system of setting the prevailing wage is by organizing and agitating the people who work for it.

These two unions have only established small bases in the industry, and their several recent attempts to establish a base among the field workers have met with little success. The workers involved have up to now shown a lack of confidence in the ability of the unions to organize effectively. There is wide agreement among them that it cannot successfully be done without considerable

support from the rest of the labor movement.

The big gap in the present organizing plans is the absence of the Teamsters Union. This union is in the midst of bargaining for 65,000 canery workers in Northern California. In addition, it has organized freezing, processing and other plants, giving it an established membership of perhaps 100,000 in this end of the industry. Their absence is a serious weakness in the drive.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

While it has not been possible up to this point to bring into being an effective organization of farm workers, in the field of legislation some changes and new possibilities can be noted.

The big growers were successful in eliminating the farm workers from the provisions of the state FEP law, and in defeating a minimum wage bill which included a provision for agricultural workers. At the same time, however, Governor Brown's recently announced ten-point program for farm workers indicates that new advances are being made on this front.

The possibilities of enforcing existing health, housing and other legislation have increased. At hearings held in Stockton in December, 1958 by the Interim Subcommittee on Farm Labor of the Assembly Industrial Relations Committee, the growers' representatives were opposed by labor and other organizations such as the Community Services Organization (Mexican-American), the Friends Service Committee and the Catholic Rural Life Committee. These supported adoption of minimum wage and other legislation and sharply criticized Edward C. Hayes, head of the state's Farm Placement Service for the functioning of his office, particularly in regard to the authorization of import workers.

Organization of farm labor was discussed at a conference held in February of this year by the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, made up of nationally prominent people such as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman and Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, and co-chaired by Frank P. Graham and A. Philip Randolph. Participating organizations were the Farmers Union, the Catholic Rural Life Conference, the American Civil Liberties Union and the AFL-CIO. Both William Schnitzler and James Carey pledged to do something about organizing farm workers. And Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell indicated that his department was making a study of farm wages and working conditions, and that proposals would be made for federal legislation.

Mitchell was also keynote speaker at a recent Conference of Farm Labor Services held in Los Angeles, sponsored by the Department of Labor. Here he stated that the conditions of farm workers are an affront

to the conscience of the American people and that they must be covered by minimum wage, maximum hour and unemployment compensation laws. While he spoke the Packinghouse Workers, on strike in Imperial Valley, held a mass demonstration in front of the conference hall, with 200-300 banner-carrying farm workers taking part. The Community Services Organization and the Catholic Rural Life Conference helped in the mobilization.

Thus, the plight of the farm workers, their status as second-class citizens, and the vast open shop which prevails in their end of the industry are emerging once again into the public arena.

POSITION OF THE MEXICAN WORKER

Why does the Mexican worker travel as far as 1,000 miles to get work that may last only six weeks? The answer, of course, is his standard of living at home.

Mexico's population increased from 16.5 million in 1930 to 25.5 million in 1950. In 1949, per capita income in Mexico was $114 as compared with $1453 in this country. Inflation has been twice as great in Mexico as it has here. Farm wages in Northern Mexico in 1947 were $1.10 a day in United States money. Agriculture in Northern Mexico is very similar to that of the Southwest in this country, and there is a considerable northward migration for seasonal farm work.

It is clear that the Mexican worker in California agriculture is on a different footing from any other alien worker here. Until 1923, there was unlimited immigration from Mexico with virtually no formalities. After that, until 1948, there was an "open border" in effect though not in law . There is serious doubt whether immigration under the contract program is any greater in size than past migrations; it seems rather to be essentially a change in form.

The Mexican Communist Party has, at least in the past, opposed the Agreement. In 1951, it stated:

> A new agreement represents submission to the war program of Yankee imperialism. (This was during the Korean War.) 2. Despite all pledges to the contrary, Mexican workers are underpaid and subjected to the worst discriminatory treatment. 3. The export of *braceros* damages the national economy and is a means of evading the solution of the acute problems of the Mexican peasants.

On the other hand, the Mexican trade-union leader, Vicente Lombardo Toledano, took the position at that time that Americans should not worry about Mexican opposition to the contract program—that they should organize the *braceros*. And in this country Alfredo Montoya, then president of the ANMA (Mexican-American National Association), spoke about the deportation drive against Mexicans in 1951 in these words:

I think we should protect the right of Mexicans to earn a living in this country both because of the traditional right of Mexicans to cross the border either way and because our country bears some responsibility for the impoverished condition of Mexico. This does not necessarily mean that we encourage our Mexican brothers and sisters to leave their country to work here —but we must protect their right to do so.

It is these considerations, we believe, which should mainly govern the immediate approach of the American Left.

A PROGRAM FOR CALIFORNIA FARM LABOR

There is no reason to believe that the Mexican contract program will be a permanent part of the agricultural labor scene. California has seen many migrations of farm workers, and nothing indicates that this phase will be any more permanent than previous ones. In fact, with minimum wages and substantial organization among agricultural workers, we may find that few or no foreign workers will be necessary.

Until then, we should consider supporting the *bracero* program critically, as parts of the trade union movement now do, as the best system for importation of alien labor. In the present situation, the most pressing need is for the trade unions to reach the *braceros* themselves and to build an organization among them, an organization which would deal with their grievances and unite them with the domestic agricultural workers in the fight for minimum wages, FEPC, overtime pay and other gains.

The stable base of union membership, however, would have to come from domestic farm labor groups. In California, the low point in farm employment is March. During that month, in the years 1951-57, there were between 151,000 and 191,000 year-round and local seasonal workers employed, the overwhelming majority of them professional farm workers. This is a relatively large, stable base for a union, especially when combined with some 100,000 cannery, shed, processing and frozen food workers already organized.

What is needed is a strong, militant organization, one which is under the direction and control of the farm workers themselves. Aid from the labor movement is needed, including personnel and organizers, but the key thing is the advancement of farm workers into positions of leadership. This would lead to a real change in the political complexion of the rural areas. For such an organization would be composed in its majority of minority group workers, and this, together with the identity of interests of the working farmers and farm workers, would lay a basis for a minority group-labor-farmer alliance in these areas.

The Communist Party in California has a proud history in the

bitter struggles of the farm workers during the past 25 years. With the experience and knowledge we have gained, coupled with our Marxist orientation, we are able to approach the question more fundamentally and to identify ourselves closely with the economic and political interests of farm workers. The fight for a Bill of Rights for farm labor was one of the four major planks included in the legislative program of the Communist Party of Northern California. It read as follows:

The real labor scandal in California is the condition of its agricultural workers. The California AFL-CIO Federation of Labor justly describes the state's million farm workers as the "cruelly exploited (and) . . . forgotten stepchildren of our economy," whose plight is a "moral, economic and social scandal." We urge that all existing social welfare legislation—especially minimum wage and unemployment insurance—be extended to give full coverage to agricultural workers. We further urge legislation to provide decent housing, health, education and recreation facilities for farm workers.

It is imperative that not only our members directly involved in farm workers' activity, but also those in industrial unions and other mass organizations take part in campaigns on issues affecting farm workers. The Party and all Left and progressive workers, should help to rally the trade-union movement to support the organizing drive among agricultural workers. They can help to strengthen small farmer-farm worker cooperation, and to rally community organizations in the struggle. And they can participate directly in the organization of farm workers. By doing these things, they can make a signal contribution to the achievement of great advances for the American working people on this front.

Two excellent pamphlets dealing with the recent events in Tibet, and complementing each other, have just been published. One is by Anna Louise Strong, and is called *Tibet: What Happened? What's Ahead?,* and is obtainable for ten cents from New Century Publishers, 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. This is a reprint from an article in *New World Review;* it is an on-the-spot report by a world-famed correspondent. The other is by Susan Warren; it is called *The Real Tibet* and is priced at 25c recently published by the Far East Reporter, P.O. Box 1536, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N. Y. This is a 13,000 word study of the history, social system and latest developments in Tibet. It is splendidly polemical, carefully documented, and very timely.

—The Editor.

IDEAS IN OUR TIME

BY HERBERT APTHEKER

MARXISM AND FREEDOM

When capitalism replaced feudalism, advocates of the change and adherents of the new system insisted that both represented the triumph of reason over superstition, and therefore of liberty over tyranny. Capitalism—that is to say, the free market, free enterprise, the agreement freely entered into by co-equal participants, workers and owners, the supremacy of the law of supply and demand, the nice way in which the allegedly innate desire for personal advantage fitted in with the accomplishment of human progress, the guarantee in all this that merit would be rewarded and the lack of it penalized—this system, capitalism, it was held, was not really a social system at all. It was not something artificial; it was rather the achievement in human relations of the reasonable and natural order of things.

The law of supply and demand was as constant and as natural as the law of gravity; the whole functioning of free enterprise and the unencumbered market was as inexorable and as natural as the coming and going of the tides.

The Age of Faith marks the era of feudalism; the Age of Reason marks the era of capitalism. Reason was the hallmark of the new science, itself the instrumentality for the development of that technique so consequential to the rise of capitalism and to its defeat of feudalism. Reason was held to have triumphed not only in matters of physics and astronomy, but also in matters of politics and economy.

All this was enhanced by the fact that capital was in rebellion against the status-concentrating, closed, regulatory feudalism. What it sought was an elimination of all artificial regulation and the free play of the newly-discovered laws of poliics and economics. Hence, *laissez-faire*—leave things alone now that things finally are arranged in their natural way.

Freedom and Restraint

The first component, then, of the concept of freedom in the classical bourgeois outlook, is to see it as the absence of restraint. Freedom is viewed negatively; I do not mean by this, of course, that it is demeaned; on the contrary, it is highly valued. I mean only that freedom is viewed in terms of what government may or may not do; it is viewed in terms of opposition to power and to the exercise of power. Thus, Lord Morley, one of the keenest analysts of the question of freedom among those operating from outside the Marxist view, in a work revised by himself as late as 1921, emphasized that "liberty is not a positive force" and spoke of "liberty, or the absence of coercion," showing clearly that he felt the two ideas to be synonymous.*

* John Viscount Morley, *On Compromise* (Thinker's Library edit., 1933, 3rd impression, London, 1946, p. 125). In a footnote at this point, Morley wrote that "there is a sense" "in which liberty is a positive force"; but he went on to write that it was so in that it had "a bracing influence on character."

While freedom, then, is held to mean the absence of restraint, this absence applies to the citizens of the government; it is they who are free to the extent that they enjoy an absence of restraint. This carried with it a corollary, namely, the necessity to restrain the government; i.e., to delimit power. So, the absence of governmental tyranny derives out of a restrained government. Often, the existence of such restraint is held to be identical with the essence of a free society, or with the existence of liberty. Thus, Dean Acheson, the former Secretary of State, writing in the current *Yale Review* (Summer, 1959) declares that "the rights of Englishmen . . . were specific and detailed restraints upon power" —a rather paradoxical posing of rights as deriving from restraints, but again emphasizing the negative quality of the rights; or the negative quality of freedom. Hence it is that in the classical enunciation of freedoms, the Bill of Rights in our Consttiution, one finds that these Rights actually are an enumeration of those things that the government is forbidden to do.

All this assumes the evil nature of power; it assumes that the foe of freedom is power. This is not a far-fetched assumption when one remembers the historical record on the uses of power. But the fact that it is an assumption and is so deeply ingrained in our thinking, sometimes makes it a consideration that we do not really think about. (As an aside, this assumption permeates the writings of C. Wright Mills, for instance.) But it is important to note that there is here an assumption of the evil quality of power, particularly political power; from this follows the axiom that to the extent such power is curbed, to that extent is freedom present—*i.e.* to that extent is there an absence of restraint upon the individual.

These postulates work and are meant to work only if a fundamental proposition is adhered to. That fundamental proposition is that the basic component of civilized society is the existence of private property and, more specifically, the private possession of the means of production. It is for the protection of this relationship that, above all, the government and the state exist.

The whole point of the superiority of capitalism is that it provides a system, allegedly, for the natural and unencumbered functioning of private-property ownership. Hence, since that system has been discovered—a truth found, like gravity—the less government, the better. Indeed, with such a system, government itself is but a necessary evil.

It is necessary because the poor we always have with us; these are the incapable ones, the ones without merit—hence, these are the poor and they are without ownership of the means of production. They will live by the grace of God, and the grace of those better ones who do possess the means of production. To *govern* them is one reason why government is necessary, else in their avarice, sinfulness and ignorance they may destroy civilization. Government is needed, too, as a balance wheel among the properties themselves, so that no one component thereof so far forgets itself as to seek to usurp for itself all wealth and power. In this way, government will prevent both anarchy and tyranny, and justice will prevail holding even the scales of a natural political economy, marked by reason and blessed by God. A third consideration, marking the necessity of

government, is the matter of international relations, especially the waging of war, for the extension of His realm, and the encouragement of profit.

Economic Inequality

Also of decisive importance in the bourgeois theory of freedom, was its limitation to matters of politics. That is, classically, freedom is purely political; it has no relevance to the economic. This follows logically if one accepts the view that capitalism *is* economic freedom; that capitalism is the achievement of reason in matters of economy. Accepting this view makes mischievous at best and tyrannical at worst any meddling with, any regulating of, the economy.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, this view had less inconsistencies than it appears to have today—at least to many people—because in those centuries the fact that government's first obligation was the security of private property was institutionalized so that only the propertied were allowed to participate in politics, either as the electors, or, especially, as the elected.

Nevertheless, the potency of this idea remains very great in our own day; thus, it is widely insisted that one's own business really is his own; or there is a very grudging acceptance of any kind of regulatory enactment, whether it be of the health and safety of the workers, or the purity (or, at least, harmlessness) of the product issuing from the business. And the whole matter of labor relations is still held to be outside the ken of government, with government interfering only when questions of public security become involved, or when it appears on the scene as an "impartial" arbiter or arranger. It is reflected also in the persistency with which matters of health and social welfare are confined to the mercies of private medicine or to professionalized agencies.

The concentration upon the purely political, in the bourgeois concept of freedom, carries over to the very formal nature of the idea of equality in that concept. Here the equality was altogether a matter of law only; and did not even extend fully into the political realm insofar as those without sufficient property were debarred from participating in the selection of officers, or from holding office.

Furthermore, in bourgeois theory, the existence of inequality in matters of material possession was held to be a proof of the existence of a free government. We do not mean to say that it was held that the existence of rich and poor was itself proof of the absence of tyranny; of course, this was not the classical view and of course it was well known that rich and poor had existed with political tyranny. But it was held in classical bourgeois theory that free government would be one in which ability and lack of it would have free reign; it was also held that the presence or absence of wealth was the basic determinant of the existence or non-existence of ability. Hence, where one had a natural conomic order—*i.e.,* capitalism—one would have, without any inhibitions, the fullest play of abilities; therefore, a free government would be one in which inequality in economic terms would be present.

This is basic to the remark of John Randolph, leading pre-Civil War Virginia politician: "I am an aristocrat. I love liberty. I hate equality." It is present in the

"exclusiveness" of the clubs and residences of the well-to-do; it is present in the way in which the President carefully differtiates between discrimination in law and in public matters and discrimination in socal and economic and moral and personal matters.

There are three additional basic components of the bourgeois concept of freedom that we wish to touch upon. These are, to state them summarily; the idea of spontaneity as being an essential element of freedom; the concentration upon individuals as vital to freedom; and, the strain of elitism that runs through this presentation of freedom. Let us consider each of these, briefly.

