# SOCIAL SCIENCES TODAY

# CONTENTS

# IS HERBERT MARCUSE'S "CRITICAL THEORY OF SOCIETY" CRITICAL?

Professor Y.Zamoshkin, D.Sc.(Phil.),
and N.Motroshilova, Cand.Sc.(Phil.)

The social critic has become quite a popular figure in the West since the Second World War. The demand for critical theories of society is easily explicable wherever the contradictions of social development assume the form of acute paradoxes that are realised by the public at large. It may be assumed that there will be a mounting interest in critical concepts of society.

Today such theories are a kind of barometer which registers the capacity to self-criticism revealed by social thinking within the framework of the social organisation of present-day capitalism. The level of the self-criticism to which social thinking can and does rise in present-day society is a major indicator of the existence or absence of internal potentialities in its development. However, in any concrete scientific analysis of any kind of theoretical self-criticism, what is of major significance is not the subjective critical level, not the ideas and intentions of the authors of various theories but a reply to the question of whether their concepts are critical in their objective content and objective social significance.

A reply is all the more important for the numerous socio-critical concepts that are widespread in the United States and West Europe being heterogeneous in the highest degree. They differ in their political ideological and methodological aspects and call for a strictly differentiated

approach and appraisal[1]. The concepts of Herbert Marcuse, a social philosopher who has won an extensive popularity of late,[2] are a specific type of socio-critical theory.

According to these concepts, this theory, in respect of industrially highly developed countries, the USA in the first place, (Marcuse himself has acknowledged that his theory has emerged from his observations of the development of the latter country) is characterised by a tendency for a special social condition to arise, which he has called a condition of social "one-dimensionalism".

The theoretical model of a "one-dimensional society" plays a tremendous part in Marcuse's concept, for in "one-dimensionalism" he sees the main foundation of a critical attitude to social organisation. In the sphere of production Marcuse sees "one-dimensionalism" in the merging of individual industrial units and links in a single organism,

---

[1] Thus, for instance, of the works of representatives of social criticism, there are specific features in the writings of a group of sociologists criticising fascism, militarism and the state-monopoly bureaucracy. These authors follow the traditions of C.R.Mills, the social psychologists E.Fromm, with his opposition to the alienation and dehumanisation of social life, and also the writings of the philosopher and sociologist T.Adorno, the economist and sociologist G.Myrdal, and others.

[2] The gist of Marcuse's concept is expressed in his book One-Dimensional Man, Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society (New York, 1964) which has come out in many editions and has been translated into many languages, in his article "Socialist Humanism" edited by E.Fromm (New York, 1966) and also in the report "A Revision of the Concepts of Revolution" at the UNESCO symposium dedicated to the 150th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx (Paris, May 1968).

all of whose parts are strictly subordinated to each other. As a result, in his opinion, the advance to "totalisation" is decisive for the entire social climate. By "totalisation" he means the establishment of an all-embracing and integral rationally regulated system of industrial, managerial and educational institutions, all influencing each other, a system of a universal functional interaction of all the elements of social life. Technological economico-administrative "totality" and "one-dimensionalism", as Marcuse puts it, is continued in the "one-dimensionalism of socio-political reality: in politics the external distinctions between the basic parties conceal an inner unity, with opposition turning into a force capable of preserving the equilibrium and self-reproduction of the existing system. In following this logic of argument, Marcuse denies all revolutionary aspirations and revolutionary potentialities in the working class of the advanced capitalist countries. In essence, he reduces the role of the working class and its organisations to a performing of the functions of a "pressure group" which allegedly promotes only the reconciliation of inner social contradictions and the restoration of equilibrium in the system of the state-monopoly bureaucracy.

Marcuse sees as the main feature of a "one-dimensional society" the ability to withstand the destructive social forces and changes, to preserve continuity and stability, the ability to contain social change. That society and its state have achieved a hitherto unknown "unity of opposites", he writes.[3]

According to Marcuse, present-day society is also marked by an unprecedented merging of the individual with the entire social and political entity. This is no longer a simple and pragmatic "adaptation" to the social milieu as a reality that is external to the individual, but an

---

[3] One-Dimensional Man, p.12.

actual indentification of the individual with society an "introjection" into him of social norms and establishments, their conversion into an "internal" dimension of his personality. Marcuse sees in this one of the most powerful tendencies which operates absolutely automatically and moulds "one dimensional man" (in strict conformity with "one-dimensional society").

The critical tone of his concept is determined by a realisation of all the highly dangerous consequences, destructive to society and individual, created by a "one-dimensional" social condition.

Marcuse is convinced that a fundamental danger to mankind is presented by "one-dimensional" thinking in the U.S.A. and Western Europe often perceiving this condition as one that possesses obvious advantages over historically precedent social conditions, and some times even seeing in it an embodiment of the ideals evolved by mankind in the course of many centuries. In explaining this fact, Marcuse attempts to register all the "advantages" of the present-day level of social life as achieved through the rapid development of science and technology.

From his point of view, it stands to the credit of the society he criticises that it has given immeasurably expanded wealth to society as a whole, extended and deepened its power over nature, and provided it with a rational organisation of production and management and, in consequence, an enhanced material level of welfare and consumption in masses of people far greater than ever in the past. All this produces a man with a "happy" consumer outlook, that outlook (the belief that it is the aim of the existing system to produce and supply material values) expresses and engenders social conformism, Marcuse claims. Typical of that consciousness, he continues, is a specific form of justification of the conformist stand. Of course, the rigid system of the determination of life and the behaviour of the individual may deprive man of freedom and the possibility of self-determination, but he as a rule

argues as follows: "There is no reason to insist on self-determination if the administered life is a comfortable and even a good life. This is the rational and material ground for the unification of opposites, for one-dimensional political behaviour".[4]

According to Marcuse's concept, the dominant opinion in a "one-dimensional society" holds that the common interest of all members of present-day society consists in a defence of a status quo, the consolidation and perfection of the established social order, a struggle against historical alternatives that threaten that order, and in conservatism and positivism. Also predominant is the idea that only rationalised forces of organisation and administration operate in that society, and that the relations between classes, groups and individuals are based on reasonable and firm foundations. In short, to the "one-dimensional man" society as a whole begins to seem the "embodiment of reason."

In a "happy" and conformist consciousness, Marcuse says, we find a new inner property of social life, with a new and, as it were, spontaneously and automatically appearing social reality. However, as he further emphasises, it should not be forgotten that such a reality is itself a product of deliberate administration and organisation, a result, not only of the "objective order of things" but of a carefully planned and extensively implemented practice of the ideological manipulation of consciousness and feelings of people, the practice of their "socialisation" and education in the spirit of the "generally accepted" and "standardised" norms and values.

Marcuse disagrees in principle with those who, like D.Bell and S.Lipsett, consider that present-day U.S. society demonstrates the "end of ideology." Unlike the prophets of the "end of ideology", Marcuse realises that ideology exists not only in the form of concepts directed

---

[4]   Ibid.,p.49.

towards a cardinal social reconstruction but also in the capacity of a complex system of ideological principles, stereotypes, symbols and spiritual values designed to adapt members of society to the existent social relationships and order of things. He pays special attention to the obvious fact that, in the United States of today, widespread acceptance is being given to that kind of ideological practice which finds expression in the activities of powerful mass media, educational institutions and so on.

The basic contradiction of our times, Marcuse thinks, consists in the following: on one hand, a society is developing with an internal, built-in and ineradicable "rationality" in the administration of things and people, a "rationality" which finds its most outstanding embodiment in "one-dimensionalism." Unlike the apologists of industrial society, Marcuse considers a "rational one-dimensionalism" a negative characteristic of present-day society. However, what is more important he goes on, is that, on the other hand, "this society is irrational as a whole. Its productivity is destructive to the free development of human needs and faculties; its peace is maintained by constant threat of war; its growth dependent on the repression of the real possibilities for pacifying the struggle for existence - individual, national, and international".[5]

What follows, Marcuse asks, from direct, open and coercive control yielding place to administrative, ideological and psychological control, and from the character of labour changing and a certain rise in the standards of living becoming discernible? Present-day society is dominated by forces over which the individual exercises no control. What follows from the majority of people in that "one-dimensional" society failing to realise that dependence? "The slaves of developed

industrial civilisation are sublimated slaves, but they are slaves."[6]

In the present-day industrially advanced society of the U.S.A. and Western Europe, Marcuse goes on to say, the growth of a "rational order" goes hand in hand with "the progressive enslavement of man by a productive apparatus..."[7], this leading to the destruction of the life of those people who create and use these means. Thus, present-day capitalist society, whose achievements Marcuse is prepared to recognize as considerable, receives by and large, a distinctly expressed negative appraisal in his concept, chiefly because the development of that society distorts the individual's will and abilities and dooms him to a slavery which is indubitable though camouflaged.

Because of all this, the balance of the "pluses" and "minuses" of a society which Marcuse himself characterises as "one-dimensional" seems to him a negative one. Moreover, he draws the conclusion that such a society must be destroyed in a revolutionary fashion, and replaced by a society of a new type, in principle. He dreams of the social revolution, this distinguishing him from many social critics of the liberal ilk. Is, however, Marcuse's concept really so radical and critical in its essence and in its objective contents? In this article we shall attempt to provide a reply to this question and to this question alone.[8]

[6] Ibid., p. 32.

[7] Ibid., p. 144.

[8] The authors have deliberately limited their tasks the more so that the journal Voprosy Philosophii (problems of Philosophy), published by the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, has already given an analysis and political appraisal of the ideological propositions in Marcuse's concept (see, for instance, the editorial "Philosophy in the Present-Day Struggle of Ideas" (Voprosy Philosophii No.7, 1968) and the article by D.Ulle entitled "Critical Notes on the Social Philosophy of Herbert Marcuse" (Voprosy Philosophii No.9, 1968)

[5] Ibid., pp. IX - X.

The aim of this article is to help destroy illusions existing today in the minds of many Western intellectuals who sincerely aspire to take part in revolutionary activities and accept at its face value the semblance of revolutionary radicalism in Marcuse's concept.

It should be taken into account that what Marcuse lays claim to is not simply the role of a publicist who voices a spontaneous temper of radical protest, but the role of a theorist who allegedly is creating an original and revolutionary world-outlook system, the role of a philosopher who has allegedly discovered and formulated methodological principles of a consistent revolutionarily critical thinking. In coming out in such a role, he attempts to exert, and indeed exerts, a certain influence on the consciousness of a certain section of the student youth and the intelligentsia in the U.S.A. and Western Europe. That is why a reply to the question whether Marcuse's "critical theory" is indeed revolutionary and consistent calls for analysis of the inner logical structure of his theoretical concept, the philosophical and methodological principles of his thinking, and the mechanism of the social vision that underlies the ideological projects, schemes and methods of argumentation that he uses.

<center>x   x   x</center>

Since Marcuse has proclaimed it his mission to evoke in the minds of the youth of today an inclination to revolutionary and critical thinking, he has called a "one-dimensional" and forthrightly apologetic conciousness his main opponent.

It should be noted that the "one-dimensional" spiritual life of the present-day advanced capitalist countries, so scrupulously described and sharply criticised by Marcuse, is an absolutely real tendency that is linked with the development and consolidation of the part played by the state-monopoly bureaucracy. For instance, Marcuse shows very convincingly that, as a rule, present-day culture in

<center>-10-</center>

the United States is, in the hands of the bureaucracy, an "instrument of social conformism" and the manipulation of people. That culture has become dissolved in mass propaganda and grown into a big business which is subordinated either to the logic of business calculations or else to the practical tasks of a "total administration". All this perverts people, makes them forget their actual non-freedom, and evolves a "happy" consumer consciousness. In this case, according to Marcuse, culture becomes "one-dimensional" also in the sense that it "ceases from being a critical dimension in comparison with the existing reality". Even those works of art and literature which seem to be propagating the idea of behaviour that is connected with some infraction of the social order(for example, gangster films or beatnik literature) are ultimately "an affirmation rather than negation of the established order."[9]

As Marcuse sees it, the sphere of social knowledge is in ever greater measure becoming an instrument of conformism and bureaucracy. In essence, it is becoming a knowledge of facts as such, of individual functions and situation, and not of essence, a knowledge of the methods set by the bourgeoisie, not of the aims of social progress. It is static and non-historical, i.e., possesses all the symptoms of "one-dimensional" thinking. This knowledge is suited only to the functional rationalisation of individual processes in the bureaucratic apparatus. It conceals the general and, so-to-say, "substantianal" irrationality of social life. That is why Marcuse so aptly calls positivism, operationalism and one-sided functionalism the "rational theoretical form of an irrational order." The social science now existing in the U.S.A. and Western Europe is also unacceptable, in Marcuse's opinion, because of its apologetical, reconciliatory and pragmatically applied character."[10]

---

[9] H.Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man, p.59.

[10] Ibid., pp.8,9,17,79,107, and elsewhere.

<center>-11-</center>

As we see, the criticism to which Marcuse has subjected the present-day forms of concrete social knowledge in the capitalist countries is highly apt. However, it has one big shortcoming — the "one-dimensional" appraisal and understanding of the highly contradictory processes taking place in the sphere of the social sciences, in the conditions of present-day capitalism.

Is it true that, in these concrete historical conditions (the system of the monopoly bureaucracy), economic science, sociology, and social psychology, which employ the methods of empirical investigation, in fact often serve the individual, practical and pragmatically utilitarian aims of the predominant social organisation? Yes, that is true.

Is it true that, in these concrete historical conditions, there has emerged a dangerous gap and a mutual alienation of socio-philosophical critical thinking that is orientated towards the humanist traditions, and concrete scientific social researches? Yes, that is true. But can one fully identify the inner and contradictory logic of the development of concrete social studies - a logic which has of necessity led up to the development of empirical methods and techniques, operational procedures and principles of functionalism - with that real and concretely historical ideological function which such studies acquire in the given social set-up, conditions of the consolidation of the state-monopoly bureaucracy, under the influence of a definite socio-class target? Can one simply delete the scientific devices and methods in the culling of representative factual material about certain concrete situations, mechanisms and phenomena in the consciousness of actually existing people, only for the reason that such devices and methods are used by "factory inspectors", officials and "social engineers" for purposes formulated by the bureaucracy? No, that cannot be done.

As is common knowledge, Marx and Lenin, who gave classical examples of revolutionary critical theory, brought together and merged a philosophical interpretation and the development of the traditions of humanist thinking, with scientific concretely historical, economic, sociological and socio-psychological research into the most varied and contradictory real processes and phenomena that affect the posing and the solution of the problem of man. The intellectual traditions of the doctrine of Marx and Lenin have acquired a special significance today, in an epoch of the gigantic complication of the system of social relations and the acceleration of the social process. In an epoch of mass social movements mankind faces the need to take responsible and scientifically grounded decisions. In these conditions, there is a growing need for the scientific elaboration of a system of the social orientation of society and personality, in which long-term programmes, which envisage the qualitative refashioning and humanisation of the entire system of social relations, will be blended with a detailed and most strict knowledge of the varied mechanisms which are actually functioning today, at the given stage of the development of a society, in the sphere of production, consumption, politics, culture, social and individual psychology and the like, and will be blended with a knowledge of the objective possibilities and the framework of social practice at a given place and a definite period of time.

The discrediting of sociology as a type of scientific knowledge, in the eyes of those sections of society which come out in defence of the ideals of humanism and democracy, is one of the ideological consequences of the specific and one-sided development of scientific social studies in the West. In this situation, socio-critical theories are winning popularity, which are, in essence, a kind of "one-dimensional" (as we shall try to show) reaction to the activisation of alienated forms of social research.

A one-sided and purely negative attitude to the methodology and practice of present-day social science leads to very grave consequences. Marcuse's concept is a telling instance of this fact. All socio-critical

theories are usually based on a description of a society which is the object of that criticism, a description of the relations and mechanisms of human behaviour, the structure of the individual's role, its motives and experiences and the like, all of which are typical of that society. If, in describing a society, the theoretician rejects, in principle, the procedures and methods of professionally scientific social research, he is more often than not obliged to ground himself either on his subjective ideas, or else on ideas that exist in every-day consciousness and present themselves to him as certain obvious facts.

Marcuse has rejected the employment of instruments placed at his disposal by present-day scientific research and capable, in some measure, of helping him to objectively varify and appreciate such ideas, for instance in the establishment of the degree of representativeness of facts which strike the eye and are the foundation for a number of current ideas. It may and often does happen that ideas which the critic sees as an adequate characteristic of the state of affairs in present-day society, are in fact imbued with fetishist illusions, are converted forms of the consciousness and bear the imprint of the influence of ideological standpoints, stereotypes, frames of mind and illusions typical of the conformist thinking that is rejected by the social critic. These ideas may prove a condition and a simultaneous result of the narrowness and "one-dimensionalism" of that thinking, a "one-dimensionalism" conditioned first and foremost by the apologetical forms of the application of social knowledge, a social target set by the bureaucracy, and the functional inclusion of that knowledge in the ideological atmosphere of a given society.

Let us illustrate this thought with theoretical constructions by Marcuse. As is well known, he is worried by the character of the influence exerted on man and society by present-day industrial production and present-day technology. It is that influence which he considers the main source of the conformist "one-dimensionalism" of

the consciousness and the bureaucratic anti-humane forms of social organisation. Here Marcuse, in fact, accepts on faith the initial postulate of apologetical "scientist" thinking found in the schemes of W.Rostow and other adherents of the theory of "industrial society" which, as is common knowledge (to Marcuse as well), is an expression of the interests of the state-monopoly bureaucracy. In criticising this theory as a typical manifestation of "one-dimensional", and "functionalist-technicist" thinking, Marcuse in fact borrows most uncritically from, and reproduces in his concept the logic of argument typical of W.Rostow and similar officials and experts in the service of the US bureaucratic apparatus.

After all, a conscious or unconscious apologia for the bureaucracy also proceeds most frequently today from the logical schemes of technological determinism: it regards bureaucratisation as an allegedly necessary outcome and necessary condition of the effective and rational development of present-day industrial production and economy as a whole. The state-monopoly bureaucracy, as is well-known, realises and reflects its own activities and its own organisation first and foremost in the concepts and terms of economico-technical solvency. It imposes that internal evaluational approach on social studies as a restrictive framework and a guideline of its developments.

To both the "scientist" and the "one-dimensional" man in the street thinking that adapt itself to the bureaucratic organisation of society, the latter seems a simple symbol of material welfare and economic efficiency. However, it is seen in the same light by Marcuse himself, who has so energetically voiced his indignation at "one-dimensional" thinking. He himself sees the interlinks between man's material welfare, the bureaucratic and dehumanised forms of organisation and present-day technology as a succession of casual dependencies.

This mode of thinking conceals the objective links between bureaucratic and dehumanised organisation and the

character of objective material relations, as well as between that organisation and the system of culture and the system of values existing in a given society.

Karl Marx examined these links in volume 3 of "Capital". He showed the internal duality of the forms of the management of socialised production in the conditions of capitalism. He showed that organisation of management is subordinated here not only to the objective needs of the rational conduct of present-day industrial production, but, which is of particular importance to the class interests of the economically predominant social groups, exerts command over things and people. The choice of alternatives in the process of control, the choice of criteria of the efficiency of management, depends on the system of dominant values which ultimately reflect the objective socio-class structure and the historically conditioned type of culture in a given society.

Marcuse accepts on faith and even turns into one of the fundamental postulates of "critical" thinking an idea that is characteristic of the theory of a "single industrial society" and, in essence, formulated within the framework of that theory. That idea deals with the absence of any substantial distinctions between present-day capitalism and socialism. (See the interview granted by Marcuse to a Monde correspondent on May 11,1968). This idea, which has a definite function in the present-day ideological struggle, plays down,in the consciousness of the man in the street, the private-ownership nature of capitalist relations and distorts the genuine essence of the scientific socialism of Marx and Lenin. It is not fortuitous that, in Marcuse's concept, the notion of "present-day society" is most often identified with the notion of an "advanced industrial society" (which has also been uncritically borrowed from the theories of W.Rostow, Raymond Aron and others), while the relation towards the means of production and to property is not included in the basic characteristics of society. When Marcuse gives a generalised characterstic

of the economic organisation of present-day society, he, like the adherents of the theory of "industrial development", takes industrial and managerial activities within the industrial enterprise of today as an initial model of the organisation in which the socialisation of functions and of separate links is effected within the framework of a single and rationally regulated system of the division of labour and the mutual exchange of activities. Here the political and economic foundations and characteristics of that organisation are totally ignored which, as is well-known, is also typical of bourgeois apologetical thinking.

Bureaucratically orientated social research has concentrated its attention on problems of management and the "socialisation" of men in the light of the functional needs of that management, and on a study of definite parameters and properties of the individual with which the operation of the mechanisms of conformism are connected.

All personal properties and mechanisms that contradict these aims or are not in line with them either have not become the object of professional research, or else have been regarded as malfunctions and as symptoms of "non-conformist behaviour". The emphasis has been placed on the ability of the consciousness to be ruled and be brought under control. The main task has been to gather and systematise such empirical data that will be subordinate to dependencies which have been already discovered by researchers and serve the practice of the manipulation of people. This emphasis has also had a characteristically ideological significance. It has been an indicator of a definite system of "reading" measuring and studying man and his social properties and qualities. It is this system which Marcuse has, with every justice, appraised as being "one-dimensional", one that plays down the actual contradictions and the duality in the nature of capitalist society.

At the same time, Marcuse accepts on faith the "one-dimensional" picture of present-day society and man's status in it; he agrees with the widespread idea that, in

this society, which is considered only in connection with present-day technology, only one all-inclusive and omnipotent trend towards conformism is predominant, and that consciousness is becoming more and more controlled. It should also be remembered that social studies that are imbued with a manipulator approach in a number of Western countries, especially in the United States, are historically closely linked up with the organisation of mass commercial publicity, has focused its main attention on the personality of man as consumer and buyer, on the study of the mechanisms that encourage buying and consuming (compensatory mechanisms, motives connected with social prestige, and so on), and on the possibility of controlling man's consumer urge, stimulating them and achieving a definite psychological effect of their satisfaction.

These specific utilitarian-pragmatic forms of approach to problems of consumption on the part of bodies that allocate money for research, and then on the part of researchers, have been ideologically justified by references to the growth of mass production of articles of consumption, the economic necessity of maintaining high industrial growth rates, and the like.

A one-sided and emphatic attention to the consumer expectations and habits of the individual, an attention which has determined the nature of the working thesis of the professional researcher, has been internally linked with a special kind of ideological attitude to the man of today, with ideologically "one-dimensional" forms of seeing and interpreting the essence of that man.

Marcuse, who feels great concern over the facts of the development of a consumer psychology and a consumer attitude towards life, has at the same time perceived in a non-critical spirit these "one-dimensional" forms of outlook. He has accepted far too seriously the self-satisfied and "optimistic" ideology of mass commercial publicity. This has led to his theory being dominated by a "one-dimensional" idea of the developed industrial society of today as one which - as he alleges, perfectly naturally (in view of its development) - is becoming a "consumer" society. There has emerged a one-sided and "one-dimensional" picture of the individual as typical of that society -- Homo Consumens, who also possesses a satisfied or even "happy" consciousness.

In essence, the problem of the sources of poverty and of the sharp social contrasts in the standards of living in the lands of developed capitalism has remained beyond the field of vision of Marcuse's "critical thinking". The same holds true of the dialectics of requirements linked with the spiritual development of the individual. Also "one-dimensionally" interpreted are the obvious facts of people's dissatisfaction with a level of consumption that is not always an indicator of a narrow consumer attitude towards the world and are very often conditioned by the just and necessary demands of the toiling masses, demands that must be included in any programme of practical and theoretical humanism.