Spontaneity is viewed as important to freedom in the sense that when action is fortuitous it is devoid of compulsion, restraint and regulation. We speak of being as "free as the wind"; of being "free and easy." The idea stems from the rebellion against the regulatory character of feudalism; it stems also from the idea of capitalism as being a natural system, functioning automatically, properly and reasonably, if only left alone. From this it is but a step to insist that spontaneity itself is of the essence of freedom. This is particularly true where, as in bourgeois theory, power itself is viewed with extreme hostility; hence the planned or organized exercise of control or direction—the opposite of spontaneity—must be the foe of freedom.

There is, also, in the concentration upon spontaneity, a reflection of philosophical idealism, with the denial of materially based and structurally induced causes as being fundamental sources accounting for economic, social and political phenomena. This also follows quite logically from the view of capitalism as being a natural order; it has the added virtue of making absurd or irrelevant, proposals for social change of a radical nature.

Individualism

The emphasis upon individualism also follows logically from all the postulates of the bourgeois theory of freedom. If capitalism is a natural order, *laissez-faire* is proper; if *laissez-faire* is proper than it is "every man for himself," in a system that is self-adjusting and runs itself, and one must expect to "sink or swim." You must "stand on your own feet"; no one "owes you a living"; you have to "make your own pile." You may even have to be ruthless; you will certainly have to be and want to be "rugged."

Hence, everything is individually centered; the widest possible extension away from the individual meriting approval is responsibility for one's own family. It is not a far step from this to the glorification of one's own "pleasures," and to the pursuit of such personalized pleasures as being the purpose and the end of life. Religion offers some muting of this; but even here, salvation is a personal matter.

This, too, is related to the early concept of political office as being a source of self-enrichment—something institutionalized, for instance, in 17th and 18th century England, in the American "spoils system," and in the American meaning of the word, "politician." There is, in fact, an ambiguity in the whole idea of public servant in a society geared to self-enrichment, as being the dynamic of

the whole organism. Related to that is the idea that failures move into the areas of such service—incompetents, like teachers, for if you know, you do, and if you don't know, you teach; or ministers who are out of this world, and rather effiminate anyway; and those on the public payroll, are ne'er do wells and hangers on and errand boys for the inevitable "big shots."

A rigorous presentation of this kind of outlook was made in the work entitled, *What Social Classes Owe to Eeach Other,* written by the eminent American sociologist, William Graham Sumner, in the late 1880's. Mr. Sumner for many years a professor at Yale, and perhaps best known for his book, *Folkways,* produced in the first-mentioned work—which sold very well, in its day, by the way—a full-scale defense of complete individualism. The content of his book is indicated in the reply its author made to the questions posed in his title: asking what social classes owed to each other, Sumner replied: "Nothing."

Back some seventy years ago, professional sociologists had not yet developed the sophisticated approach of denying, in one way or another, the existence of classes, so Sumner accepted this as universally understood. But he was troubled by the wave of radicalism and liberalism and "do-goodism" that appeared, especially after the "Long Depression" of 1873-79. He undertook to show that given the natural and inevitable quality of capitalism, any tampering with the way in which wealth was distributed, or any infringement upon the absolute inviolability of property rights was utterly wrongheaded and could lead only to disaster. The poor were poor because they were inefficient or stupid or otherwise defective; and the rich were rich because they were the opposite of the poor. Any attempt to undo the working of nature in the economic and social sphere would result in increased suffering, would be unjust, and could only be highly transitory because no matter what was done artificially, ability and quality would tell, and fairly soon the rich would be rich again and the poor would be poor again.

It is this kind of thinking that made the misapplication of Darwinism to social phenomena so attractive to adherents of capitalism and produced Social Darwinism. It is important in the "shame" attached to poverty; there are elements of it present in the "Affluent Society" caricature of U.S. reality. It is at the heart of the thinking which opposes any kind of government regulation in matters of the economy, a kind of thinking still dominating the minds of Herbert Hoover and Dwight D. Eisenhower, for instance.

Elitism

A logical extension of all this is a firm, though sometimes unexpressed, commitment to elitism. Elitism is organic to all societies marked by the private possession of the means of production; it is basic to dominant thinking wherever class-stratification exists. In capitalism it is especially strong, because there nature allegedly has triumphed and so those who are on top must be on top because of superior ability. Hence has been achieved the true aristocracy and the natural elite—all the more convinced of their elitism because they are supposed to be "self-made" and really the victors in a "fair contest." The elitism, so marked

a feature of capitalism, is further intensified by the racism that has been associated with the development and growth of capitalism, and especially present-day capitalism or imperailism.

Capitalism has been characterized, in fact, by this dual elitism. There is, first, the internal, where those who possess the means of production and who effectively dominate the society are held to be superior to the rest of the population, making up the vast majority; and there is, second, the external, composed of the darker peoples of the earth (in particular instantces, as in our own country, this simultaneously has been internal, too) who are referred to as the "backward" peoples. These peoples, being backward, are to draw water and hew wood for the more advanced, for the enightened and the lighter-skinned peoples.

The darker ones are to produce raw materials for sale at prices others administer and shipped in conveyances others own, and marketed at prices others set; and they are not to produce finished products, but rather are to purchase these from the advanced areas, again under terms set by those advanced areas. These peoples, being over-exploited, are the underdeveloped; but the underdevelopment is to be charged not to the exploitation but to themselves, and is to be a proof of their inferiority. That is, the very feature that accounts for the exploitative relationship is fastened upon as the source not of the exploitation, but of the backwardness.

When, as has happened in our own day, this exploitation reaches explosive dimensions, the explosiveness is charged to the Communists, and one emerges with still another "reason" for continuing the Cold War. Thus, the *New York Times* (July 11, 1959) in a lead editorial on "The New Rich and Poor" notes "a dangerous trend in world economy," namely, "the rich industrialized nations are growing richer while the poor and underdeveloped raw material countries are at best holding their own or are growing poorer, and that in any case the gap between the two is widening rather than closing." God forbid the *Times* should suggest to its readers any causal connection between these phenomena; rather it concludes, with characteristic brilliance: "The Communists are, of course, making the most of their opportunities. They thus pose a new challenge which the free world cannot ignore."

With this external elitism, and its especially steep exploitation, some of the intensity of the conflicts threatening the home order may be diluted. That is, on the basis of the super-exploitation of the darker, colonial peoples, relatively higher standards may be obtained by the internal "inferior" ones. These relatively highly standards apply not only to standards of living, but also to standards of political practice. It is not coincidental that the development of bourgeois democracy in the direction of the full enfranchisement of the non-propertied occurs with the development of imperialism. The possibility of dropping some economic benefits to selected layers of the "inferior" classes at home, makes possible also the enhancement of their political rights, especially as the former process tends to develop opportunism and class collaborationism at home.

Actually, of course, the process if a highly complex one, and the basic cause

of both economic and political advance for working people in the home areas of imperialism lies in their own struggles, organization, and strength. Nevertheless, the possibility of yielding and the policy of concession—and the development of a kind of "unity" of classes—are also closely tied in with the benefits of imperialism, so far as the elite is concerned.

By the same token, the breakup of imperialism is enhanced by the simultaneous cracking of both layers of elitist domination. That is, the revolt of the darker peoples complements the internal conflicts; their intensification in turn inspires a swifter pace in the external.

Here the main point is that freedom in bourgeois theory and practice has been basically elitist and racist. It has always carried with it something of the wolf's "freedom" to eat the sheep; the freedom of the former is the death of the latter. In this manner the concept of freedom in bourgeois theory and actuality always has had about it an anti-humanistic essence, understandable really, in a theory expressive of the limitations of a social order still confined to the pre-human epoch of history.

Marxism—A Positive View

In contrast to the bourgeois theory of freedom, the Marxist does not view it negatively, but rather positively. That is, while the bourgeois theory of freedom focuses upon the absence of restraint upon the individual, and the presence of restraint upon the government, in terms of what it may *not* do, the focus of the Marxist theory is opposite. It tends to view freedom not so much in terms of what may not be done, but rather in terms of what can and should be done.

The negative quality of the bourgeois theory springs, as we have indicated above, from the view of capitalism as a natural and altogether salutary system; as, indeed, that ordering of society in which reason has triumphed and therefore one in which the laws of nature are in operation. Under such circumstances, the less done the better; in this case, prohibitions against the state are of the essence of assuring freedom. This, it is of the utmost importance to remember, assumed the private ownership of the means of production, and the safeguarding of that relationship as the essential function of the state and as the hallmark of a civilized society.

The Marxist view is altogether different. It sees capitalism not as natural and beneficent, but as artificial and parasitic. It seems capitalism as a progressive *force,* relative to the feudalism it replaces, but not as a progressive *system,* because of its class nature and its exploitative essence. The Marxist view holds that the private ownership of the means of production, far from being a hallmark of civilization, is the fundamental constituent of all pre-human history; and that, especially with the enhanced socializing of the relations of production, the retention of the individualized mode of appropriation becomes more and more stultifying, not only economically, but also socially, ethically, and psychologically.

Hence, the Marxist view of the state is class-oriented. The Marxist agrees with the classical bourgeois approach which sees the protection of private prop-

erty ownership as basic to the functioning of the state; but evaluating such ownership in terms exactly the opposite of those of the bourgeoisie, the Marxist sees this commitment on the part of the state as the root of its evil quality. Therefore, the Marxist, seeking the transformation of that property relationship, simultaneously seeks the transformation of the nature of the state from an organ for its preservation into an organ for its elimination. In the former case, given the idea of the naturalness of the economic foundation, the whole point of freedom, as we have seen, will be the absence of restraint; in the latter case, given the idea of the exploitative nature of the economic foundation, the whole point in the effort to achieve freedom will be the active searching for the means of altering that foundation.

The bourgeoisie, having rebelled against feudalism and autocracy and having achieved, in its own mind, the final Elysium of a reasonable social order in conformity with natural laws and rewarding merit and penalizing its absence, will be exceedingly suspicious of power per se; it will view political power as a possible threat to its own order. The Marxist views power also in class terms; he sees it as being used in fact to maintain capitalism because its class content in fact is capitalist. But the Marxist does not take a hostile or necessarily suspicious view of power per se; it depends upon what kind of power, with what source, and used for what ends. In fact, while this is fundamentally sound, it can degenerate into a certain naivete about power itself.

The Marxist, in contrast to the bourgeois, insists that coercion, not freedom, characterizes the economics of capitalism. Furthermore, the Marxist sees the economic structure of a society as ultimately decisive in terms of its nature; he holds, therefore, that that existence of class divisions—the organization of society on the basis of those who own and those who do not own the means of production—assures the domination of society by the owners and the subordination of the ownerless. Hence, while in bourgeois theory, freedom has only a political meaning and no relevance to economic matters, in Marxist theory, the economic relations fundamentally determine societal characteristics and therefore these relations have the closest connection with the question of freedom. The problem of freedom to the Marxist is human and therefore societal; it is not simply political. The Marxist view, being dialectical, is never compartmentalized; therefore, in freedom, as in everything else, it sees the question as a unity and as a whole, not as an abstraction and as apart.

Bourgeois theory sees economic inequality as an attribute and a consequence of a free society. While, at its finest, this theory insists that "all men are created equal," this insistence applies to the political, the legal, the formal. Even here it has had and continues to have great exceptions—especially economic, national and racial—but leaving aside these exceptions, and accepting the phrase in full, bourgeois equality, like bourgeois freedom in general, has application only to the political. At best—in the case of Jefferson, for example, where there was acute fear that economic inequality would threaten the durability of the social fabric, what was desired was not the elimination of such inequality but its limitation.

In Marxist theory, economic inequality is viewed as an attribute of an unfree society. The emphasis upon the economic as at the root of societal reality and as at the heart of actual power, would naturally lead to the condemnation of economic inequality as being violative of freedom. While, then, Marxism is not equalitarian in the sense of Anarchism, where no allowance is made for the development of such technical and economic proficiency as to allow abundance, nor for incentive prior to the achievement of the possibility of such abundance, and during the transition from capitalism to socialism, still Marxism is basically equalitarian. It does view significant divergence in income with suspicion, and it does see this as fundamentally reflective of the still limited tehcnique and ethics of socialism; it sees its elimination as one of the dstinguishing features of communism, as contrasted with socialism.

Class Society Corrupts

The individualism so heavily emphasized by bourgeois theory is suspect in Marxist theory. The suspicion has two roots: (1) that the individualism is fundamentally a luxury of those who own the means of production, and has in it more irresponsibility and hedonism than any real effort to develop the potential or the creativity of the individual; (2) that the individualism partakes of the cannibalistic and is in conflict wth the hghly socalized nature of modern life. From these considerations flow the attributes that C. Wright Mills has described in his *Causes of World War Three* (Simon & Schuster, N. Y. $3.75), seeing "the United States as an overdeveloped society full of ugly waste and the deadening of human sensibility, honoring ignorance and the cheerful robot, pronouncing the barren doctrine and submitting gladly, even with eagerness, to the uneasy fun of a leisureless and emptying existence." Mills here, as throughout his work, does not differentiate enough in his description of our society, especially in class terms, but I think no perceptive person will deny the large amount of truth in his analysis.

Furthermore, as capitalism matures, the individualism conflicts with the collective needs of society; more and more, therefore, practice departs from principle. This, in turn, arouses fierce feelings of guilt and of cynicism or apathy, which help induce anti-social patterns of conduct and multiplying cases of breakdown.

The Marxist theory of human beings generally is an optimtistic one; the dominant bourgeois outlook is gloomy. It is true that the bourgeoisie in its revolutionary youth, when it sought to remake the world, tended to take a very positive approach to people, expressed so beautifully and exuberantly by Shakespeare who, it will be remembered, compared man to a veritable god. But the bourgeoisie, when it saw man as noble, meant mean of property, of propriety, men who mattered. And the strain that sees man as damned and as a worm, which runs through the entire record of class-divided history, is never wholly absent from bourgeois literature. It becomes increasingly important—as do so many attributes of medievalism—with capitalism's decline. Today, in

the United States, with the ascendancy ideologically of the New Conservatism, this demeaning of human nature is dominant.

Marxism insists upon the corrupting quality of class society, not the corrupt quality of human beings. Moreover, while bourgeois theory assumes the enervating effect, in moral terms, of impoverishment and oppression, Marxism insists upon the corroding influence of class domination and the ennobling influence of common struggle. The bourgeoisie tends to see the debilitating effect of victimization; Marxism sees the victim, but does not see him as passive, and sees his struggle as continual and creative.

To the bourgeoisie, to have had ancestors who were slaves is shameful; to have had ancestors who were slaveowners is a mark of distinction, and the more numerous their slaves, the greater the distinction. The Marxist's evaluations are the opposite.

Marxism rejects elitism root and branch. On the other hand, all exploitative classes as we have indicated, have taken an elitist view. All have developed theories justifying the domination of the many by the few. These theories, whether of a religious or a secular guise—including those of Robert Michels and Gaetano Mosco, where the elitism allegedly is implicit in any kind of mere organization—have in fact held that the rule by the few was necessary and proper because the many were the inferior (or the more sinful) of the few. In capitalism it is insisted that the minority who possess the means of production obtain and retain that possession as a result of supeiror abiltiy and that therefore the elitism is really a natural expression of capacity and is highly beneficial.

This may be justified ideologically by the insistence that the few are the Elect—religiously speaking—or that the few are the more intelligent—"scientifically" speaking. For the latter purpose, developed for our more secular age, so-called intelligence tests have been developed and corrupted and misapplied and misinterpreted to demonstrate—to no one's surprise and to the elite's comfort—that the well-to-do are the hright ones and the poor are the stupid ones.

Inferentially, at least, the results of the tests explain the positions in society, while in fact the tests are standardized in accordance with the stratifications in society, and the whole method of testing, marking, and weighing reflects the same stratification. So each explains the other and justifies the other, and all is right in the best of all possible worlds, or as good as things ever can be. Then the educational system is geared in accordance with the findings; thus, again, assuring that similar findings will recur, and also assuring, it is hoped, the continuance of the status quo that produced the original findings!

These are some of the major ideological trappings for the internal elitism of modern capitalism, which, in essentials, go back to the beginnings of recorded history and to class systems that preceded capitalism. The venerable nature of the theory, by the way, gives it additional authority.

With capiatlism's expansion, come the colonialism of the 17th and 18th centuries and the imperialism of the 19th and 20th centuries. Both widen and deepen capitalism's exploitation, and both bring the rules of capitalism into

collision with differing societies and peoples. These societies are to be undone and their peoples exploited. Both distasteful undertakings beg for rationalization, especially in view of their apparent contradiction with religious and political ideas developed for home use in the course of anti-feudal efforts. The elitism organic to ruling-class thought is brought into play to justify this rapine and oppression; happily, the victims this time are not only of different religion and speech and custom, but also are of a different color. Hence, develops the particular elitism known as racism; the internal and the external elitism of the bourgeois epoch feed each other and together help mightly in sustaining the whole exploitative structure.

Just as Calhoun insisted that only with the enslavement of the black was the freedom of the white possible, so imperialism has insisted that only with the super-exploitation and gross deprivation of the darker peoples of the world could there be any economic concessions or political reforms at home.

Marxism points to the existence of elitism as vitiating bourgeois-democratic theory and practice, and it insists that the substance of the elitist argument is false. The superior capacity of the rules in class-stratified societies in the past has been in the areas of domination, guile and deception; and the superior position has reflected domination of the means of production and of communication. The vast majority of human beings, deprived of this ownership, have been the doers and the creators in all history. It is they who have produced; they have sustained the few, not the few the many.

Class-exploitative systems have developed an elitism which has deprived and still keps the majority of mankind from the cultural, educational, political, and material treasures of the world. This has meant in fact the denial of freedom to the vast majority of mankind; on the basis of that denial, others have had varying portions of really vitiated freedom.

Marxism holds that these treasures, produced by the labor of hand and brain of the deprived majority, belongs really to them, and that they are fully capable, given the opportunity, of enjoying them. In fact, Marxism holds that with the vast majority coming into effective possession of what they have in fact produced, those treasures will be used for the first time as they should be used, both in quantity and quality. This in turn, producing for the first time a society on earth in which the vast majority are literate, cultured, secure, healthy, and fraternal, will make possible such a renaissance of culture and such a growth of human capacity as has never yet even been dreamed.

Freedom and Planning

As we have observed, one of the essential components of the concept of freedom in the bourgeois view is spontaneity. Somehow, only the unforetold can be free. Marxism's view is quite different.

In terms of spontaneity, what is more spontaneous than a boat in a tossing sea, with one untrained man aboard? But suppose one adds training to the man and he employs that training. Is there not a loss of spontaneity—but is there a loss of freedom? Is there rather not a gain in the freedom of the man, insofar

as he is now more the master of his own fate than he was before? And if one gives this man oars and sails so that he may employ his training more effectively; and adds a compass; and a map; and a motor; and a crew of well-trained men with whom he may work and who may share in the tasks? Does not each one of these additions, lessen the spontaneity and enhance the freedom?

Planning seems an intrusion at best where it is held that the prevailing order is self-regulating, and that nothing harms its functioning so much as interference with that self-regulation. This helps develop in capitalist society an insistence that that which is planned, having lost spontaneity, has lost freedom. But all this is based, without being articulated usually, on the assumption that capitalism is a natural order and does function naturally. For in other matters no sane person acts in this planless and spontaneous way. No one, for instance, would think of erecting a building without a plan; and no one would think of drawing up a plan for a building without some knowledge of the nature of materials, the laws of physics, the rules of design, etc. Such knowledge and such planning are prerequisites for the building; without them, and other things, one is not able to, is not free to, erect the building.

If one structures his view of all life and society on the dialectical materialist outlook, then that which is obvious in the building of a house is equally obvious in life and society as a whole. It is infinitely more complex and difficult in the latter than in the former, but the principle is the same. This is the meaning of Engels' famous phrase that "freedom is the appreciation of necessity." "Freedom," Engels continued in his *Anti-Duehring,* "does not consist in the dream of independence of natural laws, but in the knowledge of these laws, and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends." Hence, "freedom of the will means nothing but the capacity to make decisions with real knowledge of the subject."

Hence, too, as Engels pointed out, freedom "is necessarily a product of historical development"; it grows as knowledge grows. The growth of knowledge leads ever nearer to the achievement of truth; the latter objectively exists; the former is the way to it. In the biblical phrase, "Know ye the truth and the truth shall make ye free." Stripping the word truth of its religious quality, of its dependence upon faith; secularizing it, and making it depend upon science, one has the path towards the achievement of freedom, in the Marxist view.

Many readers will be interested in knowing of a mimeographed publication just issued by the Historians' Group of the Communist Party of Great Britain. It is entitled, *Bibliography of Historical Writing in the Light of Marxism;* in it will be found listed hundreds of titles of books and articles, in English, dealing with the British Isles and modern European history. The United States is not included; no doubt an invitation that we Americans "go and do likewise"—something long overdue. Those interested should write to Mrs. Joan Simon, 71 Clarendon Park Road, Leicester, England—The Editor.

Rationality, Progress and the Arts

By Sidney Finkelstein

In the July number of this magazine, I tried to show that the sociological approach to art, of which Arnold Hauser is so brilliant an exponent, takes up, in Hauser's words, the "historical process within which art is enmeshed" and discovers in social classes the basis for a "sociological interpretation of spiritual achievements." Thereby it presents a necessary beginning for an understanding of art.

One of its limitations, however, as against Marxist thought, which it draws upon but does not carry out completely, is that it sees the relation between society and art as that between the "material" and the "spiritual." Parallel to this, rise similar appositions, between "objective reality" and "subjective fantasy," between the "rational" and the "irrational," between "thought" and "emotion." And accordingly, the arts seem to be eternally bound to the subjective, the irrational, the emotional.

THE RATIONAL AND THE IRRATIONAL

The sociological approach does not see that in society itself there is the conflict between the rational and irrational; on the one hand the forward thrust of the means of production, the conquest of nature with the discoveries springing out of this, and on the other hand the pressure of social relations and institutions that have become outmoded, no longer serving the needs of human progress yet continuing to operate as a destructive force. And so it does not see that in the arts there is likewise a conflict between the discovery of truth, including the artist's understanding of his own social ties and the forces operating upon him, and the irrational pressures of ideology. In what realm does freedom belong? Is it thought or emotion, objectivity or subjectivity, acceptance of reality or vision and fantasy?

It belongs, of course, to both. The desire for freedom, which is the ability to grow and to develop the full powers of the human being, lies at the core of all emotional life. And yet its great forward steps, its exultant victories, always come out of the mastery of "necessity," the discovery of the laws of the real world and how they become tools in human hands. The most liberated figures in the arts were those who show by the very imagery of their art that they were in the midst of social life and had pushed near to the boundaries of knowledge their age had made possible; the Greek sculptors

and writers of the classic age, the Renaissance artists, Shakespeare, Beethoven, Goya, Daumier, the 19th century critical realists of the novel. Their art is many-sided. A basic view of the world as real and rational pervades their thought, and far from this acting as a barrier to emotional life, it provides a springboard for a wealth of emotions, being an open door to the discovery of life in all its variety. If they are aware of unsolved problems, they are not frustrated or defeated by them. If the visionary element in their art reflects conflicts that seem insoluble, there is also a positive element to it, an awareness of a world in change and of new possibilities.

On the other hand, the assertion of freedom in terms of individual defiance of society, ending in the pretense that the real world does not exist at all — this is typical of a host of artists in the last three quarters of a century—results in the opposite of freedom, namely frustration, for the blows of the real world are the more devastating when their origin is unknown. The forces operating in society on the individual get to be seen as the mysterious forces in the mind itself, the "unconscious," dominating the conscious mind. And the frustration which results from this approach to "freedom" is amply documented in the works of art themselves.

It is one of the contradictions of moden art that many of those with the very greatest talents, in the handling of the tools and language, in the ability to capture the immediate presence of life, should have thus surrendered to irrationality; the emotional life of their art, far from expanding, dwindles to a wail of tragic loneliness or the self-mockery of irony. It is less apparent in those whose art still shows something of a social documentation and breadth, as in Proust, the early Joyce, the early Picasso. It reaches a peak when the real world is rubbed out of consciousness, or appears only in the form of nightmarish, subjective distortions, as in Kafka, Berg, T. S. Eliot, Klee, the surrealist painters. And when it comes to art of today like the novels of Camus or the paintings of the American abstract-expressionist school, it becomes doubtful whether we are dealing with art of integrity at all, for striking anti-social attitudes has become a pathway to a lucrative social success.

Since Hauser does not see the conflict between reality and ideology, the rational and the irrational, in these terms, he is unable to cope successfully, in *The Philosophy of Art History,* with the psychoanalytic theories of art. In his chapter, "The Psychological Approach: Psychoanalysis and Art," he offers a number of cogent and penetrating criticisms of the Freudian and psychoanalytic theories, but then comes to the conclusion: "Historical materialism as a dialectical philosophy

of history and psychoanalysis as a dynamic theory of mental processes could go a long way together."

It is certainly true that Freud put his finger on and brought into public discussion a host of psychological phenomena, involved with marriage, love, sexual relations, the family, the relations of children to parents, which up to then society had tacitly agreed to touch on gingerly or ignore. And it is also true that a great body of art from Wagner and Proust to Kafka and the surrealists reveals the same phenomena. At first the arts entered this psychological realm independently of Freud. In fact, Freud picked up ideas from Wagner, in whose operas it is not hard to find a grandiose, symbolical projection of his own love and marital relationships. By the 1920's, the surrealists were painting dream symbols directly borrowed from Freud's theorizing.

What Hauser does, however, is to accept the presence of the phenomena Freud pointed to as providing authenticity for the theory of psychology that Freud invented to explain these phenomena. One does not prove the other, any more than the fact that the ancient Egyptians were able to chart the stars and create an accurate calendar proves the correctness of the myths they wove about the stars. Freud expanded his phychological theory into a grandiose theory covering all human society and history; a theory which, as expounded for example in *Moses and Monotheism*, flies in the face of what scientists have learned and discovered.

Hauser makes a valuable point when he points out Freud's view of the artist as one who creates dream fantasies out of his own frustration, and thereby wins "honor, power, fame and the love of women," is not at all characteristic of the life and manner of work of artists before the 19th century. It gains cogency apparently with the age of "romanticism," when the "war of all against all" of competitive capitalism, and its recurrent crises, rise to their height, business society regards artists as queer characters who do not produce profitable commodities, and artists are in rebellion against the philistinism of what they see as all society. Hauser writes that Freud ". . . perhaps did not realize the special limitations of this period, and insisted in his typical way, on the universally human character of what was in reality a merely historical situation. In any case, psychoanalysis came into being as an answer to the problem of a civilization in which, as a result of the romantic crisis, an individual's life and his work have become two separate provinces, and in which a cleft has been opened between his private self and public performance."

If historical materialism states that the real world is rational, that its laws can be understood and made part of rational thought processes, it does not deny that subjectivisms

and irrationalities can be found as well in every mind, or that a host of people, including some very gifted artists, think with no rationality at all. What is important is that to dialectical and historical materialism, the relation between irrationality and rationality is like that between ignorance and knowledge, as in Hegel's line which Engels quotes in *Anti-Duhring*: "Necessity is blind only in so far as it is not understood." Of course to make this knowledge actually operate for human freedom is difficult, and cannot be done by any one person alone. It has to be done socially.

THE FREUDIAN "UNCONSCIOUS"

Freud however accepts irrationality, or the forces at work in the "unconscious," as a basic mode of mental operation. He regards the family, as he discovers it in middle-class bourgeois society, with all its hidden antagonisms, frustrations and insecurities, as the form families have taken in all past history and will take for all time. He admits the existence of a real outer world, referring to it as "actuality," but sees it as chaotic and basically unknowable. Laws of economics, history and society do not exist for him. His ideology is that of capitalism in crisis; namely, that to master reality is a hopeless task, and that whatever laws seem to operate in the real world only frustrate and defy human intentions and desires.

This is of course the way the bourgeois world appears to a person engaged in its competitive struggle. "Freedom" to the bourgeois is the right to do anything he wants. He is "his own boss." But all these individual "freedoms," to buy, sell, hire, fire, invest, and plan, clash with one another, and the result can be boom followed by bust, losses instead of profits, bankruptcy and crisis. Even the mighty, world-spanning corporations and monopolies of today, with diplomacy, armies and navies behind them, find themselves "frustrated" by anti-colonial and national independence movements.

To Freud, while the individual must cope with "actuality" and make some sort of agreement with it, every such adjustment is a compromise, a "repression," an infringement on freedom. We can add that this is exactly how a factory owner or corporation executive regards an agreement he is forced to make with a trade union. But the workers see this differently, for by cooperating with one another they have each gained a little elbow room to live like a human being. So in the growth of a child, Freud regards each contact with the harsh laws of outer reality as demanding an adjustment which is also a "repression." To the dialectic materialist approach, each step in discovering and mastering these laws changes them from something harsh and forbidding to the basis for an exultant leap in human powers. And

so, what Freud regards as eternally repressive, dialectic and historical materialism regards as a step to freedom.

A dialectical materialist approach must be part of the evaluation of the gifted artists of our time who have revealed in their work psychological patterns similar to those which Freud used as the data for his theories. One of these is Marcel Proust, whose novel, *Remembrance of Things Past,* is such a tremendously sensitive and complex autobiographical and psychological portrayal. Hauser writes that Proust "has written, without suspecting it, a brilliant vindication of psychoanalysis." But what is vindicated is only the truth of the psychological data itself, not Freud's theory of the mind, society and history. We can also say, as Hauser doesn't, that Proust has written, without suspecting it, a brilliant vindication of historical materialism. For in the novel enters not only Proust himself, but a representative section of the French upper class, shown in all its pride, its vacancy of mind, its complete lack of touch with outer realities, and its degeneracy. Proust does not see beyond the limits of a dying section of society, But Hauser should, not for the purpose of berating Proust but for the purpose of better appreciating him. There is more to be learned from Proust than Hauser puts his finger ou, but to learn this we have to put Proust's novel in a larger social perspective than Proust himself had.

Our age is not simply one of a "romantic" or "bourgeois" crisis. It is an age of transition from class-antagonistic society to classless society, from the antagonisms that have existed from the end of primitive communal iife to the abolition of these antagonisms. Never in all history has the opposition between two clashing views been so conscious, fierce and world-encompassing. The wars engendered by capitalism in its monopoly stage have been the bloodiest in history, its economic crises the most devastating, its contrasts of wealth and poverty the most glaring. It has perverted the glories of science into the creation of weapons that can wipe out all human life. All human relations are effected by the insecurity and fears it arouses.