The theory of structural-functional analysis evolved in the U.S.A. as well as the research practice based on that theory is, as is well-known, used as a working model, in the first place as a "value-normative" model of society according to which society is regarded as a system of the most generally accepted and predominant values and norms expressed in people's expectations and in human character as objectivised in the institutions and forms of social action. This model has been designed to consider society as a kind of entity, but an entity of a special kind, one that is regarded first and foremost to the prism of mechanisms that are working towards a preservation of its internal and relative stability.

This model has, indeed, been built in one definite "dimension". It has been unable to embrace and, what is most important, to mentally realise the inner dialectics of social being and consciousness, or to explain society's mundane foundation torn apart from within as characterstic

of certain stages of its development and expressed most distinctly in a society with clashing and opposed interests. It has never laid claim or pretended to lay claim to an explanation of the objective logic of the transition of certain social systems into others, the logic of the unfolding of internal contradictions that work against the integration and self-reproduction of the capitalist social system and engender social revolutions.

A one-sided emphasis on the mechanisms of ideological integrity to register which use has been made of a functionalist-normative model has been reinforced with those predominant forms of ideological vision which depict present-day capitalist society as a "one-dimensional totality" in which any social opposites and conflicts can be reconciliated and eradicated by a functionally rational organisation of the administrative apparatus and through manipulation of the mind's emotions and human desires.

Marcuse condemns this "one-dimensional totality" which he considers incompatible with the free development of human personality, individual capacities and initiative. He calls it a camouflaged form of slavery. However, he has not been able to overcome his ideological "one-dimensionalism" in his perception of the society around him, a "one-dimensionalism" which is also characteristic of a one-sidedly functionalist and apologetic thinking. However, unlike the direct apologists, Marcuse places a minus sign in front of that "one-dimensional" characterstic. "Social totality", which is one-dimensionally interpreted and uncritically accepted in the quality of the only reality is just as one-dimensional and is totally rejected.

Though Marcuse has declared himself an offspring of classical German philosophy and has come out with a call for a transition from a purely positivist mode of thinking to dialectical thinking, he does not understand the essence of dialectics as the algebra of revolutionary criticism.

One might well apply to him the apt characteristic given by Karl Marx to Proudhon: in reading Hegel he did not go further than simple negation.

In Marcuse's concept, criticism is _emotionally axiological_ and is divorced from genuinely contradictory and multi-dimensional reality; it ignores the inner development of social science and systematic sociological, historical, economic and socio-psychological research into the variegated social processes and nexuses of our time. It is incapable of integrating in theory and understanding from the viewpoint of dialectics the _actual relationship and the struggle of different and contradictory antagonistic trends_ in the sphere of present-day material production, in the field of its social organisation, in the social and class structure and in the consciousness and behaviour of people; it is incapable of revealing and appraising with sufficient accuracy the actual trends which today are (or tomorrow can become) a basis and nutrient medium for practical social movements that implement actual, and not illusory, alternatives in present-day history.

Marcuse's concepts are an illustration of the typical features in a consciousness which, while critical in its subjective aspirations, fail to reappraise the false fetishes characteristic of the commonplace ideological consciousness that is predominant in the society he rejects. A mode of thinking that seems to be orientated towards a critical attitude to reality is, in fact, internally _fettered by an ideologically mundane and non-critical schematism_. Marcuse accepts as reality a scheme that has been stripped of actual and objective dialectical contradictions; he then falls furiously on that scheme, that idealised model of society which has been _simplified_ by the "one-dimensional" consciousness.

The distinction between apologetics and the "criticism" in Marcuse's writings is a distinction in a purely evaluational attitude (acceptance or rejection) towards

a social situation which is registered and <u>considered by</u> <u>a non-dialectical mode that is kindred in principle</u>.

A one-dimensional approach to the reality of today and to the trends in its development makes Marcuse incapable of seeing the transition from the actual to the desired. <u>That the desired is regarded only as a mechanical and</u> <u>complete negation of the actual</u>. An opposite condition, which is supposed to be an ideal, is simply asserted and propagated, without however, any research into the objective processes and possibilities of the transition to that oppositeness, transition as a natural historical process.

Marcuse considers himself a socialist, but the reader will fail to find in his writings any systematic or logically substantiated exposition of a programme of socialist transformations. The characteristics of the socialist ideal of his writings are vague and indeterminate in the extreme; as a rule they are presented on an <u>abstract anthropological plane</u>. The political-economy or structural organisation of problems of socialism are, in essence, either not posed at all or relegated into the background. Much is said (again in a general way) of the "fundamental change in the direction of technical progress", "the total reconstruction of the technical apparatus", the elimination of technical rationality and the like. Marcuse does not deny that socialism calls for a high level of technological development, but he does not know, and admits to not knowing, wherein that development differs from the process of today, which is usually designated by the notion of the "scientific and technological revolution". He also admits his inability to reply to the question of which internal trends and potentialities of present-day production of necessity pave the way for the transition to socialism.

Marcuse realises — and this is noteworthy — that the general concepts referring to cardinal social changes must be based on a scientific analysis of the trends of social

development that already exist today, are emerging within the framework of our times, and are preparing those social changes. He is quite right in saying: "The criteria must refer to the manner in which a historical project realises given possibilities — not formal possibilities but those involving the modes of human existence."[11] This correct idea, however, is only given lip-service and is constantly being suppressed by the habits of a "one-dimensional" and basically metaphysical utopian thinking. In essence, Marcuse can only appeal to such evaluational concepts and "evaluational universalia" as "Freedom", "Beauty", "Happiness" and the like. At the same time, he realises in part the utopianism of any absolutisation of universalia as such, and their divorce from actually scientific and dialectical social analysis. He recognises without any regret that socialism is again an abstract idea.

He dreams of the social and socialist revolution, but at the same time acknowledges (and this is given in various forms in all his main writings of late) that he does not discern in the world of today social forces that could be agents of a radical and genuinely socialist transformation of society. "Socialist theory, no matter how true, can neither prescribe nor predict the future agents of historical transformation", he wrote in 1966.[12]

Marcuse's disbelief in the revolutionary possibilities of the proletariat in the industrially advanced capitalist countries is common knowledge. Today, however, he is often regarded as one who sings the praises of the "revolutionary energy" and the "revolutionary aspirations" of radically-minded students and intellectuals.

Indeed, Marcuse considers that the basic forces today most distinctly opposed to the corporative capitalism of

---

11
　Ibid.,p.219.

12
　Socialist Humanism , New York, 1966, p.117.

today are, on one hand, those who are known as the "middle-class intelligentsia" especially the students, and on the other hand, the oppressed ghetto population: the social groups and ethnic minorities that make up the lower depths of bourgeois society. While greeting the social rebelliousness of these groups, Marcuse acknowledges (and this must be emphasised) first that they form a minority of the population and, second, that none of these groups can provide the "human basis" of social process in present-day production. Hence, he draws the conclusion that, by themselves, these forces of opposition cannot be regarded as historical agents of radical change.[13] In Marcuse's opinion, the student movement and ghetto disturbances can at best result in the disintegration of existent society.

Although, in his _Monde_ interview of May 11, 1968, Marcuse strenuously denied being a "defeatist", his socio-critical theory can, objectively speaking, in no way evoke confidence and hope of victory in the hearts and minds of people who are today coming out actively for the revolutionary establishment of a socialist society and the achievement of the ideals of socialist democracy and socialist humanism. In essence this theory does not provide the framework for a scientific substantiation of the prospects of radical social transformations, which is why the latter are objectively turned into a utopia. It is not by chance that Marcuse concludes his main book with the following words: "The critical theory of society, possesses no concepts which could bridge the gap between the present and its future; holding no promise and showing no success, it remains negative. Thus it wants to remain loyal to those who, without hope, having given and give their life to the Great Refusal."[14]

---

13

See the official text of his address to a UNESCO symposium in May 1968.

14

_One-Dimensional Man_, p.257.

In dissociating himself from direct methods of defence of the capitalist system, and at the same time frankly voicing his disbelief in the victory of the progressive forces in the struggle against that system, thereby discouraging those who are engaged in that struggle in deed, not in word, Herbert Marcuse objectively leads his theory to its perfectly logical conclusion. A thinking which lays claim to being a revolutionary critical force leads merely to naively romantic phraseology or to helplessly speculative moralising.

In Marcuse's theory, a critical rejection of present-day capitalist society has no theoretical, philosopho-methodological foundation or scientific basis. In essence, the highest degree of criticism is achieved only in a registration of the morbid sensations of the commonplace and undeveloped consciousness of a group of people who are opposed to the state-monopoly bureaucracy. Marcuse has given theoretical twist to this spontaneous process which is, in many respects anarcho-individualistic. If one disregards the "evaluational" condemnation of capitalism in Marcuse's doctrine, what remains is a depiction of capitalist society which repeats many stereotypes of present-day ideological apologetics and is a "critically framed positivism", "positivism in reverse". In Herbert Marcuse's concept, one-dimensional thinking fights itself. Capitalism is denied on the basis of present-day bourgeois fetishist consciousness.

# TWO SOURCES OF CHINESE POLITICAL THOUGHT

V.Rubin, Cand.Sc.(Hist.)

There is a prevailing opinion that Confucianism because of its intrinsic conservatism was preserved more or less intact from the days of Confucius (551-479 B.C.) to the beginning of the 20th century. A careful study of the history of political thought in China, however, shows that this is one of the prejudices surviving from an age when even serious scholars considered it possible to speak of phenomena of Eastern culture as something immutable, existing, as it were, out of time. In reality, during its thousand-years old history Confucianism which posed the question, how a state should be administered and on what principles relations between a ruler and his subjects, noblemen and ordinary people, father and sons should be arranged, traversed a lengthy path, with its end little resembling the beginning.

In the present article we aim to describe the period in the development of Confucianism when, not having yet become an ideology of the state, it fought, against the ideology of despotism, against legalism. This struggle is of exceptional interest not only because it revealed Confucianism in its development, but also because the questions it dealt with are among those which people both in the East and in the West have examined more than once. Subsequently, the ideological synthesis of the Han state, which came to be known as Confucianism, was created at the end of the second century B.C., although it had little in common with the doctrine of Confucius and Mencius (circa 371-289 B.C.). Moreover some ideas included in this state ideology had been bitterly opposed by the founders of Confucianism.

Let us begin with a general description of the parties to the dispute. This polemic was initiated by Shang Yang, a statesmen of the mid-fourth century B.C. who executed a number of reforms which ultimately enabled the Tsin state some 130 years later, to defeat all its rivals and unite China into the Tsin empire. The Shang-chün shuh treatise, apparently compiled by followers of Shang Yang who collected his literary legacy and expounded his thoughts[1], was of a strikingly pronounced anti-Confucian nature. The ideas of this treatise, modified, mollified and supplemented by Han Fei (circa 280-230 B.C.) formed the basis of the second biggest legalist work Han Fei-tzu. In response to the legalist theory which absolved a political leader of conscience and moral rules, Mencius, that "indefatigable fighter against everything in which he perceived the social evil of his time,"[2] elaborated the theory of a humane ruler. He developed and supplemented the thesis formulated by Confucius that in politics it is necessary to proceed from the same ethical principles which regulate relations between people. Hsüntzu (circa 289-238 B.C.) was the second Confucian participant in this ideological dispute. Supporting Mencius on the most important points, he was willing to compromise with legalism on some questions and thus, anticipated the legalist-Confucian alloy of the Han epoch.

Before characterising differences in the positions of these trends, let us note the common feature which united th  with other schools of ancient Chinese thought. In contrast to the ancient Greek philosophers who sought an answer to the nature of the world around them, the Chinese thinkers wanted to find an answer to the question, how to

---

1  
The Dutch scientist J.J.L.Duyvendak dates the treatise to the end of the fourth and beginning of the third centuries B.C. (J.J.L.Duyvendak, The Book of Lord Shang, London, 1928, p.159).

2  
N.Konrad, West and East, (in Russian). Moscow, 1966, p.249.

rule. The main element in their approach to the world was their ethical and political views, and Chinese social thought of those days should be judged from this perspective. The difference between the Confucians and the legalists consisted in the model of political action put forward by exponents of these doctrines. The principal element in this model was the role of the ruler. The Confucians upheld the view that in relation to his subjects the ruler must play the part of the father of a family, regarding the state as the family of the ruler. It is worth recalling that while today even a small state is absolutely incomparable with a family, in ancient China a number of circumstances contributed to, and consolidated, such an analogy. The city-state of the sixth-fifth centuries B.C. was small in size.[3] On the other hand, the family was much larger than today. As demonstrated by M.Kryukov, a Soviet sinologist, the term tsia, which so far was interpreted by most scientists and translators as the designation of a small family, in sources of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. designated a patronymical collective formed as a result of the growth of one patriarchal family community consisting of a group of families (big and small) which preserved, in one or another form, an economic, social and ideological unity and bore a common name. Such a collective could consist of hundreds of people.

Although the beginning of the tradition which regarded the state as a big family[5] can be traced in Shih-ching

(Book of Songs) and Shu-ching (Book of History) whose origin dates back to the first half of the first millenium B.C., this concept received its classical expression in early Confucian sources of the fourth-third century B.C. Tahsüeh, (Great Doctrine) the well-known text of the third century, B.C. states: "In order rightly to govern his State, it is necessary first to regulate his family."[6] Explaining what properties the head of a state should possess Confucius said: "Only filial reverence and brotherly love are required to rule." Proceeding from this principle, Mencius advised King Ch'i to share the pleasures of music with the people. Just as a family celebrates its holidays together, so does the ruler celebrate together with his subjects.

The legalists counterposed to this approach the way an artisan acts, measuring and processing his material. This comparison was borrowed by them from the philosopher Mo Tzu (479-381 B.C.) who said that he who wanted to be just but could not do so lacked the correct method and was like a carpenter who wanted to work up wood but did not know how to use a plumb-line. Mo Tzu held up the will of the heavens as a gauge for determining the correctness of action, while reward and punishment had to serve as the means for realising this will.[7] Borrowing this model, the legalists improved it, replacing the hazy and indefinite notion of the will of heavens by the will of the ruler, expressed in law which precisely defines the scale and means of action—reward and punishment. Here is how this thought is expressed in Shang-chuh shuh : "In the past, kings verified the scale with correct weights and

3
  Chanko tse, a treatise of the third century B.C., notes that "in ancient times, even if a city was densely populated it had no more than 3,000 families." The fact that in the Mo tzu treatise the increase in population figures as the aim of statesmen shows that China had a small population in the fifth century B.C.

4 The journal Peoples of East Asia (in Russian),Moscow, 1965, p.284.

5 In view of the above, the term "family" should be understood in the broad sense as a collective connected by kindred ties whose size may vary from a few to several hundred people.

6
  J.Legge, The Chinese Classics, Vol.I, Hong Kong, 1861, p.234.

7
  Mo Tzu, Writings, Translated by B.Watson. New York, 1963,pp.22,36, 83.

established the length of a cubit and an inch. To this day they serve as a model because their units were clear. If their models and measures are discarded and only personal opinion is relied on, there will be no definiteness.... That is why the old kings, realising that it was impossible to rely on personal opinions and biased judgments, laid down laws and made differences clear. He who conformed to the established gauge was rewarded, he who violated the generally obligatory rules was punished. The law on rewards and punishment was correctly applied and therefore the people did not challenge it." It was pointed out in Han Fei Tzu that the ancient wise ruler Yao could not rule the state without laws just as the renowned carpenter Hsi Chung could not make wheels without dividers and a set-square, relying only on his sight.[8]

Both models lay claim to totality. Neither the Confucians nor the legalists thought about the fundamental difference between a family and the state, a thought with which Aristotle begins his Politics. While the Confucians proceeded from the premise that the state is a big family, the legalists asserted that the family is a small state and that in ruling it there is no room for sentiment just as in ruling a state. The Confucian model arose in a city-state and as long as the proportion of personal ties and

---

8

The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu, Vol.I.Transl.by W.K. Liao. London, 1959, p.270. H.G. Creel proved that Shen Pu-hay (mid-fourth century B.C.) and the methods he elaborated for organising and controlling the civil service played a greater part in the development of legalism than Shan Yang with his emphasis on rewards and punishment (H.G.Creel. "The Meaning of Hsing-ming." Studia Serica Bernhard Karlgren Dedicata. 1959,pp. 199-210; The Fa-chia: "Legalists" or "Administrators", The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology. Academia Sinioa, 1961. Extra vol., No.4, pp.607-636). Without analysing this theory we consider it necessary to stress here that the social model of Shen Pu-hain fundamentally did not differ from Shan Yang's model.

relations between the ruler and the subjects was considerable, this model was to certain extent adequate. When the city-states were absorbed by big empires, the Confucian model became obsolete and was replaced by the legalist model. There is no doubt as to the expediency of the legalist model from the viewpoint of unifying measures and weights and creating a precisely functioning and disciplined state apparatus. However in opposing the Confucian approach which subordinated politics to ethics, the legalists tried to abolish humanism, justice and moral principles completely and to replace these concepts with state expediency. Subsequently,of course, the Confucian model was used often by rulers for demagogic purposes. Nevertheless it preserved the aspect of moral duties, stressed by Confucius and Mencius, which the father-ruler bore towards his sons-subjects, whom he had to instruct and teach and whose welfare was his responsibility, resorting to compulsion only in extreme cases. Mencius said that when the ruler ceased to be a father and turned into a tyrant, the subjects had the right to rebel, and overthrow and kill him like an ordinary bandit. But if the ruler acts as an artisan who must apply to the material a proper measure to fashion the needed article, naturally, his subjects, the material, have no right to object to the means applied to them. This would be as unthinkable as the protest of a piece of wood against being sawn, out, planed and hewn. Although the early Confucians had no notion of the rights of the individual in solving political questions they proceeded from the premise that here, too, everything depended on the attitude of man to man. But the approach of the legalists was different; the human personality disappeared completely. Instead, there was, on the one hand, the energetic leader, devoid of all human traits except the will for power, and, on the other, the material of his activity, the mass, in which individual faces could no longer be distinguished.

Cynicism and worship of success established the moral climate at the end of the fourth and beginning of the third

centuries B.C. when the polemic between the Confucians and
the legalists developed. Any and all means were considered
permissible in the struggle for power within a country and
for hegemony over other kingdoms. At that time the voices
of the Confucians were the voices of individuals, of non-
conformists who, bucking the tide, stubbornly clung to
their moral principles which seemed completely obsolete.
Ssuma Ch'ien noted this, pointing out in the biography of
Mencius that the Celestial empire was engaged in creating
military alliances and an aggressive war was regarded as
something wothy. Mencius preached virtue and those whom he
addressed did not heed him. A situation prevailed in which
a mechanical model of political action which nullified moral
obstacles to a ruler's activity enjoyed special popularity.
And we see how Mencius himself resorted to this model,
interpreting it in his own way, and entered into a
discussion of related questions. For example, he said:
"Only with the help of dividers and a set-square can we
draw a correct square and circle; only with the help of
a wiseman can human perfection be attained. If a king wants
to discharge his duty as a king and the servant, the duty
of a servant, both have to take as a model Yao and Shun."
In the case of the legalists the analogy with measuring
instruments signified the need to have some kind of a
yardstick for measuring human affairs. But Mencius used
this analogy as a metaphor which spoke not of mechanically
measuring human actions, but of comparing them with the
idea. Having borrowed the model from the legalists,
Mencius gave it a fundamentally different interpretation.
The term "fa" which in the legalist understanding signifies
"measure, gauge" and hence also "law" was interpreted by
Mencius in the sense of "following a model, an ideal."

The following conversation of Mencius with Kao-tzu was
even more significant. Kao-tzu said: "Human nature is like
a willow, while justice is like a bowl. To create humanism
and justice out of human nature is the same as to make a
bowl out of a willow." Mencius replied: "Can you make a

bowl leaving the willow intact? A bowl can be made only
after you cut down the willow. If by cutting down a willow
you can make a bowl, in your opinion, it is apparently
necessary to kill man to create humanism and justice. Your
words could lead to humanism and justice being considered
a calamity throughout the Celestial empire." Although the
problem of means and ends were not yet formulated in
ancient Chinese philosophy, a kernel of its solution is
contained in the reply of Mencius. He insisted that
humanism and justice could be achieved only through humane
means; otherwise the people would denounce these concepts.

The mere comparison of the two models reveals the aims
by which the thinkers and political leaders were guided.
Thinkers who insisted that the head of state treat his
subjects as members of his family could not consider power
as such a supreme value. Mencius proved that "rule of the
Celestial empire does not bring joy to a lofty man. " Such
a man should strive for the prosperity of his parents so
that he should not be ashamed either of the heavens or the
people and, finding gifted men would be able to teach and
educate them. But next to this line of argument which
could be regarded as a call for disinterested humanitaria-
nism, there is also another, the essence of which is to
prove the advantage of humanitarianism for the ruler, to
prove that humanism is the best means for achieving hegemony
over the kingdoms of China. This last line is developed
in detail in numerous conversations of Mencius with rulers.
The philosopher clearly did not anticipate that disinterest-
ed humanitarianism could find a response among them.

What is the "humane rule" he advocated? The treatise
gives several definitions. In one place it is characteris-
ed as bringing tranquility to the people; elsewhere, as
defence of the people, that is, securing regular property
for them so as to enable them to support their parents and
children. Since land is the property of the peasants,
Mencius elaborated in detail the procedure for alloting
land to the peasants. In a third text Mencius insisted

that the task of the ruler is to help the propertyless. To
accomplish it, the ruler must have a heart which cannot
stand human suffering. Such a heart was possessed by Yü
who held that if someone drowned in the Celestial, empire,
he was responsible for it. Humane rule consists in
renouncing military ventures, reducing punishment, cutting
taxes and duties, renouncing government monopolies of the
use of marshes and lakes, in caring for widows, orphans
and childless people and giving a hereditary salary to
government officials.[9] All these measures, as Mencius
taught, would make it possible to achieve such a moral
advance and unity of the people, that no attack would be
feared.[10] Mencius was confident that the humane ruler
would win the war also because the people of the state
against whom he fought would side with him. He said that
a humane man was invincible: "If man develops to the utmost
his unwillingness to harm others, it will be impossible to
defeat such a humane man." That is why Mencius abhorred
the killing of people the main political virtue. The
treatise presents the following conversation of the thinker
with the Liang king Hsiang-wang. The king asked how it
was possible to bring order to the Celestial empire.
"I," Mencius said, "replied: 'by uniting it.' The king
asked: 'Who is capable of uniting it?' I replied: 'He who

---

9
    Mencius, addressing Hsuan-wang of the Ch'is, described
    as follows the rule of the ideal king of Chou, Wen-wang:
    "Peasants gave one ninth of the crop, servicemen had
    hereditary salaries, goods were inspected at the town
    gates and markets, but were not taxed, there were no
    bans on the use of the riches of marshes and ponds,
    relatives of criminals were not enslaved. Widows
    widowers, orphans and the childless--no one considered
    these poor people in the Celestial empire. But Wen-wang
    in his humane treatment put them in the first place." As
    usual Mencius expounded his ideal in the form of a
    picture of the past.
10
    In reply to the complaint of the Wei king, Hui-wang,
    against territorial losses, Mencius replied: "If a
    people are ruled humanely, the people will repulse
    with sticks the Tsing and Chu forces with their strong
    armour and sharp weapons."

does not kill people.' 'Who will give him the Celestial
empire?' the king asked. I replied 'the Celestial empire
will be given to him by the people who inhabit it. Does the
king know how the shoots of plants sprout? On the seventh
or eighth month they dry up of heat. When the darkened
clouds in the skies send down torrents of rain, the shoots,
straightening up, swiftly grow. Is there a force which
could keep them down? Today among those who rule the people
of the Celestial empire there is no one who would not find
pleasure in killing. If one such ruler comes forth, all the
people of the Celestial empire would look upon him with the
greatest hope and follow him just like a stream running
downward, which no one is capable of stemming." Mencius
could not conceive of a fiend heading the Celestial empire.
He said: "It happened that inhuman people headed separate
kingdoms, but there has never been a case of inhuman people
capturing the Celestial empire." Life did not corroborate
such optimism. Less than 70 years after Mencius' death,
China was united by Tsin Chi-hoang-Ti, one of the cruellest
despots in world history.