So it is understandable that at a time like this, theories which deny all human progress itself should reach a peak of acceptance unmatched in history, while the assertion that society can solve even the problems of exploitation, poverty and war are met with either sneering contempt or a frightful hatred and witch-hunting fury. Never before has there been so rabid a flight of cultural figures to a glorified vision of the past. Every ideology long discarded is now being refurbished and offered again as a refuge; medieval theology, worship of a fancied feudal aristocratic "order," philosophies born in Asian feudal

and slave-holding societies, and even primitive myths and magical beliefs. Critical realism, which based its analysis of reality on the touchstone provided by the vistas of human freedom and equality opened up by the rising bourgeois world itself is now exorcised. Replacing it is the theory of "no progress." And directly assisting this are the ideologies of Freud, Jung and other psychonanalists, claiming that the myths born out of primitive ignorance of the outer world, with the first attempts to organize society and master the secrets of nature, are the basic, ineradicable laws of the mind.

ART AND PROGRESS

The question of whether there is progress in art, involving also the question of progress in real life, is a central issue in the next section of Hauser's *The Philosophy of Art History*. He calls it, "Art History Without Names," referring to an approach which sees art history as a succession of all-encompassing styles and movements. By such styles, the giants of art are characterized no differently from the small-fry. And so it is "art history without names," interested primarily not in the individual great works but in the reasons that one style follows another.

There are many theories which tackle this problem, and which seek some law of progress or continuity unique to art, regarding art as something autonomous and not dependent for its development on anything that happens in society. One such theory finds a steady development from simplicity to complexity. Another finds an alternation of "waves" or "cycles," like the alternation between clear, closed, monumental forms and mysteriously evocative, loose, open ones, between "classic" and "baroque." Still another states that each age raises its own problems and finds its own solutions. Therefore the arts of each age are unique to it, and must be examined in their own terms.

Hauser subjects these theories to a fine critical analysis, and points out that they all have to oversimplify drastically the turbulent, contradictory life of the arts in order to make it fit their patterns. He shows that only what happens in real social life can explain the styles:

> Unthinkable . . . is the transition from medieval symbolism to the artistic rationalism of the Renaissance without the change from feudal economy and lordship to the bourgeois social order of the towns . . . the triumphal march of romanticism without the triumph of the French Revolutiotn and the bourgeoisie, emancipation of the individual, the notion of free competition, and its application to spiritual as well as material production.

The personality of the individual artist, Hauser says, is likewise a reflection of society.

Where there is no society, there are no individuals, whether in a logical, psychological, or historical sense. An individually feeling, thinking, acting, producing, creative personality only emerges by reaction; it embodies the answer to a question or the response to a challange. An artist is formed only in the course of grappling with the task that has been set him and which he undertakes to solve. In the solution of that task his individuality realizes itself step by step.

But still the question remains, is there progress or continuity in the arts? If not, what then is the use of studying the past heritage? Why do we need art history altogether? Hauser comes to the conclusion, "There is nothing that could be called a universal law of the social history of art." He cites in support of this a celebrated passage from early Marx, which is printed here in much greater detail than in Hauser's book. It is from *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

It is well known that certain periods of highest development of art stand in no direct connection with the general development of society, nor with the material basis and skeleton structure of its organization. Witness the example of the Greeks as compared with the modern nations or even Shakespeare. As regards certain forms of art, as, e.g., the epos, it is admitted that they can never be produced in the world epoch-making form as soon as art as such comes into existence; in other words, that in the domain of art certain important forms of it are possible only at a low stage of its development. . . . Is Achilles possible side by side with powder and lead? Or is the Iliad at all compatible with the printing press and steam press? Do not singing and reciting and the muses necessarily go out of existence with the appearance of the printer's bar, and do not, therefore, disappear the prerequisites of epic poetry?

But the difficulty is not grasping that Greek art and epos are bound up with certain forms of social development. It rather lies in understanding why they still constitute with us a source of aesthetic enjoyment and in certain respects prevail as the standard and model beyond attainment.

A man cannot become a child again unless he becomes childish. But does he not enjoy the artless ways of the child and must he not strive to reproduce its truth on a higher plane? Is not the character of every epoch revived perfectly true to nature in child nature?

From this, three thoughts may be extracted which may appear to contradict one another, and yet all of which have validity in the history of the arts.

One is that progress in the arts does not consist of each age producing greater works in every category than a past age. It is quite possible that no epics will ever be written greater than Homer's. Shakespeare cannot be said to be a greater dramatist than the Greeks, but only different. And to carry on the thought, it is quite possible that there will arise no sculptors greater

than Polycleitus, and no symphonies greater than Beethoven's and no novelists greater than Tolstoi. There is change, however. Each age must find its own characteristic expression, and that of an age of "powder and lead" and the printing press must be quite different from that of an age when history and law are still wrapped up in mythology, and when there are neither books nor newspapers but chanting bards.

Second is the thought that each age, which achieves a consummate, classic expression, representing a stage in human development, stands in relation to later ages as their "childhood." In other words, our own age can very well be the "childhood" of a later age. And an age, looking upon the arts of a past period, neither wipes them out of mind, nor imitates that period. It strives "to reproduce its truth on a higher level." What is this higher level? It is a knowledge of the make-up of the world, of nature and the laws of society, of the complexities of the human being and of human relations, of the interconnection of public and private life.

Let us compare for example the art of Europe in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., which includes the "classic" art of Greece, to that of Europe in the 15th and early 16th century. This includes the galaxy of great sculptors, painters and architects of the "high Renaissance" in Italy, their counterparts in France, Germany and Flanders, Shakespeare and the great Elizabethan poets and dramatists, the novels of Rabelais and Cervantes, the first composers of opera. To a great extent this age tried to "reproduce" the classic art of Greece, even though it knew very little of that art. We could not hold that any one figure of the later age produced greater works than any one of the past age. Michelangelo is not greater than Phidias. But undeniable it is that in the later age, there is a new sensibility, a far greater awareness of what the world really is, an awareness of the different classes moving in society and the way in which history is shaped, a reflection of intimate and private life, a penetration into human psychology and all its shades of mood and inner conflict, a sensuous discovery of subtleties in nature which could not have been felt by the Greeks, There is a far greater consciousness by society of its real existence.

The same is true if we compare the arts of the 19th century to those of the 15th and 16th, including now along with painting, sculpture, poetry, opera and drama, the riches of the socially realistic and psychological novel, and the development of symphonic music, chamber music and art song. Is there not again a greater sensibility, a penetration into sides of life hitherto unrevealed in the arts? To take one example, there is the portrayal of the common people, the "nobodies" of society, in Dickens, as compared to Shakes-

peare's clowns and Cevantes' Sancho Panza. For another, there is the refinement of landscape painting, which even the Renaissance touched upon very little. For still another, there is the panorama of the economic and political life of society in terms of the class of wills and psychologies, presented by Balzac and Stendahl, or the picture of the impact of a great historical event upon every class of society that Tolstoi presents in *War and Peace*.

"LAW OF SOCIAL HISTORY OF ART"

And so, there is what Hauser denies, a "law of the social history of art." It may be called the development of realism, using the much-abused term not in the vulgar sense of "fooling" an audience, making it believe it is looking at nature and not art, but in the sense of a contribution to social consciousness, bringing it closer to the realities of actual life, and revealing the many-sided growth of the mind in response to the depth revealed in nature, society and people. Such realism does not appear in the arts in a steady line of progress, but while there are peaks and valleys, each peak represents a new conquest.

Such progress is not so striking in any one of the arts, taken by itself, than in all the arts and other forms of cultural and intellectual life taken together. And here we touch upon another aspect of the development of art which is hinted at by Marx, when he writes that the Greek epic typified a period before "art as such" had come into existence. What he means by this is that Greek society of the period of the Homeric poems had no consciousness of "art" in the sense we use it today, as a special form of activity different from science, philosophy, the writing of history. Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were, to their times, poetry, music, story, history, religion and even rudiments of science, still not differentiated from one another. This is true of all ancient epics.

The rise of what we can call the "divisions of intellectual labor" was of course a necessary step in progress, with each following its own path of discovery and enriching the others. And the same is true of the ramifications within the arts themselves. When literature divides for example into poetry and prose, and that into the epic poem, lyric poem, drama, short story, novel, and essay, each represents a different side of social intercourse and human sensitivity, as happens also with the pictorial arts and music. Even when the ruthless operation of the commodity principle of capitalism makes certain forms of art notoriously unprofitable, these arts remain ineradicable, as necessary in a deeper way to society. And it is in their totality that the development of art in relation to life is seen.

Connected with this is another "law of the social history of art"

which Hauser misses altogether. It is the fact that each progressive reshaping of society also taps fresh resources of artistic creativity among the people. To put it in plain statistics, more people are able to develop their artistic talents, to combine "head and hand." In the sixteenth century, with the rise of a popular theatre in London and the changes in English society of which this was a sign, there were a Marlowe, Shakespeare, Jonson, Dekker and a host of others. The development of literacy produced not only audiences for books but also writers. Out of the womb of American popular journalism came a Walt Whitman, Bret Harte and Mark Twain. In late 19th century Russia, a few narrow doorways for education and participation in cultural life were opened for the Ghettoized Jews, and up rose writers, musicians, painters. Where were the Sholom Aleichems a generation before? Or consider the wealth of poetry, music, painting, story and acting produced in the United States today by the Negro people, under forbiddingly difficult conditions. Where were the counterparts to these talents in the days of slavery? At best, some might have been known in obscure communities as the more gifted of singers or tellers of folk tales.

When we realize that the entire production in the arts up to now represents only a tiny fraction of the creativity latent in people, only the work of the relatively few who in each age were able to find the opportunity to develop themselves, then we can glimpse the wealth that will be produced when the heritage and tools of the arts become a widespread popular possession. And any worry over whether greater painters will appear than Rembrandt or greater poets than Homer becomes pointless. What is important is that all these creative productions taken together give society a consciousness of itself that no single figure or small group could ever have provided.

FOLK ART

Folk and popular art give us a glimpse of the creativity latent among the mass of people, under conditions which kept the great tools and traditions of art creation out of their hands. Hauser misses the significance of this for the future, in his following section, "Educational Strata in the History of Art: Folk Art and Popular Art." He does give us here a keen and enlightening critique of two misconceptions of folk art. One is the "romantic" 19th century misconception which indiscriminately lumped together many strata of art as "folk art," and looked upon this art as something created by the people "in mass." The other view, prevalent today in intellectual circles, is that there was really no such thing as folk art, as an "unlettered" art of the people. What happened is only that some works of fine or "cultivated" art, the art of an "elite,"

filtered down to the common people and was imitated or taken over by them in debased form.

Hauser points out the complicated interweaving of threads that has taken place in folk art, such as the absorption of the medieval peasantry of art stemming from castle, town and church, and yet the new qualities which were given to this art as the people combined it with their own traditions and made it reflect their own life. He points out the truth that the community in which folk art is a living tradition is not one that creates in unison, but one where there always are especially gifted talents, admired singers, story tellers, musicians, balladeers, craftsmen. What they create remains "folk." As Hauser says, the folk singer "is in fact the spokesman of a community, and in this sense it is perfectly correct to describe folk art as a collective activity." The latter part of this section, however, Hauser turns into a denunciation of the mass-produced popular art of today, and a lament over the death of folk art, and it is of this that some questions can be raised.

The analysis Hauser provides of the capitalist popular art of today, stamping out stories, pictures, songs from a die, is a cogent one. He concludes, "The rules according to which mass art has to be produced are strict, rigid and inexorable." And this art is fed to a passive audience in which Mauser has no faith.

This is raised not as a mystical hope but out of the observation of plain fact. There are laws of movement in the popular arts, despite, as Hauser points out, the coincidence "of democratization of culture with competitive capitalism."

First, the mass producer, despite his theories of the "hard sell" and his awesome machinery for convincing people that they want what he gives them, has to scurry about to find what they will accept. And he has to throw his net wide for talent. A vast number of people are drawn into this cultural production, and among them are some who both possess the creative spark and respond to some realities of life. Even in popular art, talent has wider and longer appeal than non-talent. In popular song, the hits of each month are generally not the good songs, but over a period of time the songs of a W. C. Handy, George Gershwin and Richard Rodgers get to be the ones that are cherished, and they testify to the tapping of a genuine creative current.

Hauser says flatly, "Neither the American Negro music nor the songs of the modern industrial worker have any of the marks of a folk art." To take jazz alone, in which the Negro people have played the major role, its folk roots, in the blues, are a historical fact. And it just does not fit Hauser's picture of a standardized art. For within it there has always been a creative current, raising a banner of expressive improvisation and freedom against the standardiza-

tions of commercial popular song and dance, and has even become an agent in some victories against racism.

The public is not as passive as Hauser thinks. Its active attitude in the arts rises, of course, in ratio to its activity on the economic, social and political front. It makes no direct demands, and shows its interests by what it accepts or discards. And yet, the changes that do take place, bringing the popular arts somewhat closer to the realities of life, are certainly not due to the producers. In the film, we can compare the idiotic treatment of the Frist World War, at the time or in the 1920's, to the films of the Second World War and of war themes in general that appeared during that period and for a few years afterwards. Or in the struggle against racism, so central to American life, the films have shown a steady development from the old anti-Negro stereotypes to works like *The Defiant Ones.*

As for folk art, Hauser writes that in the Western countries, "nothing can prevent the extinction of folk art and its replacement by the mass art of the big town." But he sees only one side of the picture. There is no doubt that with the end of the cultural isolation of the countryside, the old forms of growth and continuity of folk art are gone. But there is no cause for sorrow in this. Far from becoming extinct, folk art has begun to operate on a new level. Studied and collected, it has become a widespread possession more than ever before, part of a nation's heritage, and has also for more than a century entered into works of "fine art" which are becoming a popular possession. The creative use and development of folk art which has taken place in the great national movements of the past century and today make up one of the major developments in the social history of art.

Hauser's utter ignorance, or lack of mention, of these movements, in both *The Social History of Art* and *The Philosophy of Art History,* may be cited as another limitation of sociology. Perhaps there lies behind it also an influence of Hauser's training in Germany, where art history and theory for all its great accomplishments, has been notoriously antipathetic to the concept of national cultural expression. It tended to look upon the movements for national cultural growth on the part of Russian, Slavic, Czech, Polish and Hungarian people as a pathetic provincialism, lumping all such movements together as "nationalism" and advancing its own national chauvinism as "universality." And so in Hauser's *The Social History of Art,* covering as it did all the arts, he devoted his chapters on the 19th century to the one line of "romanticism." Chopin was briefly mentioned, and as a "romantic," not as a Pole. Tolstoi was touched on as a representative novelist, but ignored was the great development of a distinctly na-

tional Russian music, art, and literature, of which Tolstoi was a part, and which happens to be one of the great world cultural movements. Verdi and Italian culture, the great Czech national composers, the rich Irish national literary movement, the American developments in the arts, were not considered worthy of mention. Whistler found a place, but not Whitman.