It is interesting to compare the position of Mencius
with the views of Hsun Tzu on this question. The more
realistically-minded thinker did not confine himself to
the preaching of humaneness. While Mencius proved that
humaneness was the only way to might, Hsun Tzu saw three
possibilities for adding neighbouring kingdoms — virtue,
strength and riches. Although all three can lead to the
goal, virtue is the most expedient and economical.
Annexation by force results in the state acquiring new
territory inhabited by frightened subjects. It then has
to maintain a vast occupation army thereby increasing
expenditures and weakening the country and, eventually,
the army as well. Annexation of new territory with the
help of riches means that the state will have to feed the
starving population drawn to the conqueror only by the
hope of being fed: "In such case you will have to issue
supplies of grain from your storehouses in order to feed

them, hand out goods and wealth to enrich them, and appoint conscientious officials to look out for them."[11] In this case too, both the country and the army would ultimately be weakened. Only by the adding of new territory with the help of virtue, by increasing the number of devoted and dependable subjects, would the country and the army attain unprecedented strength. But even Hsun Tzu shared with Mencius the belief that only a virtuous ruler could unite China. Strange as it may seem, he maintained there was a direct relationship between the size of a country and the moral make-up of the man who rules it. When the state is small, Hsun Tzu said, a little man with the help of little methods can capture it and keep it with a small force, but the Celestial empire is big and a little man cannot capture it.[12]

Now let us see what tasks the legalists set themselves. The link between their scheme and these tasks is easily established. In this scheme, as we have noted, the people are likened to material used for purposes that have no bearing on their welfare. The ruler utilises this material for himself, for establishing his power and winning hegemony in the world accessible to him, in the Celestial empire. The founders of legalism proclaimed this with cynical frankness. Thus, Shan Yang, claiming that rulers must hold single-handed the helm of state, says: "When the people are stupid, by knowledge one may rise to supremacy; when the world is wise, by force one may rise to supremacy."[13] True, he adds that at times this will also be for the good of the people[14] but this is merely lip service paid with customary phraseology. Yang Shang stated with utmost frankness that people were of value only as a means in the hands of the ruler. "Having a numerous population, but not employing, it is like having no population."[15] To be able to produce from material what is wanted it must yield to treatment, must not be too hard. This led to the rise of a very curious theory in Shang-chun shuh. It is based on the thesis that the strength of the state is determined not by the strength of the people, but by their weakness. In a chapter bearing the eloquent heading "Weakening the People", it is stated: "A weak people means a strong state and a strong state means a weak people. Therefore, a country, which has the right way, is concerned with weakening the people .... Being weak, they are law-abiding .... Therefore, it is said: 'To remove the strong by means of a weak people brings strength.'" This thought is further developed as follows: "If the people live in humiliation, they value ranks; if they are weak, they honour office, and if they are poor, they prize rewards. If the people are governed by means of punishment, they enjoy service, and if the people are made to fight by means of rewards, they scorn death. Therefore, if, in war, one's army is efficient, one is called strong. If the people have private honours, they hold rank cheap and disdain office, if they are rich, they think lightly of rewards."[16]

If a people are merely material, a means, and not an aim, the measures proposed by the Confucians lose all meaning. The legalists insisted specifically that there was no need at all for easing punishment. On the contrary, severe punishment, from their point of view, is the best means of rule. They devoted much attention to this problem. True, alongside punishment, the legalists considered it necessary to resort to rewards. Reward and punishment

[11] Hsun Tzu, Basic Writings, Transl. by B.Watson, New York, 1963, pp.76-77.

[12] See The Works of Hsünze. Transl. by H.H.Dubs, London, 1928, p.193.

[13] J.J.L.Duyvendak. Op.cit., p.227.

[14] See, for example, The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu, Vol.II, London, 1959, p.326.

[15] J.J.L.Duyvendak. Op.cit., p.216.

[16] Ibid., pp.303, 306.

are two "levers" with which a ruler can efficiently rule
and attain might and prestige. But the role of these two
"levers" is by far not equal. In the polemic with the
Confucians, the legalists repeatedly stressed that
punishment was the main "lever" and rewards, an auxiliary
one. It is said in Shang-chun shuh: "In countries that
attain supremacy, there is one reward to nine punishments,
and in dismembered countries, nine rewards to every one
punishment." Elsewhere this idea is expounded in greater
detail and somewhat differently. "In a country that has
supremacy, there are nine penalties as against one reward;
in a strong country,there will be seven penalties to three
rewards and in a dismembered country, there will be five
penalties to five rewards.[17] Shang Yang is echoed by Han
Fei-tzu: if punishment prevails the people are calm, but
if rewards abound abominations arise.[18] And so rewards,
to use Shang Yang's words, must be light and punishments
heavy. "The fact that punishments are heavy makes rank
the more honourable, and the fact that rewards are light
makes punishments the more awe-inspiring." Such prevalence
of punishment is stressed in some texts of Shang-chun shuh:
"If you wish to imitate the ancients, you will have
orderly government by promoting virtue; if you wish to
imitate modern times, you will have laws by emphasising
punishments". This idea is formulated even more frankly
in the following statement: "If you govern by punishment,
the people will fear and, therefore, they will not commit
abominations." [19] In Han Fei-tzu's opinion, a desire to

---

[17]
    Ibid., pp.202, 230.
[18]
    See The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu, Vol.II, p.326.
[19]
    J.J.L.Duyvendak. Op.cit., pp.208,229.

ease punishment would be a grave error on the part of a
ruler: A wise ruler must not pardon or ease punishment,
since this entails a loss of prestige and is fraught with
danger.[20]

The problem of reward and punishment clearly reveals
the specific features of the political ideology of the
early Confucians and legalists. As was indicated previously,
Mencius in his programme of administration demanded a
reduction of punishment. In this respect he followed
Confucius who also was opposed to "administering, while
establishing order with the help of punishment" (Lunyü,
II,3). But it cannot be said that the early Confucians
were against punishment in general. Some recognised
reward and punishment as a method of administration, but
considered it secondary. Their attitude to this question
is seen from a letter of Shu-Hsiang, a Chin statesman
(535 B.C.). Here is what he wrote: "Ancient kings ... did
not draw up laws on punishment, fearing to arouse a spirit
of dispute and struggle in the people. But to stop crime
completely is impossible, and so they restrained the people
with justice (1),bound them by their rule (2), treated them
fairly (3), protected them with their confidence (4),
supported a humane attitude (5), introduced salaries and
titles to encourage obedience (6), sternly halted transgres-
sions and punished the guilty (7) and threw fear into the
hearts of the evil-minded. Afraid that this would not be
enough they taught the people devotion (8), prompted them
to behave correctly (9) and taught them to discharge their
duties (10). Ancient kings ruled the people mildly and
treated them with respect, ruled unflinchingly and adminis-
tered justic firmly. Moreover, they tried to place at the
head of the people wise and knowing men (11), chose educated
and prudent officials (12), true and sincere chiefs (13)
and kind and cordial teachers (14).

We numbered the various methods of administration

---

[20]
    See The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu, Vol.I, p.28.

mentioned in this excerpt. Though this is very approximate, it enables us to establish that of the 14 administration methods only three (the sixth, second, and seventh) could be qualified as reward and punishment. The others were fundamentally different methods, namely, persuasion and moral influence with the help of confidence, education and example. We see the same combination of method of persuasion and compulsion, with the obvious predominance of the former in the case of Hsün-tzu who recommended teaching ordinary man without compulsion and to punish only incorrigible criminals. The method of example was especially important in the political ideology of the early Confucians. Mencius maintained that great men following the right road at the same time corrected others and that the wise man, perfecting himself, thereby brought tranquility to the Celestial empire.

But the influence of example, like the influence of persuasion and confidence, is a purely human phenomenon. It characterises relations in the family, in the human collective which was the prototype of the state for the early Confucians. It is possible to rely on persuasion, confidence and example only if one believes in man and considers him a moral person to one or another extent. But the legalists proceeded from the premise that man is a beast concerned only with enjoying himself and avoiding suffering. It is stated in Shang-chun shuh: "Shame and disgrace, labour and hardship are what the people dislike; fame and glory, ease and joy are what the people pay attention to."

The same thought is repeated endlessly in Han Fei-tzu. Han Fei proves that considerations of well-being prevail even in relations between parents and children. He writes: "When a boy is born parents congratulate each other. But they kill the new-born girls,.... Parents think of future comforts and calculate the long-lasting advantages." Having such an approach, the legalists, of course, could not believe in the force of example. They held that a

wise man cannot transmit his qualities to others, just as a strong man cannot transmit his strength.

The contrast in the political ideology of the early Confucians and legalists on the question of reward and punishment also is evident in their approach to problems of economic policy. As was pointed out earlier, Mencius insisted on a reduction of taxes and on granting property to the people. The importance of this question to Mencius is clear, since he frequently returned to it. He roundly attacked the rulers whose people were starving. The treatise relates the following conversation of the thinker with the Liang king, Hui-wang. When Mencius asked whether there was any difference between killing with a stick or killing with a sword, the king replied in the negative, to which Mencius added: "You have fat meat in the kitchen and fat horses in the stables, but the people look starved and in remote places people are dying. Consequently, in your country animals devour people. If a ruler, called upon to be the father and the mother of the people, does not hesitate to permit animals to devour people, can he be considered the father and the mother of the people?" Elsewhere Mencius compares such rulers to robbers.

The legalists, naturally, could not be guided by such considerations. Their "re-evaluation of values" determined that the people were only material for the ruler and it would be ridiculously naive to think of their welfare. Abolition of the "Chintian" system, effected according to Ssuma Ch'ien in the course of the Shan Yang ref rms, was at times regarded as a reflection of the interests of the propertied (in contrast to the hereditary) nobility. A study of Shang-chun shuh shows that this is not the case. The legalists were interested not in creating the possibility of enrichment for those who did not belong to the hereditary nobility, but in having one master, the ruler, dispose of all the wealth created in the country. This is expressed in Shang-chun shuh by a paradoxical formula: the poor must be turned into the rich and the rich into the poor. At first glance it might seem

that this is practically a call for a social revolution. On closer scrutiny it is established that the purpose of this redistribution is to create a system under which the country's entire wealth would flow into the hands of the ruler or, as it is put in Shang-chun shuh, "all the benefit would flow into one opening." Indeed, the formula "the poor must become rich and the rich poor" is explained as follows: "The rich must be persecuted by punishment so that they become poor and the poor rewarded so that they become rich." Let us continue: "The rich should be despoiled of their riches by means of titles. Those who are dissolute should be divested of their dissoluteness by punishments."[21]

The enrichment of peasants under a legalist ruler is merely temporary. When the peasant becomes richer, the state sets into motion the machine for expropriation. Is it possible for a stratum of propertied nobility, singled out from the peasantry, to arise under these conditions? Encouraging agriculture, the legalists considered that it is most of all advantageous to expropriate the peasants because their wealth, the land, is always within sight of the ruler. "The property of the chattering scholars is in their mouth," it is stated in Shang-chun shuh, "the property of the idle scholars is in their thoughts, the property of brave man in bravery, of artisans in their hands, of merchants in their person. Thus, they can transfer their property to any house ... The wise man's way of administration is to see that the property of the people is in land."

The legalists' policy in the field of culture was enunciated with utmost frankness, as their other policies. A stupid and ignorant people are a great force because an ignorant people with no awareness beyond their village

---

[21]
The peasants were compelled to buy titles. This is explained by another text in Shang-chun shuh which says: "If the people have a surplus of grain, cause them to obtain office and rank by means of their cereals."

-42-

have no way out except to till the soil, and "if the people do not neglect agriculture, the state is calm and out of danger."[22] But while the people are left in ignorance, should the ruling class be educated? Of course, people who advise the ruler must have some knowledge, but even here one should not go too far. Shang Yang said: "If the ministers of state and the great officers are not allowed to occupy themselves with extensive learning, brilliant discussions and idle living, and if they are not allowed... to travel about, in the various districts, then the farmers will have no opportunity to hear of changes.... This being so, clever farmers will have no opportunity to discard old ways, and stupid farmers will not become clever, nor will they become fond of study. If stupid farmers do not become clever, nor fond of study, they will apply themselves energetically to agriculture."[23] Stultifying the people was a keystone of legalist political theory. Han Fei-tzu borrowed Shang Yang's idea of the danger of knowledge. He wrote that although Confucius and Mencius were learned, eloquent and wise men, the state derived no benefit from them because they did not engage in agriculture.[24] Han Fei-tzu spoke with approval of the fact that Shang Yang, in addition to introducing the system of mutual responsibility and denunciation, advised Hsiao-kung, the Ch'in king, to burn the Shih-ching and Shu-ching. Han Fei-tzu said that this measure helped Hsiao-kung to safeguard security and ensure the country's wealth and might.[25] The burning of books by

---

[22]
J.J.L.Duyvedak. Op.cit., pp.176-177.

[23]
Ibid., p.181.

[24]
The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu, Vol.II, p.251.

[25]
Ibid., Vol.1, p.115.

-43-

Tsin Chi-Hoang-Ti, another ruler,[26] was prompted not only
by the opposition of Confucians to his policy. Executions
would have sufficed to crush this opposition. But the
total stamping out of education and culture was one of the
main objectives of the legalist programme.

The brutal repression and destruction of culture
discredited the legalist theory so completely that
throughout the history of Chinese political thought no one
ventured openly to call himself a legalist. Nevertheless,
the legalist trend, far from dying, actually triumphed
within imperial Confucianism. This victory, however, must
not be pictured too simply. The bureaucratic ideology
incorporated a wide spectrum of ideas. As a rule, legalist
views became the banner of the die-hard, militarist-minded
part of officialdom which insisted on punitive measures as
the main method of administration, with the help of which
the people should be kept in absolute obedience. On the
other hand, the ideals of the early Confucians were
frequently put to the foreground by the officials who
advocated a peaceful, relatively liberal and enlightened
policy which gave the people a respite and allowed them to
improve their living conditions.

A detailed analysis of this problem demands special
study to establish the place of early Confucian and legalist

_____

[26]
The assertion that only Confucian books supposedly
were destroyed on order of Tsin Chi-Hoang-Ti still
appears in the literature. But neither the ancient
poetry, Shih-ching, nor the collection of documents and
speeches, Shu-ching, against which the order of Tsin Chi-
Hoang-Ti was directed in the first place, can be
considered Confucian books for the very reason that
they date back mainly to the beginning of the first
millenium B.C., that is, a period several centuries
before Confucius was born. In reality, the book-
burning order was directed against all humanist culture:
it will be recalled that only books on medicine,
pharmacology, fortune-telling and agriculture were
permitted.

-44-

concepts in the imperial ideology of one or another epoch.
We would like to cite here only one example illustrating
the full complexity of these questions. Chu Yuan-chang
(1368-1399), founder of the Ming dynasty, revered Confucius,
apparently because he considered him an advocate of
stability and order, but bitterly hated Mencius for his
disrespectful attitude toward rulers. As demonstrated by
the Chinese historian, Wu Han (who became one of the first
victims of the "great cultural revolution"), in those days
study of the Mencius treatise was strictly prohibited and
the tablet with his name was removed from the Confucius
temple. Mencius was "rehabilitated" only after a special
commission, set up in 1394 to purge the treatise of
"sedition", issued an emasculated edition from which 85
texts were deleted. Ideological pressure under other
emperors of this dynasty was only slightly less severe.
The victory scored in politics by the legalist trend was
opposed by the movement of the Chinese intelligentsia and
a particular group of officials who addressed protests,
petitions and admonitions to the emperors. These people
for the most part sacrificed themselves deliberately—they
were executed after refined tortures. But, on examining
the content of petitions to emperors which were the cause
of their death, we learn with amazement that their keynote
was not the ideals of Confucius and Mencius, but legalist
concern that full power be concentrated in the hands of
the emperor (not of eunuchs) and that implicit obedience of
officials be ensured by strict laws. The language of these
documents is stamped by servility and any seeming criticism
appears merely in the form of hints at the wisdom and
virtue of the emperor deceived by shameless advisers.[27]
The fact that even the most advanced sector of the officials
was imbued with this servile spirit is evidence of the
gradual ousting of the ideals of humanism and the triumph
of legalist totalitarianism in imperial Confucianism.

_____

[27] See Ch.O.Hucker, "Confucianism and the Chinese Censorial
System" in Confucianism in Action. Standford, 1959, p.207.

-45-

# AFRICAN COUNTRIES FIGHT RACIALISM

## Y.Etinger, Cand.Sc.(Hist.)

The newly independent countries of Africa which are exerting much effort to abolish colonial and racialist regimes on their continent, have an important place in the struggle of the world's progressive forces against racialism.

The combating of racialism is one of the main elements today in the foreign policy of the vast majority of independent African states. The principles of anti-racialism, together with anti-colonialism, are a most important part of the concepts and declarations on foreign policy enunciated by the governments of the young African states as is only to be expected since it is in Africa that such bastions of contemporary racialism as the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia are located.

The leaders of African countries are well aware that as long as the racialist order is not abolished in southern Africa, and as long as all Africa is not fully and finally liberated from colonial and racialist regimes, the full and final independence and freedom of the African continent cannot be considered secure.

As President Nyerere of Tanzania has said, "the separate freedom movements in Africa were but different arms of one liberation process. Colonialism must be wiped out in Africa before any post-colonial state can feel secure".[1] In recent years an alliance between the colonial and racialist regimes has emerged in Africa, with South Africa as its core, which further increases the danger to the newly independent countries.

The struggle against these regimes is complicated by

---

[1] *Foreign Affairs*, April 1966, p.374.

the fact that they are the major bases of imperialism in Africa in military, political and economic respects.

Julius Nyerere stresses that the domination of the white minority over the African population, most likely, is acceptable to the West.[2] Therefore the struggle of the African countries against racialism in the southern part of the continent is also objectively directed against the imperialist forces of the United States, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and other powers whose extensive and varied aid is important to the very existence of colonial and racialist regimes. Thus, the African countries are up against a united front of racialists and influential imperialist forces supporting them, a united front based on an intricate interlacing of the economic and political interests of the upper circles of the white minority in southern Africa and the foreign monopolies operating there. Needless to say, the existence of such a united front greatly hampers the efforts of the African states against the colonial and racialist regimes. It must also be remembered that imperialist circles, using their influence over certain African leaders, are preventing a consistent struggle for liberation in southern Africa, frequently paralysing the political and economic measures taken by the African states. A typical example is the diplomatic struggle around the problem of Rhodesia.

The struggle of the African states against racialism, and against the apartheid policy of the ruling circles of South Africa and to an increasing extent by the regime in Rhodesia, is waged in different forms and along several lines. An important form is the activity of the African countries in the United Nations and other international organisations, directed to exposing the policy of racialism and demanding the adoption of appropriate diplomatic

---

[2] Ibid.

measures and economic sanctions against the regimes in Pretoria and Salisbury. Second, the African states have taken steps to boycott South Africa and Rhodesia economically and politically, measures which became more effective after the founding of the Organisation of African Unity (O.A.U.) in 1963. Third, the African states are rendering help to the liberation movements in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, and Rhodesia, giving them aid in money and weapons, training fighters against racialism on their territories, sending volunteers, an so on.

Questions relating to the anti-racialist struggle invariably have a prominent place on the agenda of various intra-African conferences. The participants in the first conference of leaders of independent African states, held in Accra in April 1958, pledged themselves to bend every effort to help liberate the colonies in Africa, and to eradicate racialism and racial discrimination in all its forms in Africa.

The first conference of heads of state and governments of African countries, which was held in Addis Ababa in May 1963 and founded the Organisation of African Unity, took concrete measures to intensify the struggle against racialism and colonialism, and agreed to set up a committee to coordinate the assistance rendered by independent African states to the liberation movements which came to be known as the O.A.U.Liberation Committee.

At the same time a special fund was instituted to give material and financial aid to the liberation movements in countries dominated by colonial and racialist regimes.

The members in the Addis Ababa conference also reached understanding on a number of concrete measures designed to put economic and political pressure on these regimes. The African countries informed the Western partners of these regimes that "they must choose between their friendship for the African peoples and their support of the Powers that oppress African peoples".[3] One important result of the Addis Ababa conference was that it made the struggle for final abolition of colonialism and racialism the state policy of all the sovereign countries in Africa, united to achieve this goal.

The O.A.U. Liberation Committee set up by the Addis Ababa resolutions has been meeting regularly in Dar es Salaam, the capital of Tanzania, since 1963 and taking up questions related to the struggle against the colonial regimes.

Demands for the uprooting of racialism and colonialism are made at all conferences of the Organisation of African Unity from the Assembly of Heads of State and Governments to meetings of the O.A.U.'s special commissions. Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, addressing the session of the Foreign Ministers' Council of the O.A.U. held in Addis Ababa at the end of February 1968, stated that the world must realise that only one alternative remained to the enslaved Africans; the use of force. The only language the racialists understand is force and Africans must use it to achieve independence. The Emperor stressed that the African states were grieved by the position of countries which continued to support racialist minority regimes in southern Africa and connived with their immoral governments.

The attitude to racialism is increasingly becoming the touchstone of the position of a country, of its foreign policy, and of its relations with African states.

It must at the same time, be stressed, that considerable difficulties have arisen in the struggle to abolish the racialist and colonial order in the southern part of Africa. These difficulties are linked not only with the differences that have arisen among the African countries themselves concerning concrete methods of combating racialism. The point is that the ruling circles of South Africa are trying to split the ranks of the O.A.U., by

[3] Observer, June 2, 1963.

proclaiming their "new policy toward" independent African states. The essence of this "new policy" is an attempt to establish diplomatic and commercial relations with these states, demagogically exploiting slogans of peaceful co-operation between white and black Africa and "non-interference in each other's internal affairs."

The form in which South Africa's leaders interpret the principle of non-interference is highly indicative. Prime Minister Vorster has said outright that South Africa must be taken the way it is. In other words, they demand that African countries in effect recognise the racialist system that exists in South Africa. Without mincing words they say that they reject any steps to establish diplomatic relations if their objective is a change in the home policy of the Republic of South Africa.

The struggle against racialism is a kind of cement uniting the joint actions of the African countries, and prime means of African consolidation, and in the future it may become the premise for deepening the anti-imperialist principles of African unity and extending them to an ever wider range of common problems. Indeed, the very concept of pan-Africanism, which has had a great influence on the whole course of the struggle for continental unity, arose, in the view of that eminent Soviet student of African affairs the late Prof. Ivan Potekhin, as a means of ideological and political struggle against racialism and colonialism.

The Pan-African, continental aspect of the anti-racialist and anti-colonial struggle is recognised also in the West. (Hence the attempts to weaken the joint actions of the African states against the racialist and colonial regimes.) "Of central importance to the achievement of these objectives is the removal of the last vestiges of 'colonialism' in the continent — white overlordship in the Portuguese territories, in Rhodesia and in South Africa," wrote Colin Legum, the well-known British writer on Africa,

for many years correspondent of the London Observer. "The gravest offense to Africans is the practice of white supremacy on the African continent itself. The practice is symbolized by apartheid. On this single issue there are no 'moderates' in Africa; all African leaders are agreed on the need to destroy white supremacy. They are also agreed as to the method — direct and active support for the underground liberation movement; diplomatic isolation of South Africa, Portugal and Rhodesia; total economic sanctions."[4]

In Legum's opinion, the African states' struggle against apartheid is a kind of moral crusade. He writes: "The Communists support them.... The West opposes them — for this is the way Africans regard the West's equivocal policies over Portugal and South Africa" (a point of view clearly expressed at the Addis Ababa conference in May 1963). "The crusade against Africa," Legum noted, "invests the militant radicals and the anti-Western forces with powerful weapons ... African suspicions about the Western role in Southern Africa strongly reinforces fears about neo-colonialism."[5] At the same time the course of the Western states objectively weakens the positions of circles in Africa that continue to favour close political and economic cooperation with these states. By helping Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon, the imperialist powers thereby unintentionally put the pro-Western circles in independent African countries in a difficult position as they cannot ignore the public mood that clamours for decisive measures against the imperialist-supported régimes on the continent.