Yet these developments, far from being provincialisms or movements away from "the main line," have through their very independence and the fresh resources drawn upon, radically enriched and reshaped world culture. They loom even greater today. For despite the havoc wrought by two world wars, the lights of culture being lit in land after land over the world could not have even been guessed at a century ago, and even with the fragmentary exchange that exists today the world is beginning to shine with a new collective illumination.

CONVENTION IN ART

The last section of the book, "Conflicting Forces in the History of Arts: Originality and the Conventions," reveals only how incompetent the sociological approach is when it takes on matters of art form. Hauser confuses three very different aspects of art under the term "conventions" which, as he puts it, come into conflict with originality.

One of Hauser's "conventions" consists of the languages, tools and basic techniques of the arts, like the writer's knowledge of how to handle words, the painter learning to draw and handle color, the composer learning the secrets of harmony, rhythm, and instrumentation. But these, properly speaking, are not conventions. Brought into being socially, they are developments of the human senses and open doors to the perception of reality. A person without language would not only be unable to communicate, either with "originality" or in any other way. He would be unable to think. When a painter learns to draw and handle color, he learns how to see. When a person learns the rudiments of music, he for the first time develops an ear for pitch, and learns how to shape his own melodies.

A second aspect of the arts, which Hauser likewise lumps with the "conventions," consists of what are perhaps better called the artifices bound up with the social life of art and the channels through which the artist and audience come together. Thus, drama has its artifices, which audiences readily accept. They know that when they attend a play they are looking at actors, not real-life events, and that when a curtain falls and rises again there may be a supposed lapse of many years. And they are not confused when someone dies on the stage and then takes a curtain call. People are not bothered by the fact that a flat painting looks as if it had three dimensions,

or that Michelangelo's David is far greater than life size while Vermeer will paint a room with people on a canvas a few inches square, or that a Persian book illumination will have lovely decorative motifs woven about its scene of living people. They are not bothered by the fact that in an opera or musical comedy people sing instead of speak, and with an orchestra accompanying them. Nor does it confuse them that the writer of a novel seems to have the miraculous power to enter into the minds of his characters and introduce the reader to the most intimate, private scenes.

Such artifices are bound up with the very nature of art, which never, but in some naturalistic aberrations, tries to deceive people into thinking that they are looking at real things or events. They are the technical aspects of the institutions which society sets up so that people can come together for a common cultural experience. And so these artifices, on the basis of which the artist can meet and move his audience, are no threat to originality but an open door to it. For Mozart to take up the apparent technical difficulties of composing opera, as compared to writing a piano sonata—writing for both voices and instruments, finding a good libretto, adapting music to speech and to stage action, even shaping his arias to the actual singers who would sing them—did not mean an obstacle to originality. On the contrary, it stimulated some of his most original music, for what it gave him was also the inspiration of a more popular audience and a wide sweep of life as his theme.

Of course such artifices that appear very natural and stimulating at one time can appear very strained, arbitrary, unreal and conventional, at another. But this is not due to the presence of artifices themselves. It comes out of the thinking behind them. For the instituitons of art are superstructural. Through them a ruling class brings the pressures of its ideologies to bear upon the artist. And only when this interferes with the free exploration of reality do the artifices basic to art turn into actual conventions that stand as a barrier to originality. Ideology always tries to mask itself as not a class prejudice but an eternal rightness, proclaiming, "This is not how we want things to be, it is only the way things ought to be."

In the Middle Ages such rules or conventions as to how painters should paint or musicians should compose were presumably the edicts of God. With the classicism of the absolute monarchies, the rules and conventions had behind them the presumed authority of Greek and Roman antiquity. In the 19th century, the rules, conventions and academicisms were raised as a matter of propriety, decency, morality and obedience to the mannerisms of the great masters of the past, who were dead and could raise no embarrassing questions, and whose

works were by now proved and established commodities.

When the artist rejects such conventions, he is seeking freedom not from artifices but from superstructural pressures, and reaching for a new audience. The new form he develops has as many artifices as the old. Thus Rembrandt, when his more profound paintings and biblical scenes did not find a market among the richest bourgeoisie, turned to etching. Goya turned to lithograph. Daumier found a path to the working class in cartoons for the popular press.

On the other hand, the clamor of some artists for "naturalness" is often a movement not towards reality but away from it, and a turn to subjectivity. Thus, when Wagner denounced the "artificiality" of operatic arias, duets and ensembles, and also miraculously had rivers seem to be flowing through the stage or fire springing out of it, he was seeking only a powerfully immediate, overwhelming sensuous appeal to project the psychological fantasy of his operas themselves. He went back to these "artificialities" readily enough, as in *Die Meistersinger,* when a more realistic view of life called for them. The peak of such "naturalness" and defiance of "artificialities" is reached with the modern American non-objective painters, who claim that they don't want their works to give "illusions" to anybody, but to be merely concrete things, and who justify their large, almost blank canvases, as Mark Rothko does, on the ground that they want the painting to "envelop" the observer. A painting no longer opens the eyes to real life but becomes itself "environment," a substitute for life.

Since Hauser does not see these contrasting aspects of what he lumps together as "conventions," he confuses originality with the absence of all artifices, and since this is impossible, he concludes that there must always be a compromise with originality. "A work of art that consisted entirely of original, strictly creative elements would be unintelligible; it becomes intelligible only through a certain sacrifice of originality." But originality is a quite different matter from a "free expression" unhindered by any knowledge of language, tools, techniques or the heritage of the arts. It springs from the discovery of reality, and the mastery of the social and artistic tools which help the artist to make such discoveries.

The most profoundly original artists were always those primarily interested in what was happening among people in real life, themselves entering boldly into the strongest currents and allowing life itself to educate them. For the world is always changing. Each individual person is conscious only of his small part in that change. To really discover what is new, to bring together into an artistic work the composite experiences and changes that together make up the new, to give society

a true consciousness of what it has become and what is emerging in it, is the greatest challenge to originality. Artists who make such discoveries also discover the styles that they have to employ.

Sociology in art, like that of Arnold Hauser, makes its best contribution when it discloses how tight the ties are between society and art. It reveals also that these ties are most tight precisely when the artist believes he is most free, in that he is above society and renounces its problems and conflicts. It is then, sociology shows, that he is most the slave of an ideology serving his exploiters, for he has barred himself from the most important source of originality. Sociology is weaker, however, in dealing with the next step the artist must take, for freedom. It is to take up a social role consciously, and become a partisan for what is new, developing, enlightening, and broadening human possibilities, fighting what is outmoded, irrational and destructive. And what sociology does not see at all is that this service of art to society is not eternal, but leads to a new step in which society, so to speak, serves art. To eliminate the exploitation of one class by another, to eliminate the possibility of one person seeing his own freedom or liberation as possible only at another's expense, to bring about the fullest cooperation in the conquest of nature, brings about the conditions for the most vast and widespread flowering of creative talents. It enables all people to live like rounded human beings. This is a prospect for the future, but there are already many signs of what is to come.

One is the fact that in the Soviet Union so much of the great heritage of the arts has become a popular possession, and the audience itself has become so active. Or we can cite China, which up to recently was a land of famine and technical backwardness, with its resources looted by the West. In a resolution by the Chinese Communist Party, called *Some Questions Concerning the People's Communes,* the communes are advised to reduce the area sown to crops by two-thirds, and work the other third more scientifically and intensively. The result it says will not only be much greater crops than at present. It will also be that, as the resolution continues, "Part of the land so saved can lie fallow by rotation, or be used for pasturage and the growing of green manure; the rest can be used for afforestation, reservoirs, and the extensive cultivation of flowers, shrubs and trees, to turn our whole land with its plains, hills and waters, into a garden."

Thus, beauty and utility, the development of human senses and powers and the turning of nature to human use, again move directly hand in hand. The "gardens" of the resolution refer to nature, not art, but it is not hard to see that with such an approach to life, the result will also be gardens of art.

Soviet Science and the Seven-Year Plan

By A. Nesmeyanov

The elaboration and adoption of the Seven-Year Plan by the USSR is a turning point in modern history. Its implementation, which is now going forward, marks the consolidation of socialism as a world system, and the beginning of the building of Communism. The challenge this magnificent Plan offers to science manifestly is great. Discussing this basic question of our epoch, in the following pages, is Academician Nesmeyanov, President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.—The Editor.

THE MAJESTIC PROSPECTS for accomplishing the basic economic task of the USSR and building communism in our country, opening up in the theses of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report to the 21st Congress of the CPSU, call all Soviet scientists and technicians to new feats.

I

In drawing up the long-term plan of scientific research for the next seven years, the Soviet scientists, as heretofore, guided themselves not only by the tasks of today but also considered the requirements of future technology; they were concerned for the development of science tomorrow.

Society's power of the forces of nature, and its might, are largely determined by its energy facilities. That is why *one of the all-important tasks of Soviet science at the present stage of its development is that of harnessing the most powerful and inexhaustible sources of energy, a solution of the problem of controlled thermo-nuclear reactions.*

However, the concentration of the leading forces of science on this problem, which is tremendous for its consequences, should not distract the scientists also from the problems of the near future. Our immediate task is to develop the scientific principles of planning the power balance of our country, providing for the most economic and effective use of all energy resources: hard, liquid, and gaseous fuel, the energy of rivers, atomic energy. An urgent task here is to complete the full electrification of the entire country, to ensure a high rate of the development of its power resources and the creation of the most advantageous methods of transmitting power.

Under the new conditions, high urgency is assumed by the problem of direct conversion of the energy of fuel (including also nuclear fuel) into electric power. We shall also substantially develop research aimed at increasing the parameters of hy-

dro- and turbo-generators and high pressure boilers of electric power plants.

The tasks of nuclear physics, naturally, far transcend the bounds of the problems of present-day atomics. Nuclear physics studies questions which today as yet have no practical importance but which are necessary for an understanding of the structure of the nucleus and of mastering nuclear processes.

To this end great attention will be devoted to the further study of the collisions of nucleons (protons, neutrons) at high energies, as a result of which new elementary particles appear: mesons, hyperons, antiprotons, etc. Sources of particles with energies necessary for these purposes are super-powerful accelerators in the development of which Soviet science holds a prominent place. A number of questions ascertaining the nature of the interaction of nucleons, including the generation of new particles, are successfully resolved in experiments with cosmic rays. Therefore, as is pointed out in the theses of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report, great attention will be devoted to the further study of the interaction of cosmic rays with matter.

Extensive work will be pursued in investigating nuclear reactions under the impact of multiple-charged ions, which open up possibilities for studying nuclear reactions, but which cannot be studied by other methods, and for obtaining new trans-uranium elements.

In the theory of the nucleus, efforts will be made to get more accurate information and to develop different separate models of the structure of the nucleus and the development of more general theoretical concepitons linking separate aspects into a single whole. Efforts will be directed at building up a theory of nuclear reactions.

Closely allied with the problems of atomic physics today is research in one of the most ancient sciences, astronomy. It should be noted that the very idea of controlled thermonuclear reactions arose in studying the sources of energy of the sun and the stars. Today astronomy investigates the nature of physical processes arising in outer space in conditions which still cannot be reproduced in laboratories on Earth (super-high pressures and temperatures, super-powerful processes of energy emission, etc.). Of great interest for astrophysics is also the problem of the generation of cosmic particles whose energy is millions of times greater than the energy of particles now obtained with the aid of the most powerful modern acceleratosr. The Seven-Year Plan for the development of science devotes considerable attention *to elaborating new means of astronomical investigations both with the aid of new powerful optical and radio-technical instruments and with the use of space rockets and artificial satellites, which make it possible to send instruments beyond the Earth's atmosphere.*

Along with atomic physics, a prominent place in the plans for the development of science is assigned to the physics of solids, which includes such divisions as the physics of strength and elasticity, the physics of magnetic phenomena, the physics of super-high pressures, the physics of crystals. Modern technology, in its most diverse branches, such as, for example, aviation, ship-building, machine-building, metallurgy, power generation, radionics and others, relies for its development on achievements in this field of physics. There is no need to speak about the importance and role in our days of super-hard and heat-resistant alloys, materials, suitable for the atomic industry, rocketry, and aircraft engineering. A genuinely scientific approach to the solution of problems of creating new technically-valuable materials is possible only on the basis of profound knowledge of the nature of solids, their atomic-crystal structure and the elementary processes going on in solids in different physical conditions.

Of particular interest are crystal substances used as natural electronic "instruments." With the development of ultra-short wave radionics and radio-location, with increasing the speed of electronic computing machines, with modern communications and location techniques changing over to still shorter electromagnetic waves, one discerns more and more clearly a tendency of replacing vacuum radio electronic devices by transistors. In many cases, crystal instruments, for their qualities–weight characteristics, dimensions, dependability in operation, economic effect, length of service, etc.–are much superior to vacuum electronic devices for analogous purposes. Often the use of crystal materials, artificial ones, particularly, opens up fundamentally new directions in the development of technology.

All these investigations are given top priority among the most important problems of the forthcoming Seven-Year Plan.

II

The tasks of technical progress in the creation of the material and technical basis for communism are stupendous.

Computing techniques are rapidly developing. The leap forward in quality made in science and technology, thanks to the appearance of fast electronic computing machines, rests primarily on their rapidity, their ability to perform thousands and tens of thousands of arithmetical operations in a second. Small wonder that every time their rapidity is increased ten-fold, there arise new possibilities from the point of quality, for their application. Today science needs already computing speeds of an order of 100,000 operations per second; tomorrow it will need a million. Accordingly, *we shall have to widely elaborate the foundation of computing techniques and evolve new, still faster and still more re-*

liable technical means and machine elements, based on present-day achievements of physics and radio-electronics. Along with this, it is necessary to further improve and develop methods of mathematics, mathematical logics, the theory of programme setting and the theory of information.

In the coming seven years, mechanical computers should find broad application in the most diverse spheres of human endeavor. Accordingly, *there will be designed and produced new types of general-purpose and special computing machines, including machines for controlling production processes, statistics-taking, book-keeping and accounting, planning and designing.* The problems of machine translation from one language into another, of providing information by means of machines, and so on, will be elaborated.

The development of the possibilities of mechanical computing should have far-reaching consequences for many branches of science and technology and for many spheres of economy. Science and technology will be rapidly mathematized. More and more realms of science will become the domain of exact knowledge. It is necessary to prepare in advance for the consequences of this beneficial process by further developing the science of mathematics in general, and by training the cadres.

Chief and decisive for ensuring further technical progress in economy are, as the theses of N. S. Khrushchev's report note, integrated mechanization and automation of production processes. It is envisaged that a gradual transition will be effectd from the automating of separate aggregates and units to integrated automation, to the establishment of fully automated shops, technological processes and whole plants. This is all presenting new demands to science. In the limelight there arise problems pertaining to the automatic regulation of a process at an optimum regime. The elaboration of the theory of self-adjusting arrangements, capable of selecting the optimum regime, springs to the foreground.

A highway is opening up for the industrial use of controlling machines. The need for knowing the laws governing the course of the production process and its mathematical expression is becoming imperative. The implication is that there must be a substantial revision and improvement of technology and the creation in many cases of new equipment and new arrangements and technical means of automation. *Scientific establishments will have to take an active hand in setting up experimental model enterprises where the latest patterns of integrated automation will be put into effect.*

Technical progress in industry, transport, communications, and radio and TV broadcasting largely depends on the development of radio physics and radio electronics. The augmentation of the network of in-

ter-urban cable communication lines, of the length of radio-relay lines and of the capacity of radio broadcasting stations, as well as the speeding up of the work to widely introduce television and ultra-short-wave transmission and also color television—this is all slated in the target figures—call for the solution of several important scientific problems of radio-electronics and communications. Essential among them is the quest for new methods of transmission that would ensure high fidelity and great rapidity in the transmission of information.