In recent years Rhodesia has been in the centre of the struggle against racialism and colonialism. The most reactionary imperialist circles in the West, the ultra-colonialists, had far-reaching aims in connection with the independence of Rhodesia. They expected, first of all,

---

[4] Foreign Affairs, January 1965, p.250.

[5] Ibid.

to establish a racialist bastion in the very heart of the
continent and thereby to bar the way to the liberation
movement in southern Africa, and hamper its links with the
young African countries as well as the coordination of
activity with them; second, they wanted to reinforce the
positions of the regimes in South Africa and the Portuguese
possessions, and to facilitate military, political, and
economic cooperation among them. "It is certain that if
power in Rhodesia remains in the hands of the minority,
all of southern Africa will be enslaved," wrote the Dakar-
weekly Afrique Nouvelle.[6] The third objective was to strike
a blow at the O.A.U. and to demonstrate its inability to act
vigorously in defence of the African peoples.

The declaration of independence by the Rhodesian
racialists created a real danger of a colonial-racialist
bloc arising in the southern part of the continent.

Both the South African racialists and the Portuguese
colonialists have declared their solidarity with Salisbury.
The South African Prime Minister Verwoerd, at once stated
that his country would maintain its old relations with
Rhodesia, and refused to join in economic sanctions against
the Smith regime; the Salazar government sent military
units to Rhodesia.

The British government, forced to take the stand of the
African countries into account, announced that it would
apply economic sanctions against the Rhodesian racialists,
but flatly refused, at the same time, to employ force to
suppress their rebellion. The African countries rightly
assessed the economic sanctions as quite inadequate.
The heads of state of Algeria, Ghana, Mali, Guinea, the
United Arab Republic and other independent African
countries called for decisive action against the racialists
up to the use of force.

A special extraordinary session of the O.A.U. Council
of Ministers was held in Addis Ababa in December 1965, to

examine the question of Rhodesia. It called on all member
countries of the O.A.U. to break off diplomatic relations
with Britain if the latter did not put an end to the
racialist regime in Rhodesia by December 15, 1965. It
also called for a complete economic blockade of Rhodesia
and the stopping of all economic and trade relations with
her.

In pursuance of this resolution, Algeria, the Congo
(Brazzaville), Ghana, Guinea, Mali, the Sudan, Tanzania,
Mauritania, the United Arab Republic broke off diplomatic
relations with Britain. Somali, which had taken such
action earlier, announced that it would not resume rela-
tions with London. Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria,
the Sudan, the United Arab Republic, and other states
expressed their readiness to place their forces at the
disposal of the Organisation of African Unity. But many
African countries, as hitherto, continued to place their
hopes in Britain, expecting London to take effective
measures against the Smith clique. London's ruling
quarters, upset by the O.A.U. decision, did everything to
prevent it from being carried out. Pressed by London, many
countries refused to abide by the O.A.U. resolution. A
number of states opposed it, considering it inexpedient
and useless. In these conditions Ethiopia suggested that
the date set for its implementation be postponed and that
a general consultation of the heads of African states be
arranged to consider the measures necessary to establish
African majority rule in Rhodesia.

The O.A.U. resolution on breaking off diplomatic
relations with Britain brought to light substantial
differences among African countries. The British journal
World Today noted that "the Rhodesian question might seem
to offer good facilities for a critical experiment by
political scientists to classify African states as
'militants' or 'moderates', 'idealists' or 'pragmatists'.

---

6 Afrique Nouvelle, Dec.12, 1965.

Undoubtedly it has revealed differences of policy and
temperament among African leaders."[7]

Examining the possible consequences of the refusal by
most African states to break diplomatic relations with
Britain, World Today said that the first reaction to the
O.A.U. resolution could lead one to think that difficulties
of implementing it had destroyed the myth of continental
unity in the spirit of pan-Africanism; that this was a kind
of emotional spasm in a feverish atmosphere of an interna-
tional conference which was rejected by the serious- minded
people who treasured the maintenance of friendly relations
with Britain more than a demonstration of principles. But
the refusal, partly under duress, of a significant number
of African countries to implement the O.A.U. resolution
did not in any way mean that they renounced the struggle
against the Rhodesian regime and its imperialist patrons.
"The difference", said Doudou Thiam, former Foreign
Minister of Senegal," is one rather of style and behaviour
than of fundamental principle."[8] World Today entertained no
illusions about these differences and served warning of
inevitable pressure by all the newly-independent African
countries. "If economic sanctions do not end the rebellion
with reasonable speed, pressures will certainly develop in
both English and French-speaking States to conform to the
intransigent position; pan-African unity will be re-
established," it wrote. Such a development of events would
be very undesirable for London because "the British
Government might find itself, however, unjustly, identified
with the forces upholding colonialism in Southern Africa;
there could be a disastrous collapse of the policies
hitherto followed by successive governments towards African
States."[9]

[7] World Today, 1966, No.2.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

African leaders have repeatedly noted that Britain had
every opportunity to act swiftly and effectively against
the Rhodesian regime. President Kaunda of Zambia held that
"Britain could act more vigorously over Rhodesia. Her
communications by road and by rail could be cut, her small
Air Force destroyed at very little cost of life, much
greater pressure could be put on Portugal, and Laurenco
Marques could be blockaded even though it was used by South
Africa for oil imports."[10]

It was becoming increasingly clearer that the African
countries, as before, insisted on the application of
economic sanctions against Rhodesia, and on putting pressure
on Britain to make her take resolute measures against the
racialist regime. The question arises, why did these
countries themselves not employ armed force against the
Smith regime. A number of factors operated here, including
the military weakness of many African states.

A considerable role has also been played by the
unwillingness of the leaders of certain military regimes
in Africa to send their armed forces outside own countries,
and by the pressure of the imperialist states and the
mutual suspicions that frequently exist between states and
prevent the adoption of agreed decisions. It is thus clear
why the African countries place such great hopes in United
Nations action to resolve the Rhodesian crisis.
"The growing ferment in Africa," the New York Times wrote,
"has been reflected in the United Nations by increasingly
strong demands for action against Rhodesia."[11] But the
obvious impotence of the United Nations, its inability,
owing to the machinations of imperialist circles, to under-
take really effective action to put an end to the Smith
regime have caused deep disappointment in Africa and

[10] Sunday Times, March 24, 1968.

[11] New York Times, Dec.4, 1967.

given rise to doubts in the capacity of the U.N. to help effectively in abolishing the racialist system in Rhodesia.

The decision to employ sanctions stemmed from the assumption that their application would adversely affect the industrial sector of Rhodesia's economy and reduce its exports. The economic difficulties Smith would encounter, ran the assumption, would lead to a revolt within the Rhodesian Front Party, which it was expected would result in the emergence of a liberal group advocating a return to constitutional rule. The governments of a number of African countries, and the African press, warned against these half measures, pointing out their inadequacy, and insisted on the use of force. Their position was based on the correct assumption that influential imperialist circles had no intention of implementing even the sanctions approved by the UN Security Council on December 16, 1966. "There are groups in the United States, in West Germany (which is not a member of the United Nations), and in other Western countries", wrote the American journal Current History in March 1967, "that are known to oppose sanctions, and it is difficult to believe that individuals will not be found who are willing and able to circumvent the United Nations resolution."[12] Professor Emerson of Harvard who has held a number of governmental posts connected with Africa, stressed that it would be difficult to involve the United States in a policy of open condemnation and sanctions.[13]

African countries, while supporting the U.N. economic sanctions, were sceptical about their ability to topple the Smith regime, considering that only swift and determined employment of force could do that while sparing them from the adverse consequences of economic sanctions.

---

12
  Current History, March 1957, p.182.
13
  See R.Emerson, Africa and United States Policy, New Jersey, 1967.

-56-

In the course of the Rhodesian crisis Britain's ruling circles found themselves in a complex dilemma with three "horns", moral and political, legal, and financial. The French journal Le monde diplomatique, summed up the essence of this dilemma as follows: "To allow Mr.Smith to persist in his rebellion means for Great Britain to recognise her moral bankruptcy. Legally, Smith's unilateral declaration of independence is abolutely unlawful. For Great Britain, renowed for her legal institutions, to compound the illegality would mean to expose herself to international ridicule. Financially the situation is even more complicated."[14] There is the main reason for London's half-hearted course with regard to Rhodesia. The point is that if there were consistent and full application of sanctions,Britain, whether she wanted it or not, would have to fight not only Rhodesia but also the Republic of South Africa. It is no secret that the failure of the economic sanctions against Rhodesia is largely explained by the considerable help Smith receives from South Africa.

Britain's tactics in relation to sanctions have been based on a desire to prevent their extension to South Africa the main bulwark of the Rhodesian ultras and one of the Britain's chief economic partners. A secret agreement, has been reached according to the South African Sunday Times, by which the British delegate to the United Nations is obliged to veto any Security Council resolution directed against South Africa.

Dennis Austin, research associate at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies of the University of London, has stressed the tremendous strategic importance of South Africa for Britain and her positions in southern Africa, the Indian Ocean and the South Atlantic. Use of the Simonstown naval base for Polaris-carrying submarines is, according to Austin, a "part of the global defences of the West against the USSR",[15] which are organised in this area thanks to the

---

14
  Le monde diplomatique, October, 1966.
15
  D.Austin, Britain and South Africa, London, 1966, p.134.

-57-

traditional ties between Britain and South Africa.
Economically, Britain has always looked upon the South
Africa as a major market for the sale of goods and a source
of raw materials. Despite the poverty of many non-whites,
South Africa belongs to the relatively small number of
developed countries. Its gold production constitutes 71.8
per cent of the total production of the entire capitalist
world. Most of the gold supplied by South Africa to the
world's biggest banks passes through London. This is the
main reason why Britain turns a blind eye to the apartheid
policy and does not want to break with South Africa.[16]
In fact, the economic links between two countries tend to
expand. John Davis, general director of the Confederation
of British Industry, visited    South Africa in April,
1968 on a "peace mission" with the aim of a further extension
of trade between the two countries. Davis delivered a
letter to the South African Government from Anthony Cross-
land, President of the Board of Trade, who stressed that
the British Government was keen to develop trade between
the two countries to the maximum and that it was firmly
resisting the political pressure of those who called for an
end to the preferences that South African goods enjoyed
on the British market.

The United States, too, has considerable economic
interests in the Republic of South Africa, which occupies
first place among African countries for U.S. capital
investments. In 1965, U.S. investments in    South Africa
amounted to $528 million, while the total for all Africa
was $ 1,904 million.[17]

The South Africa, together with Rhodesia, is the main
recipient of American loans to African countries. From
1945 to 1955, loans totalling $342.8 million were granted,

---

16
    Ibid.
17  See R.Emerson, op.cit., p.34.

of which the South Africa received $151,8 million and
Rhodesia $60,7 million.[18]

US private investment is about 15 per cent of all
foreign investments in South Africa.    Its economy has
great attractions for American investors. The Christian
Science Monitor, reported, that Ford, General Motors,
General Electric, Minnesota Mining, Chrysler, and the
Standard Oil Company of California were among the US
companies with investments in South Africa in 1965. About
80 major US corporations have economic interests there.[19]
US Big Business is involved in the mining, motor car, and
chemical industries, and in banking. Prof.Emerson stresses
that direct American ties with South Africa are stronger
than with the rest of the continent. In the cold war,
South Africa is politically and strategically a rabid anti-
communist country, whose position at the southern end of
Africa still has potential strategic significance.[20] Of
undoubted interest also is the statement made in May 1965
by US General Norstad, former Commander-in-Chief of NATO,
who emphasised that not only individuals but the United
States had complete confidence in South Africa. Emerson
notes that this statement ran sharply counter to the
official American position. But while the State Department
and the American delegation to the United Nations used
forceful language when speaking of South Africa, the
Department of Commerce continued to support US trade with
South Africa and to encourage US investment in that
country, or at least to look upon it with benevolent
neutrality.[21] A whole concatenation of economic, military

---

18
    Ibid.
19
    See Christian Science Monitor, Dec.12.
20
    See R.Emerson, op.cit.
21
    Ibid.

and political factors explains the position of the West on problems of Southern Africa. The fact that people of West European origin live in the southern part of the continent also undoubtedly governs the heightened interest of the imperialist powers in preserving their influence there (there was nothing similar in the other African countries, except in Algeria, where the colonial war dragged out for so long precisely because the ultra-reactionary elements of the local French population played a leading part in it).