New techniques are placing an increasingly higher demand on materials. We need light and sturdy constructional materials for the aircraft industry, and for ship and motor-car building, synthetic fibres that are very strong and heat-resisting for the making of rubber that can take much wear and tear for modern aircraft and motor-car tires, electric insulation materials with a high dielectric standard for the electrical and radio engineering industries and sound and heat insulation materials for building, wagon-making, ship-making, the manufacture of refrigerators, and for other purposes.

Instrument-making needs crystals possessing very good optical, electrical, magnetic and mechanical properties. It is an imperative necessity to elaborate methods of synthesizing new super-hard alloys and compounds with the hardness reaching and exceeding that of diamond.

The population must be provided with excellent fabrics, woven from man-made fibres, and with artificial leather and imitation fur that would be far cheaper and far better than the real articles. The building and furniture-making industry must be given sturdy and elegant materials, based on synthetic polymers. All these man-made materials, which are becoming better and better and more and more superior to those Nature provides, are prepared chemically.

Here boundless prospects open up for investigation in high-molecular chemistry, organic synthesis and catalysis, physical chemistry, the physics of solids and the physics of crystals. The prime object here is to *solve the exceedingly fascinating problem of creating artificial materials with a given property, a problem that opens up boundless vistas.*

The projected investigations in the synthesis of inorganic polymers will, it is to be hoped, make it possible to obtain materials stable at very high temperatures. The key task for ensuring constant progress in the synthesis of artificial high-molecular materials, is to develop high-molecular chemistry itself, this branch of science which lies between organic (and inorganic) and colloidal chemistry and the physics of solids. Only the powerful development of this young science, will make it possible increasingly to replace empirical methods of producing plastics and other high-molecu-

ar materials by strictly scientific ones. We are also considerably to expand theoretical investigations conducive to the develuopment of new improved technological processes. This refers *to the creation of the most effective and economically advantageous methods of processing natural and casing head oil gases, oil, coal, diverse vegetable waste, which make it possible to obtain initial substances for the synthesis of polymeric materials and also industrial methods of producing and processing polymers.*

The Seven-Year Plan envisages the expansion of research in the field of rare elements. The importance of these elements for the national economy sharply rises with the development of scientific investigations directed at studying their properties and finding new fields for their application. Technological progress in atomic energetics, metallurgy, in the aircraft, machine-building, chemical, radio-engineering and optical industries, depends to a large extent on providing them with rare elements in sufficient quantities.

Radiation chemistry, one of the youngest branches of chemical science, will also be further developed. As is known, such chemical reactions which in ordinary conditions are difficult to effect or which proceed in an entirely different direction, are accelerated under the impact of radiation, i.e., gamma radiation, the radiation of neutrons and electrons.

Soviet scientists have found that the shortlived action of radiation on different stages of the chemical process as a result of the break-up of molecules into active fragments—radicals, which initiate chains of reactions—makes it possible to direct a reaction into a desired direction and increases the output of the end product of reaction.

The target figures for the economic development of the USSR call for a tremendous volume of geological surveying. *The task of geological science in the next seven years is to ensure that the planned volume of geological surveying greatly increases the resources of oil, gas, opens up new large deposits of rich and easily concentrated ferrous and nonferrous metals situated in favorable economic conditions.* For the successful accomplishment of this task, it is necessary to have a high level of general knowledge of the geological structure of our country, profound knowledge of the laws of the distribution of rocks, the conditoins of their formation, and the connections of minerals with them. Particular importance is assumed by investigations to ascertain the laws of the formation and distribution of mineral deposits on the territory of the USSR.

It will be necessary sharply to expand the application of geophysics to solving geological problems, which will make it possible substantially to raise the effectiveness of prospecting for mineral deposits.

Besides tackling scientific problems with regard to expanding the mineral resources of our country, great importance is assumed by investigations in the laws of the formation and distribution of subterranean waters and ascertainment of the possibilities of their practical use for water supplies.

III

Great tasks confront medical science in perfecting methods of preventing diseases, in safeguarding motherhood and infancy, in perfecting methods of treatment. A noble task of medical science is to *further prolong the average life-span of man and his vitality.*

A necessary theoretical prerequisite for the advancement of medical science, as well as agricultural sciences, is, as it is pointed out in the theses of N. S. Khrushchev's report, the development of biology. Medicine is coming quite close to mastering methods of radically combatting diseases, including the complete eradication of many of them. Another task of biological science is to ascertain the nature of diseases which are now the most serious scourge of humanity, first and foremost, malignant tumours, diseases of the cardiovascular and nervous systems. The development of rational means of combating these diseases depends on a profound and comprehensive knowledge of the physico-chemical and structural foundations of elementary vital processes, which is an all-important task of biophysics and biochemistry.

New methods of research will make it possible to study the processes of metabolism in the organism without violating the wholeness of the functioning of live tissue, without halting vital phenomena and with interference in their natural course. The cell is the basic structural brick of all organisms, from bacteria to man. Therefore, cytological research must underly a solution of major biological problems—the origin of organisms, heredity, multiplication, growth of tissues (and the organism)—normal and painful growth, and, specifically, malignant growth. Here the task must be opposite to the one mentioned above: elaboration of methods for delicate operation on living cells. The focal biological problem is to learn the structure of the basic substratum of life: the protein, and its major biological functions (fermentive, hormonal, immunological, structure-forming), and, above all, ascertainment of the chemical structure and physical structure of protein molecules and their complexes with other substances.

Penetration into the physico-chemical foundations of major elementary vital processes will open up new possibilities for consciously reacting on these processes in living organisms. Ascertainment of the mechanism of the violation of physical funcitons will help to find new ways of removing pathological con-

ditions. An understanding of the mechanism of cancer formation, discernment of the early stages of cancer, the finding of rational ways of treating it, will be of tremendous significance for solving such a complex problem as the problem of curing cancer. Allied with this line of research is study of the laws and mechanisms of the impact of radiation upon cells and living organisms. Knowledge of these complex phenomena will be of decisive significance for the prevention and treatment of the radiation disease, which is a question of the utmost urgency in the atomic age.

The tasks of agricultural sciene in further boosting harvest yields and livestock performances and in opening up such natural resources as soils, flora and fauna, in a comprehensive way, are so immense and responsible that they call for consideration apart.

"The importance of the group of biological sciences," as the theses of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report note, *"will rise especially as the achievements of physics and chemistry are used in biology. In this connection, such branches of science as biochemistry, agro-chemistry, biophysics, microbiology, virusology, selection, and genetics will play an important part."*

Whereas today it is physics and chemistry that are infusing biology with new strength, tomorrow it will be biology that will supply physics and chemistry with new ideas. This day is already on the threshold. It would be precious in chemistry and the chemical industry, for instance, to apply the principles of the synthesis of the most complex substances, such as albumens, hormones, ferments, antibiotics, and so on, which take place in plants at room temperatures and pressures and without the use of any equipment. There are data showing that many biological objects, as active albuminous systems — ferments — for instance, possess the properties of semi-conductors.

This is a valuable pointer for physicists and the theory of catalysis. The elucidation of the machinery of muscular contraction may be important for engineering, as the muscle, being a very fine motor transforming chemical energy directly into mechanical energy with a high rate of efficiency, may serve as a prototype for a motor, utterly new in principle.

As chemistry and physics increasingly invade biology—a process which as such is now rapidly developing all over the world—the importance of the group of biological sciences will fast rise, and it is quite likely that in the future physico-chemical biology will be in the lead in the natural sciences.

IV

The building of communism calls for the further creative elaboration of the social sciences, and for ener-

getic criticism of modern revisionism and bourgeois ideology. In the limelight are the problems of revealing and generalizing the laws of social development, the practices of socialist construction, and the prospects and concrete ways of effecting the transition to communism. There arises in a new light, accordingly, the elaboration of the problems of the philosophy of dialectical materialism, and the Marxian presentation of world history as a logical process of social advance towards communism and of the laws governing the development of social relationships, science, literature, and the arts in the epoch of socialism and the transition to communism.

In the present conditions there greatly increases the importance of the science of economics, which, as Comrade N. S. Khrushchev points out in the theses of his report, should be intimately linked with economic planning and the entire pracitce of communist construction. The generalization by economists of the great wealth of material accumulated through practice in the widest range of social and productive endeavor will help to find the ways for further developing economy and to foresee the prospects of technical progress, and of better forms and methods of economic management, organization and administration.

Especial heed, in view of the further perfection of economic management, will be paid to *the elaboration of the principles of specialization and cooperaiton in industry and to the elucidation of the tendencies of development in individual branches of economy.* It is necessary to lay the scientific foundation for the technical and economic analysis of the latest technological achievements; in the first place we must elaborate a set of methods for determining the economic effect to be derived from capital investments and the introduction of new techniques. In cooperation with the technical experts, the economists must look for the most opportunity-affording and economically advantageous ways and means of raising labor productivity. We shall have to widely develop studies pertaining to the promotion of the economic cooperation and international division of labor in the socialist camp. The accomplishment of the tasks put before the science of economics calls for widespread application of mathematical methods in the economic analysis of phenomena and processes and also for the use of statistical methods.

V. I. Lenin taught us that "the economist must always look ahead, towards technical progress, for otherwise he will at once find himself behind, because he who does not want to look ahead turns his back on history: there is no middle-of-the-way here and cannot be." This is the way a Soviet economist should always follow if he wants to be abreast of the demands of life and

of the prospects of the advance to communism.

To successfully accomplish the scientific tasks put forward it is necessary to extend in every way the network of research establishments, to set up and strengthen the institutes and to equip them with the latest apparatuses.

The rapidly developing industry of Siberia, Kazakhstan, the Urals, the Volga area and the Far East must command a large number of big and well-equipped research institutes and centers that can help to quickly open up these extremely rich parts of the country.

To develop practical and theoretical investigation in every way, as providing the scientific foundation for technical progress, *we must step up the establishment of the scientific townlets in Novosibirsk (mainly physico-technical), Irkutsk (chemico-technological and geological), and Pushchino (physico-chemical biology)*, and also ensure the rapid development of the scientific establishments of the Union-Republic Academies of Sciences.

Decisive measures must be taken to raise the standard of scientific work at higher educational establishments, paying heed to such establishments in the outlying parts, especially in the East of the country. Attention must be concentrated on the further development of the experimental branches of biology such as biochemistry, biophysics, cytology, microbiology, genetics, and virusology. Success will be achieved in these spheres only provided the latest physical and chemical methods of research are widely applied and the material and technical facilities of biological institutions fundamentally improved.

Special heed must be paid to the consolidation and establishment of institutes working in fields of new techniques, in radio-electronics, automatics and astronautics.

The majestic program for the comprehensive building of Communism in our country, that is set out in the theses of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev's report, inspires Soviet scientists to scale new summits and win the lead in world science.

The Spanish Working-Class Movement

By M. Perez

DURING THE PAST 20 years Franco has often boasted of having ended the class struggle. Falangist propaganda has presented General Franco's State as "a State above classes." The vertical trade unions, an integral part of this State, are said to be the "harmonizers" and "regulators" of the economic interests of the workers and of the interests of the employers. Both workers and employers are compelled to enroll in these unions.

In Spain, as in every place where there exist exploited and exploiters, proletarians and capitalists, and, above all, monopolies, events go to prove that their interests are irrevocably opposed and hostile. The so-called "State above classes" imprisons those who seek a living wage, but it has never locked up a single banker or member of the ruling class who are directly responsible for the high cost of living and the constantly soaring prices. This is the hard reality which seeps through the propaganda put out by the fascists and which has made it possible to forge the class consciousness of the new generation of Spanish workers, men of 18 to 35 years of age, who constitute the vast majority of the Spanish proletariat.

In 1958, two major events clearly proved the high level the Spanish working class and democratic movement have reached after 20 years of fascism. The first was the strikes in March and April and the second the events round the anti-Franco demonstrations of May 5. The nation-wide character of these events clearly points to the strong desire the people feels for radical changes.

When discussing the first of the above-named events, it is important to bring out the three following aspects:

1. Although strikes are illegal in Franco Spain, Spanish workers have nevertheless succeeded in organizing them on a national scale.

2. The strikes were organized in the biggest industrial centers of the country which means that they were held in places with the biggest number of workers—in the Asturian mine fields, the Biscay metal industry center and in the Catalan textile region.

3. This was the first time strikes had been interrelated, and these were spread over nearly two months. Some were called as a token of solidarity with the Asturian miners' strike or with the victims of persecution elsewhere. But this did not prevent the workers who were involved in these strikes from putting their own demands.

The second event, the "National Reconciliation Day" on May 5 in

which the working class played an eminent role, revealed a new and highly important aspect. Agricultural workers participated actively in the general struggle for democracy and came forward with their own specific demands. In a country where practically half the national revenue is derived from agriculture and where the number of agricultural workers—around 2½ million—represents one third of the working population, the participation of this category of workers in the struggle against the economic policy of the regime is of major importance.

What are the chief reasons behind the present development in the Spanish working class and democratic movement and what are the prospects for the future?

The place to look for them is in General Franco's economic policy which is guided by the desire to protect the interests of finance capital and the monopolies, of which the regime is the politcal expression.

RISING PRICES AND GALLOPING INFLATION

Here are some figures illustrating this policy.

In the eight years from 1950 to 1957, fiduciary currency doubled, increasing from 31,660 million pesetas to 60 thousand million. In 1958, the volume of paper money in circulation leaped by a further 20 per cent as against 1957. However, the index of industrial and agricultural production only stood at 175 per cent of the 1950 level. A considerable proportion of this surplus money is due not to the requirements of production, but to systematic price increases imposed by the monopolies.

In an economy dominated by the monopolies it is easy to understand that retail prices increase at a much higher rate. During the second quarter of 1958 alone, prices of consumer goods went up by 30 to 40 per cent; this included the price of coal, fares, rents and electricity. During the same period prices in general rose by 30 per cent.

Prices reached such heights that the government invented certain tricks such as authorizing the sale of a "kilo" of bread weighing only 750 to 800 grammes (instead of 1,000), according to the quality; this was done in order to camouflage the staggering price increases. An official "kilo" of bread costs 5.55 pesetas, but if a working class family wants to eat an actual kilo of bread, it must spent 6.95 pesetas.

PROFITS OF BIG COMPANIES

When taking a look at big industrial and financial magnates, we find that in 1957 profits of the biggest industrial companies were 35 to 40 per cent higher than in 1956. In 1957, the six banks, which control practically the entire economy of the country, had one thousand million pesetas more to divide among them than in 1956.

We should point out that General Franco's Government does not show concern only for the Spanish ruling

class. The increasingly cosmopolitan character of the monopolies has resulted in the growing submission of the Spanish economy and State to the economic, political and military plans of United States imperialism which dominates the whole capitalist world. The United States used Spain as a base of aggression during the events in Lebanon.

Although Spanish law does not authorize more than 25 per cent foreign capital in national companies it is impossible to keep track of the number of meetings of the Council of Ministers that have issued special authorizations for a 40, 45 and even 50 per cent participation, particularly to American capital. However, this form is what we might call "legal," because there exists another, more subtle and more profitable form which the American monopolies and their minor Spanish partners are using to plunder the people. This is how it works:

Under the terms of the American-Franco pacts signed in 1953, Franco is entitled to loans in the form of American arms and agricultural products in exchange for placing Spanish territory at the disposal of the Washington warmongers. He must pay off these loans in pesetas. It goes without saying that Spain could do without such "aid" in food if only she carried out a policy of genuine national economic development. Before Franco came to power, Spain used to balance her trade solely by exporting her agricultural produce.

Here is a typical example of this plundering: under the terms of a recent loan, the United States compelled Franco to buy 1 million quintals of American corn at 6 pesetas a kilo at a time when the State was paying Spanish peasants 3.60 pesetas a kilo. This difference of 240 million pesetas was taken from the Spanish revenue in order to enrich the American monopolies.

In other words, this "aid" is given not only to mortgage Spain's national independence, but it is extorted from the Spanish people themselves, particularly from the working people, because the millions the Americans "lend" Franco are the proceeds of their inhuman exploitation. This brings us to one of the major reasons for the low wages and high cost of living of Spanish workers.

STARVATION WAGES AND UNEMPLOYMENT

A nation-wide wage-freeze has been in operation since October, 1956. Wages, which in 1953 accounted for 55.74 per cent of the net national revenue, had dropped to 48.49 per cent in 1956. Capitalist profits, on the other hand, which in 1953 accounted for 44.26 per cent, had risen to 51.51 per cent in 1956. It is unnecessary to add that the wage freeze and soaring prices have led to a further deterioration in the workers' conditions during the last two years.

In dealing with the question of wages, one of the features of the Spanish economy should be mentioned; it is that out of Spain's roughly 6 million town and country workers, some four million are unskilled or laborers. In indutsry alone, more than a million of the 25 million workers employed have no qualifications whatsoever. Naturally, this means that a large section of workers receive a much lower wage than the official average. The following table will give a clear picture of the situation.

5% of all workers earn from 115 to 125 pesetas daily

20% of all workers earn from 110 to 115 pesetas daily

30% of all workers earn approximately 90 pesetas daily

45% of all workers earn less than 70 pesetas daily including bonuses and other awards.

The monthly budget needed by a family with two children was calculated at 3,500 pesetas during the recent census taken during the Days of Catholic-Social Study, and at 5,400 pesetas by a group of technicians and workers at a big Barcelona factory. This shows that three-quarters, according to one estimate and four-fifths according to another, of the workers are paid less than the minimum.

Therefore, after 20 years of absolute and uninterrupted power, Franco is keeping the Spanish working class in conditions that go from bad to worse. A recent survey made by the Madrid Chamber of Commerce has established the following facts which implicitly constitute a strong condemnation of the mouthings of the Franco system. Taking 100 as the index for the 1932-36 period, that is to say the period of the Republic, prices touched index 1,277 in 1958, that is to say, it was 12 *times higher,* while the average basic wage which amounted to 8.75 pesetas in 1936, rose to 43 pesetas in 1957, *five times higher.* Only a simple arithmetical sum is needed to show that during two decades of fascist rule, purchasing power has been cut by half.

For this reason a 10 and 12-hour or longer working day and the practice of taking on two jobs at a time are current in Spain, and the regime's newspapers are forced to mention this every day.

In the countryside, not only have wages shrunk considerably but the amount of seasonal unemployment and its duration are almost unbelievable. Only an infinitesimal part of the 2.5 million agricultural workers have permanent employment. The others can only find work at harvest time. This is particularly true of the vast southern regions where the growing of a single product—cereals, cork oak, or olives—predominates according to area.

WORKERS MAKE INCREASING USE OF VERTICAL TRADE UNIONS

A minimum living wage for an

eight-hour day scaled according to the cost of living has become the main rallying call uniting the workers who are putting ever-increasing pressure on the trade unions at places of work.

In order to counteract this offensive launched by the Spanish workers, the government promulgated the Law on Social Collective Agreements on April 24, 1958, immediately following the strikes of March and April that year. The letter of this law at least opens a breach in the government's wage freeze and authorizes negotiations between workers and employers through the medium of the trade union.

For the present, this law only applies in undertakings with a staff of more than 500 workers. Its scope has been severely limited by a ministerial order dated July 22, 1958, and a Service Order issued by the General Secretariat of the Vertical Trade Unions last September.

As is naturally the case in every capitalist society, especially under fascist rule, the laws—and this applies even to those won by class action, as is the case in point—are of value to the workers and are operated to their advantage only to the extent to which the working class remains vigilant and exercises constant pressure. There is no question but that Franco and his faithful servants, the trade union leaderships, do not have the slightest intention of satisfying wage demands if they are not forced to do so.

One of the trade union pundits, Mariano Rojas Morales said in a recent interview: "In my opinion, the main thing to be obtained with the help of these agreements is an increase of all forms of productivity."

But the Spanish workers are becoming less disposed than ever to bear with a policy resulting exclusively in more wealth for the big national and foreign capitalist undertakings. Whether they like it or not, the vertical unions are being compelled to echo this sentiment.

For instance, the official report on an important meeting of trade union leaders and deputies nominated by them for the "workers' and technicians' sector" of Parliament, held in Madrid last November, states: "Those taking part indicated the concern felt by those they represented in view of the gap between prices and wages. In no uncertain terms, the representatives expressed the need for an economic and financial policy taking account of the situation mentioned above."

The fact that such a meeting, attended as it was by the official "General Staff" for economic and social affairs, reached such conclusions shows, on one hand, the wide extent of the workers' demands, and, on the other, the new conclusions as a "legitimate" basis for persisting in their demands and amplifying them. Unquestionably, it will become increasingly difficult for the trade union leaders and the police to oppose workers' action for better

living conditions while the justice of their demands is openly recognized by the representatives of the fascist state. This has been clearly understood by the building workers, bakers, metal workers and members of other trades in Madrid. One of the first results obtained in this direction at the end of December, 1958, was the agreement signed with C.A.M.P.S.A. (General Petroleum Company) under which the workers obtained a 25 per cent increase in bonuses and other awards without being called on to raise productivity.

The unity of the communist, socialist, anarchist and catholic workers during the election of shop stewards at the end of 1957, made it possible to elect sincere workers enjoying the confidence of their class brothers and anxious to defend the workers' interests. It was a big victory and opened the way to a great extent for the actions that took place in March and April. Although many of these shop stewards were persecuted during the repression which followed the strike movements last year, it is becoming more and more difficult for the Franco regime to oppose the wave of protest sweeping through Spain.

Spanish fascism does not change in spots and the State is still a fascist one, but it is already a fascism and a fascist state in decay. They are unable to resist the working class with the same vigor as they did a few years ago.

Today, the millions of workers have greater confidence in their strength and unity and are more aware of the weakened condition of Franco's regime.

During these 20 years of Franco's dictatorship, the working class has not stopped fighting even under the terrible condiitons and repression. The vast majority of people still in prison (often they have been incarcerated for many years) are workers of town and countryside. A genuine general amnesty should open the prison gates and release all workers and other opponents of the Franco regime.

International solidarity and the active fraternity of workers throughout the world for the valiant fighters now in prison are a stimulus giving valuable help to the Spanish workers. Its continuance will help to shorten the period which still lies between them and a better life.

The Congo Freedom-Struggle

By Roger Clain

Only a couple of dozen or so years ago Africa was officially designated as being French, German, British, Portuguese, Spanish or Italian. By 1958 the great winds of independence and liberty had already erased a large number of these qualifications from the map of Africa. Now, in 1959, the rifles and machine guns of Leopoldville are brutally reminding the world that the "Belgian" Congo which many people believed would sleep through the centuries, is preparing to become simply, the "Congo."

According to information still incomplete at least 200 Congolese were killed early in 1959 for their heroic opposition to colonialism. Other hundreds have been wounded; still more are in jails. But the fire smoulders deep now. It is not a question of an "incident," but of a phase in the struggle for independence waged for several years now by the Congo people who have been encouraged by the successes won by their brother peoples of Africa.

WHAT THE CONGO PEOPLE SEEK

The voice of the Congo is raised high and clear. We hear it in the words of Mr. Kasa-Vubu, President of the Abako movement which was formed in 1948, and the Mayor of Doudale (50,000 inhabitants) elected against the wishes of the Belgian administration:

> We claim the immediate lifting of restrictions on freedom of the press and of association. . . . Democracy can only be established in the Congo to the extent to which we have obtained independence, even if it is only internal. There cannot be democracy while there are no general elections and the first steps have not been taken in this direction. Therefore, we call for general elections and internal independence.

On the 50th anniversary of Belgium's annexation of the Congo, Abako again stated firmly: "The total independence of the territory is the only peaceful solution able to harmonize and stabilize the relations that could exist between the Congo and Belgium."

Proof that these assertions are in keeping with the most cherished aspirations of the people was given by the council elections in December 1957 and 1958, when Abako gained seven out of the eight mayoral posts contested and 129 of the 170 council seats. Its policy has won almost one hundred per cent support by the people.

The day after the January massacre in Leopoldville, the nine African Mayors of the town braved intimidation to protest against the repression. With conviction and dignity they declared:

> We are resolutely behind the legitimate aspirations of the Congo people for independence and social justice, without racial discrimination. . . . The people are ready to make every sacrifice to this end.

HUMAN DIGNITY CRUSHED

The reasons for this popular struggle are such that they cannot be obliterated by guns or prisons; they are the reasons which will lead all oppressed peoples into the sunshine of liberty.

Plenty of facts and figures are available. There are more than 1,140,000 industrial workers in the Congo out of a total population of 13,290,687 which includes only 108,681 Europeans. According to official figures, an industrial worker's average annual wage was 11,050 Belgian francs. Taking into account the number of mouths to be fed by this income, we reach an average of 3,830 francs per person in towns and 1,450 francs for rural dwellers. In this same period a European earned 64 times more.

Even this income became a faded chimera for more than 50,000 of the Leopoldville "wage" earners and tens of thousands of other workers at the beginning of 1958. Often coming from far-off villages, these workers were thrown on the streets without social assistance or any form of payment, or driven back into the bush by the administration and the employers. And who is capable of counting the many people seeking jobs but who are not registered as unemployed? The newspaper *Wallonie* was obliged to recognize that half the population of the Congo is out of work and lives in cruel conditions.

Again according to official statistics, the Congo has 280,000 lepers. One hundred thousand Africans suffer from tuberculosis which "is spreading and will become a great threat." Malaria is undermining the health of the whole population and kills "many children."

And what about this? In September last year, the Belgian Minister for the Congo wrote: "Total abolition of flogging is *being studied*. . . . The progressive elimination of flogging in prisons is *envisaged*. . . ." But persecution is growing. Between 1955 and 1956 the number of persons committed to prison in the Congo rose from 119,653 to 209,221.

To this we can add racial discrimination in all aspects of daily life, in wages, in controls and in the multiple bans and restrictions paralyzing the exercise of the few liberties which the paternally-minded colonialists have been compelled to measure out, drop by drop, as a result of popular pressure.

Yet the Congo is fabulously rich in ground nuts, cotton, coffee, rubber, precious woods, gold, cobalt, manganese, copper, silver, diamonds, lead, platinum, radium and uranium. The Congolese workers produce a remarkable quantity of these products every year. For whom?

For the General Company of Belgium, for the Katanga Special Committee, the Kavu National Committee and for the Great Lakes' Railway Company. In short, for approximately three percent of the undertakings in the Congo which exploit more than half the country's wage earners. Out of a total annual revenue of 50,000 million francs, about half goes to foreign monopolies, especially American. The Europeans, who represent one per cent of the Congo's population, have the same revenue as the remaining 99 per cent Congolese.

But one more link is ready to break in the bloodstained shackles which have fettered the African people. Although the tragic volleys fired at Leopoldville drew the indignant attention of public opinion, they are only one dramatic manifestation of developments that have been maturing over a period of several years and which have been apparent to every observer of the African scene.

The activities of the colonialists and the parachute-commandos sent by the Belgian Government will be to no avail. The blood of the Congo people killed and wounded at Leopoldville in defense of freedom and their country's independence, will necessarily mark a new and decisive phase of the fight for liberation in the Congo. The solidarity of the workers of Belgium and the world should not fail to be forthcoming for the workers and people of the Congo.

A Book Without Scruples

By J. M. Budish

I HAVE BEFORE ME a slender booklet called *A World Without Jews;* its author is given as Karl Marx, and it is translated, edited, and graced with an introduction by Dagobert D. Runes (Philosophical Library, N. Y., $2.75; paper, 95c). On the jacket, the publisher announces that the "fearless and illuminating critical introdutcion has been provided by the eminent philosopher, Dagobert D. Runes"—who, as it happens, is himself the publisher.

Runes' modesty is matched by his "fearlessness" for he has set out to discredit, "the Socialist movements of Germany, Austria and Russia" and the "Socialist Nehru of India," as followers of Marx slanderously depicted here as a rabid anti-Semite whose "sanguinary dream" culminated in "a world without Jews." The reader well may wonder how much "fearlessness" is required in the present cold-war atmosphere of our country to slander socialism and its great founder.

A "critical" introduction to any polemical work written 116 years ago should provide analysis of the social and political conditons of that time, of the issues involved in the debate, and the meaning in which the terms used were interpreted and understood at the time produced. Runes' introduction, however, does not contain any critical analysis whatsoever. Runes, both in his introduction and in his editing, has gone out of his way to "illuminate" Marx' articles through concave dark glasses; and such "illumination" actually amounts to the deliberate spreading of anti-Semitic propaganda.

To begin with, the very title of the book is a fabrication. Marx never wrote any such book. None of the articles republished by Runes carried such a title, nor do they contain a single sentence that would provide the slightest justification for ascribing it to Marx. It is a sheer vicious invention by Runes.

Runes' illumination consists in separating from the text of the articles a few individual sentences which when in extraction lend themselves to misinterpretation as anti-Semitic. Runes prints these sentences in very bold type without indicating that this emphasis was not in the original Marx articles, but was added by Runes. He then repeats these sentences in his introduction. Here are a few of these sentences: "What is the Jew's foundation of the world? Material necessity, private advantage." "What is the object of the Jew's worship in this world? Usury." "What is his worldly god? Money." "The Jew, who is without rights in the smallest German state, decides the fate of Europe."

The last sentence, by the way, is not by Marx at all. It is quoted by Marx from the young Hegelian "scientific" theologian Bruno Bauer, whose theories, including that embodied in the quoted sentence Marx is *challenging*, in his articles. But Runes puts it in large bold type as if it were an opinion of Marx—another outright falsification. No wonder editor S. Dingol

suggested in the *Tog-Jewish Journal* (April 11) that "a much more fitting title for this Runes publication "would have been 'Anti-Semitism for 95 cents'" which is the price of the paper edition of the concoction.

Mr. Dingol correctly points out that the false label is apparently used by Runes "in order to attract Jewish buyers," and he calls attention to the fact that the Federal Trade Commission prohibits the selling of goods under a false label, though the legal prohibition does not cover books. At any rate, Runes' advertising budget for his fraud was suspiciously high.

Why should a Jewish publisher, styling himself an "eminent philosopher," stoop to such contemptible methods in republishing two polemical articles of Marx under a false label and with a deliberately misleading "illumination," though the only possible effect of such publication is to help spread anti-Semitism?

The answer to this question is supplied by Runes himself. In a letter to S. Dingol objecting to his criticism (the *Tog-Jewish Journal*, April 18) Runes says: "I wish that Jews should know that Red Marxism has always had a strain of yellow anti-Semitism, and I wish that Christians should know, that because of that alone, if for no other reasons, the Jew must be against Marxism and all its implications."

Since anti-Semitism makes use of the "Red Marxism" fraud of the cold war to identify Jews with Socialism, Runes "fearlessly" wishes Christians to know that Jews cannot possibly be Marxists, and all this in order to make money.

In his zeal to smear Marx, Mr. Runes shows not only an abysmal ignorance of Marxism, but also a "fearless" disregard for well-established and generally known facts, as well as for statements in the articles Runes edited and republished. With no respect for the intelligence of the public, he apparently depends on the readers to limit their attention to the few easily misinterpreted sentences that he separates from the rest of the text and put in large bold type, without indicating that there was no such emphasis in Marx's original. Runes stoops to charge that "Like many (other Jewish) converts, Marx found it necessary all his life to justify the mass conversion of his family by attacks against his blood brothers."* But can Marx really be classified as a convert?

Marx was born in 1818. According to Runes, "his father accepted Christianity in 1816," i.e., two years before Marx was born. Actually, Marx's father was a freethinker, an admirer of Locke, Diderot and Voltaire. And while he, as quite a number of other Jewish bourgeois intellectuals (including Heine), accepted Christianity in order to be able to take up professional careers which were then barred to Jews, *he never attacked Jews.* On the contrary, he took part in the struggle for Jewish emancipation. As to Marx himself, he strongly supported the fight of the Rhineland Jews for equal rights without any restriction or qualification. *At about the time when he wrote the two polemical articles, he also wrote, at the request of the Jewish commu-*

* Even D. Shub, the inflexibly anti-Soviet expert of the *Jewish Daily Forward* had nothing but contempt for this fabrication of Runes. Says Mr. Shub (*Forward*, June 14): "Only a contemptible irresponsible maniac who hasn't the slightest knowledge of either the biography of Marx or of the history of the European Socialist movement could have written the words" quoted in the text above.

nity, the petition they submitted to the government demanding equal rights for the Jews.

To attempt to charge Marx with religious or racial or ethnic bigotry is the height of "fearless" and shameless distortion of both the historic record and the contents of the republished articles. The Russian Jewish Encyclopedia (published in St. Petersburg in 1907, under the general editorship of such noted non-Marxist, erudite Jews as A. Harkavy and L. Katzenelson) spoke of Marx as one "who *all his life fought for ideals common to all mankind and for universal equality*" (v. 10, p. 631).

Marx's opposition to all religious privileges and the bourgeoisie in general, independently of its racial or national origin, is stated clearly and unequivocally in the very articles republished by Runes.* Says Marx: "The political emancipation of the Jew, the Christian, or the religious man in general is a question of the emancipation of the state from Judaism, Christianity and religion in general."

Marx clearly and specifically did not discriminate between Jew and Christian or any other religious man. Nor did Marx consider Christianity superior to Judaism or any other religion, or vice versa. In the face of the above clear-cut statement of Marx, Runes' attempt to put Marx among the "vitriolic enemies of Judaism" cannot be characterized otherwise than as a barefaced slander.

Marx's articles under consideration were written five years before he completed the development of his full-fledged philosophy of scientific socialism as formulated in *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848. In 1843, Marx was still groping his way from his scientific critique of Hegel's dialectic idealism and Feuerbach's narrow non-dialectic materialism to dialectical and historical materialism and scientific socialism. In his articles devoted to a trenchant critique of Bruno Bauer's "On the Jewish Quesiton," he took sharp issue with "scientific" theologian insisted that the Bauer's thesis. This Young Hegelian Jews could not be politically emancipated, indeed that they had no right to demand full-fledged citizenship unless they first sacrificed "the privilege of faith," or unless they abandoned their religion—Judaism—and adopted Christianity.

In his critique Marx showed that the bourgeois political state in the course of its logical development could and did grant political emancipation to Jews without demanding that they repudiate their religion. In fact, the very character of the bourgeois state, according to Marx, compels it to emancipate the Jews, as well as the religious man in general. But this political emancipation, Marx emphasizes, is strictly limited to "the right to enjoy one's wealth at will, without reference to others and independently of society; it is the right of private use. It is this freedom, and its practical application which forms the foundation of bourgeois society. It causes each man to find in his fellows not the realization of freedom but its limitations. . . . The only bonds that hold them [men in bourgeois society] together are natural

* Runes' translation is garbled; there are omissions, deletions, and incorrect translations of terms. However, in view of the fact that the whole context of the "illuminating" introduction consists of willful misinterpretations and outright fabrications, it is no longer necessary to dwell on the inadequacies of the translation, which reveal a total lack of knowledge not only of the subject, but also of the language of the original.—J.M.B.

necessity, private interests, the conservation of property and their egotistical desires." As against this political emancipation that "meant the emancipation of bourgeois society from politics, from even the appearance of having a content," Marx demands full human emancipation from the constrictions and contradictions of bourgeois society. Marx sums up his argument as follows:*

> Political emancipation is the reduction of man to a member of bourgeois society, to the egoistic independent individual, on the one hand, and to a citizen of the State, a moral being, on the other. Only when the real individual re-absorbs the abstract citizen of the State and becomes a social being—in practical life, in his own work and under his own conditions; only when man recognizes and organizes his *forces propres* as social forces and, therefore, no longer separates the social force from himself in the form of political force—only then will the emancipation of humanity be completed.

Marx's entire argument in his articles "On the Jewish Question" is a further step in the development of scientific socialism, which came to full fruition a few years later.

Unfortunately, however, Marx in 1843 did fall in with the common grave error prevailing at that time of using the colloquial offensive terms "Jew" and "Judaism" for financier and commercialism.** The course of the historical development of Germany, and the fact that Marx then knew nothing about the working class Jews of Eastern Europe, and that the only German Jews he ever met were all of the bourgeois class, may explain why Marx's sharp analytical mind could even for a while fall into that erroneous colloquial, unscientific, confusing and offensive use of the word "Jew."

But even in that 1843 article it is quite apparent that Marx directs his attacks not against the Jew as a member of a religious or ethnic group but against the capitalist (erroneously designated by the colloquial term "Jew") that "bourgeois society continually brings forth from its entrails." In any case, that is the only essay in which Marx fell into that grave error; *in no other work of Marx* is the word "Jew" ever used as a synonym for "capitalist."

It is pertinent in this connection to consider what two outstanding contemporary Jews thought of Marx. Moses Hess, six years older than Marx, is considered the forerunner of Jewish nationalism when it was inspired by genuine liberation idealism. In a letter to Bertal Auerbach, dated Sept. 2, 1841, Hess wrote:

> You will be happy to meet a man here who is now also one of our friends . . . Dr. Marx, that is the name of my idol . . . with the deepest philosophical seriousness he combines a keen wit; just imagine Rousseau,

* Quoted here in the correct translation of Edward Fitzgerald. Runes' translation (pp. 33-34) while not changing the meaning too much is inaccurate in detail.

** A study of Proudhon by Edmund Silberner of Princeton University, in *Historica Judaica*, Vol. X, No. 1, April 1948, takes note of the fact that "Like many other socialists, Proudhon often identified the word 'Jew' with financier."

Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel, united in one person—I say *united* and not just thrown into a heap—and you have Dr. Marx (original in Yivo, *Historishe Shriften*, 1937, v. 2, p. 426).

Heinrich Graetz, the eminent Jewish historian, was a keen student of development affecting the Jews. In a letter to Marx, dated February 1, 1877, (published in full in the same 1937 volume of Yivo's *Historishe Shriften*) Graetz expressed admiration for those works of Marx that he had read.

It is impossible to imagine that either Graetz or Hess would keep contact with, not to speak of acknowledging friendship or expressing admiration for, any man known to have vented any anti-Semitic sentiments or to reveal any strain of thought or feeling hostile to the Jews as a people.

We may now turn our attention to the major purpose of the Runes fabrication. We already referred to a letter of D. D. Runes proving that by his slanderous defaming of Marx he sought to discredit all socialist parties and countries, especially the Soviet Union. His outrageous attempt to put "Marx-Hitler" in the same category—to place Marx, who all his life fought for universal equality, in a class with Hitler, the most bestial enemy of mankind—is so contemptible it defies description.

Runes makes an attempt to bolster his vilification of socialism by citing an alleged Soviet "State document." This is a pamphlet entitled *The State of Israel—Its Position and Policy* by K. Ivanov and Z. Sheinis. We have obtained a copy of this publication and have read it carefully. But before proceeding with the analysis of the alleged Runes quotations from this pamphlet, a word must be said about some of the gratuitous statements which he does not even attempt to document. They reduce themselves to the totally false allegation that the Soviet Union "has succeeded in reducing the Jewish population of Soviet Russia to the status of a colonial people, confined basically to menial and subordinate tasks."

D. D. Runes does not adduce a scintilla of evidence in support of his defamatory assertion that flies in the face of well-established facts. Suffice here to cite only the most important of these which demonstrate the status of full-fledged citizenship enjoyed by Soviet Jews on the basis of equality with the citizens of all other races, faiths and national origins.

It is well known that a large proportion of Soviet scientists are Jews; Jewish teachers and professors are on the staffs of Soviet schools, institutes and universities;* that directors of quite a number of important plants are Jews; that Jews serve as directors of opera houses, theatres, symphony orchestras and other cultural institutions; that Jews participate as editors of publishing houses, journals, newspapers, and other media of communication; that Jews contribute their due share to all professional services, as well as to every avenue of the economic and social life of the country.

* Publications with an admitted anti-Soviet bias carried stories about alleged anti-Jewish bias in Soviet institutions. Editor Paul Novick of the *Morning Freiheit* therefore made it his business during his recent extended tour of the Soviet Union to look carefully into that situation.. In his report, published on March 29, Novick declares that he was unable to discover any such alleged discrimination either against the admission of Jews to Soviet institutions of higher learning or in branches of the Soviet economy.

During the elections to the 15 Republic and local Soviets in March of this year, many Jews were elected. To cite a few of them: Joseph Goberman, administrative chief of auto transportation, and Abraham Zaslavsky, architect, re-elected and Dr. Myron Hillels elected to the Moscow Soviet; Ilya Yehudin, Lenin prize farmer, Crimean Party Secretary and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Crimean Soviet, elected to the Crimean Soviet; Colonel-General Jacob Kreizer, elected to the Soviet of the RSFSR; Itzik Barenboim, head of the Bridge-Building organization; Nissen Gulman, director of the Building organization and Shimon Karz, shoe factory director, and J. Weintraub and I. Novak, civil service workers, elected in Kiev; the Lithuanian State Minister, Elie Beliavicus-Sarin, Henrik Zimanis, editor-in-chief of the major Lithuanian newspaper *Tiessa*, and sculptor Zair Azgur, elected in Lithuania; Deputy-Mayor Israel Kazhdan, radio factory director David Yudelevich, locksmith Moishe Hasin, factory director Yevsei Yoffe, Chief Economics Division Dr. Basia Kahan and several others, elected in Minsk, etc. The list can be multiplied.

Frol Kozlov, First Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union, who recently visited this country, in a reply to a reporter's question stated:

> In the Soviet Union, Jews, like any other nationality, occupy their worthy place in society. We have ministers and deputy ministers who are of Jewish nationality. We have some prominent men of science, including Lenin Prize winners, who are of Jewish nationality. Some of our ablest artistically creative people are Jews.

Passing to the alleged direct quotations from the Ivanov-Sheinis book let us note first that to present a book or a pamphlet by specified authors as a "State document" is deliberately misleading. Thousands of books are published annually by various state publishing houses. (There are no private publishing houses in the Soviet Union). To claim that all these books are state documents is utterly absurd.

The first part of the alleged quotation deals with the attitude of the authors towards Zionism. According to Runes it reads: ". . . The Zionist movement represents a form of the nationalistic ideology of the rich Jewish bourgeoisie, intimately tied to imperialism and to colonial oppression of the people of Asia. . . . The national liberation movement of the people of the Middle East, spearheaded by its native leaders (such as President Nasser, King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia and King Iman Ahmad of Yemen) is constantly threatened by naked Jewish aggression. . . ." Now there are passages in the Ivanov-Sheinis book which sharply condemn Zionism. However, there is no reference in any such passages to either Nasser, King Saud or King Ahmad, and *there is no reference to Jewish aggression, naked or otherwise.*

The second part of Runes' quotation reads as follows: "The clear duty of all Marxists and Communists in this situation is to help the Asian and African people crush the reactionary Jewish forces." *Every word of this alleged quote is a total fabrication.* There isn't a single passage containing any statement remotely similar to the above quotation.

The Ivanov-Sheinis book, on the contrary, makes a continuous clear-cut

distinction between "reactionary Zionists" or "Zionist-extremists" and the Jewish people. To quote a few passages from the book in verbatim translation:

"Imperialism made use of anti-Semitism, and also of other forms of nationalist oppression as a means to distract the oppressed masses from the revolutionary movement and revolutionary struggle, attempting to direct these masses into a stream of national hostility" (page 129). "Why is it impossible for the reactionary Zionists of Israel to express any indignation with regard to all the outrages" (committed against the peoples of Asia. Africa, Algeria, Kenya, etc.) (page 129.)? "But the Zionist extremists of Israel are one thing, while the toiling Jews, our class brothers, and our brothers by conviction, are something else entirely" (page 143).

Finally, in their "Conclusion" Ivanov and Sheinis say: "In opposing the bourgeois ideology of reactionary Zionism of Israel, Marxists-Leninists no less decisively are opposed to and fight against every and all manifestations of anti-Semitism, for reactionary Zionism and anti-Semitism are two sides of the same medal, generated by the very same social system—imperialism. The struggle on both fronts against reactionary Zionism and against anti-Semitism—this is the obligation of every conscious toiler aspiring to the consolidation of all progressive anti-impeiralist forces" (page 144). The authors proceed to quote Lenin's famous address against anti-Semitism:

"Not the Jews are the enemies of the toilers. The enemies of the toilers are the capitalists of all countries. ..Among the Jews there are workers, toilers—and they are the majority. ..They are our brothers in the oppression by capitalism, they are our comrades in the struggle for socialism."

Whether one does or does not agree with the Ivanov-Sheinis analysis in every detail, the above literal excerpts from their pamphlet prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the alleged quotations by Runes are a brazen fabrication. For Ivanov-Sheinis *never* identify "Zionists-extremists" with the Jewish people or the people of Israel. Nor do they hold the Jewish people or the people of Israel responsible for the sins of "reactionary Zionism." On the contrary, they repeatedly emphasize that the Jewish workers and toilers are the brothers of the workers of the Soviet Union and the world, in the common struggle against imperialist oppression.

"A World Without Jews" was never a dream of Karl Marx. Nor can any trace of it be discovered in the theories or policies of any school of socialism in the Soviet Union or the People's Democracies. The Runes book is a willful vicious fabrication of a self-styled "eminent philosopher." It is a worthy product of the most depraved elements of imperialism, in whose service it was produced.

T,
E,
RT
on
led
pe-

00

ver
ses
ons
ples
ons,

.25

ion,
ocus
ian,
on's
rial,

2.00

$.35

.75

.25