Britain's real economic and political position, and that of her American ally, explain London's efforts to limit and localise the application of sanctions. The Paris magazine Jeune Afrique wrote that "from Britain's point of view the danger of applying international sanctions is that she could be asked to approve extension of their field of action. More precisely that hypothesis means the possible extension of the sanctions to South Africa and Portugal." Jeune Afrique further emphasised that "from the very start one of the fundamental issues of British policy toward Rhodesia has been that London must not let herself be drawn into an economic war with South Africa." And that, in the final analysis, is what determined the failure of economic sanctions, "because the supply routes between Rhodesia and South Africa have not been cut."[22]

What has been the effect of the economic sanctions against the Rhodesia regime? It is quite difficult to estimate their efficacy because, as the British journal Labour Research has pointed out, Salisbury has kept all statistics pertaining to trade secret since UDI.

The Smith regime has applied stringent economic measures to lessen the possible adverse impact of the sanctions. Foreign exchange has been kept for oil received from South Africa and Mozambique. The reduced exports have been balanced by the curtailment of imports, so that a satisfactory balance of payments has been achieved. It is the unanimous opinion of international economic observers that on the whole sanctions have had little or practically no effect on Rhodesia's home policy.

Are sanctions, even if consistently applied and efficacious, in general capable of toppling the Smith regime? The Statist wrote in 1967 that "even if Britain were to win the sanctions war — which seems highly improbable — Mr. Wilson has said as recently as last week that there would need to be a long period of transition"[23] to majority rule.

Several factors have helped the Smith regime to withstand sanctions. To begin with, the economic pattern of Rhodesia is quite well developed and ramified. It does not depend on the production of a single agricultural crop and almost fully covers the country's needs in food and manufactured goods.

Second, Rhodesia's large mineral exports to Japan, the United States, West Germany, and other states, and its imports of various manufactures have been maintained. According to Prof. Emerson, although the United States has put an embargo on the shipment of arms, military supplies, and oil products to Rhodesia, it has not stopped trade with that country completely.[24] France adheres to a similar line. The Times of Zambia, sharply criticising French policy toward South Africa and Rhodesia, noted that her exports to those countries have risen by more than 300 per cent since 1960, asserted that French manufactures were openly encouraged to violate the sanctions against Rhodesia.[25] But what has been decisive is the maintenance of economic links between Britain and Rhodesia.

Shortly after UDI, the African press reported that Verwoerd, the Prime Minister of South Africa, had sanctioned the delivery of oil to Salisbury. At the same time a public

22
    Jeune Afrique, April 30, 1967.

23  Statist, April 28, 1967.
24  See R. Emerson, op. cit.
25  See Times of Zambia, April, 1968.

campaign was launched there under the slogan of petrol for
Rhodesia." Every citizen of South Africa was urged to send
a minimum of 20 gallons of petrol to friends in Rhodesia.
But the main job of supplying oil to the Smith regime was
undertaken by big companies which, under the guise of
"philanthropic organisations", arranged a regular supply of
oil and petrol to Rhodesia's industry. Big petrol storage
tanks were built on South African territory within ten miles
of the Rhodesian border. According to the British Sunday
Telegraph, the tanks areas located at Messina; from there
petrol is delivered by petrol tankers to the Rhodesian
railway station of Rutanta.

Objectively, the policy of economic sanctions pushed
Salisbury into the arms of the South African racialists,
thereby promoting expansion of economic and political co-
operation between the two racialist regimes. Sanctions
increased Rhodesia's dependence on South Africa according
to Prof.Emerson. South Africa is undoubtedly white
Rhodesia's most logical ally. The two not only have a
common frontier, but also share many aspects of a common
situation; both are harassed by serious economic difficulties
that will only strengthen the bond between them.[26]

Le monde diplomatique, examining the problem of
sanctions, concluded that neither Great Britain nor the
Security Council will be able to overthrow the Smith regime
as long as Johannesburg is rendering undisguised support to
Salisbury.[27]

Economic cooperation between Rhodesia and South Africa
has been supplemented by a military and political alliance
that is becoming ever closer and is spearheaded against
both the new African states and the liberation movement
in southern Africa. In August 1967, in reply to joint
action by the armed forces of ZAPU and the African National

---

26  R.Emerson, op.cit.
27
    Le Monde diplomatique, October 1966.

-62-

Congress, South African military units were sent to
Rhodesia where they took part in joint operations with
Rhodesian troops. But notwithstanding the call
of the African countries, the British Government
refused in fact to demand the withdrawal of South African
troops from a territory for which it formally still bears
responsibility.

The rapprochement and cooperation between South
Africa and Rhodesia are dictated, first, by their common
hostility to the liberation movement. South African ruling
circles, justifying the need for joint action against this
movement, state that all countries of southern Africa are
interested in liquidating terrorism (meaning, of course,
the struggle against racialism). "We believe," said Prime
Minister Vorster in an interview with the West German
weekly Christ und Welt, "that thereby we will render a
decisive service to the Western world .... Struggle against
terrorism is simultaneously struggle against communism."[28]
Second, the basic ideological postulates of Pretoria and
Salisbury are identical. Current History stated that in
1962 the Rhodesian Front (R.F.), a new party of the white
minority dedicated to the "Rhodesian way of life", was
formed. "As Smith later said", Current History noted,
"the new governing party 'did not believe in majority rule',
and though the word 'apartheid' was not used, Principles and
Policies, the published policy statement of 1962, clearly
showed that R.F.'s political philosophy closely mirrored that
of South Africa."[29] The policy statement emphasised that
"it must be recognised that the African and European peoples
have different philosophies and ways of life and the policy
is now advanced in which neither group is forced to live

---

28  Christ und Welt, Jan.21,1968.
29  Current History, March 1967,p.164.

-63-

under a system nor in a manner alien to the group concept."[30]

At the same time it would be wrong to picture the situation as if complete unity existed between South Africa and Rhodesia. There are grounds for considering that Smith's irreconcilable stand to some extent contradicts the so called "new policy" that South Africa, as already mentioned, has been following recently with regard to the independent countries of Africa in an attempt to persuade them to cooperate with Pretoria.

This "new policy" is based not only on the desire of the ruling circles of South Africa to break their isolation on the African continent but also to extend their political and economic sphere of influence there, an attempt to convert the young African states into markets for South African goods and suppliers of cheap manpower. "Shortly after he came to power, Vorster signalled the change in the outlook which was to come", African Communist has pointed out." Africa and the world would hear about South Africa in a way it had never done before, he said .... In the opening days of the 1967 session of Parliament, the House of Assembly passed a private member's motion that this House approves the policy pursued by the Government for friendly coexistence and fruitful cooperation with countries in Africa." This policy creates certain difficulties for the Smith regime which tries to follow Pretoria in questions of home policy.

The Smith regimes sole support among the African population lies in the tribal chiefs, who have an active interest in consistent application of the principles of racial segregation in Rhodesia because this segregation of the Africans guarantees the preservation of their traditional tribal relations and their domination over the mass of the Africans. Indicative are the following figures given by Colin Legum in World General Tribune of January 15, 1967: "An African university graduate whose job takes him

---

around the country sums up African attitudes at 60 per cent deeply opposed to Smith, 20 per cent who don't care much one way or the other, 10 per cent who believe absolutely in the invincibility of the white man, and 10 per cent who are doing reasonably well in their present jobs and know when they are on to a good thing."[31]

From the point of view of South African ruling circles, the extremely rigid position of the Rhodesian racialists toward the independent African states is undermining Pretoria's prospects of establishing relations with them, since it objectively impels African leaders to oppose white rule of any kind resolutely, whether in the Republic of South Africa or in Rhodesia.

Apart from its relations with South Africa Salisbury has been strengthening its ties with Lisbon. In the summer of 1967 the London Daily Telegraph reported that Salisbury businessmen were more confident than the year before. They had learned how to circumvent the sanctions and they knew that South Africa and Portugal would continue to support them.

Extension of the cooperation of Rhodesia, South Africa, and Portugal had been in the making for some time. As early as 1964 H.F.Strauch, well-known Swiss student of African problems, noted that "they have been talking for a long time in South Africa about the possibility of acting together with Rhodesia and Portugal in a compact alliance to counterpose the pan-Africanism of the North by the white pan-Africanism of the South."[32]

While the political objective of this triple alliance is the desire to block the road to the African liberation movement, economically, it is based on the domination of

---

30
    Ibid.

31
    African Communist, 1967, No.3.

32
    A.F.Strauch, Panafrika, Kontinentale Weltmacht in Werden, Zurich, 1964, p.208.

foreign monopolies in southern Africa.

Economic sanctions, far from striking a decisive blow
at the Smith regime have objectively helped to consolidate
the colonial and racialist bloc in the southern part of
the continent. At the same time they have inflicted
substantial harm on the economies of the African countries
linked economically with Rhodesia. The failure of economic
sanctions is no longer denied in the West. The influential
London Financial Times, has admitted that the policy of
sanctions against Rhodesia is merely a way of preventing the
adoption of effective measures against the illegal Smith
regime.[33]

Only consistent and complete application of the
principles of the U.N. Charter and the Declaration on
Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is
capable of ending the racialist regime in Rhodesia and
ensuring the freedom and independence of Zimbabwe people.
"At the moment, however, it is not sanctions but guerrillas
that offer the greatest challenge to the Rhodesian rebels,"
the London Observer wrote, commenting on the growth of the
liberation struggle in Rhodesia. "This was admitted for
the first time by the regime's Minister of Justice,
Mr.Lardner-Burke."[34]  The Zambezi was something more than
a boundary between Rhodesia and Zambia, the Observer said.
It was becoming a frontline, and the two countries were
heading rapidly for an open confrontation.

African leaders are of the opinion that a decisive
clash between the independent African states and the
racialist regime is inevitable. The struggle of the
African countries against racialism is entering a new stage.
The African leaders are increasingly convinced that the time

for adopting anti-racialist resolutions against Rhodesia
and South Africa has passed, and that resolute and effective
measures to abolish the racialist orders are needed, the
more so that the situation resulting from the policy of
those regimes is a  direct  threat to peace and internatio-
nal security. The African countries undoubtedly face a
hard and protracted struggle in which obstacles
of every kind are inevitable; but the cause for which free
Africa is fighting will triumph sooner or later, for that
is the inescapable trend of historical development in Africa.

---

33
    See Financial Times, Sept.8, 1967.
34
    Observer, April 21, 1967.

# RACIALISM IN MODERN ANTHROPOLOGY

## V.Alexeyev, D.Sc. (Hist.)

The concept of race is much older than racialism.
The ancient Egyptians had noted anthropological differences
in their neighbours, and depicted them accordingly on their
frescoes. Subsequently, as people came to know their
neighbours, near and far, such observations expanded and
accumulated. With the discovery of America, exploration of
the sea route to India, and penetration into South-East
Asia, European scholars and missionaries naturally devoted
more and more efforts to description of the physical
features of newly discovered peoples, some of whom dif-
fered markedly from Europeoids. Their descriptions were
often full of naive amazement, but they never contained a
word about the physical inferiority of primitive peoples.
The famous writings of Marco Polo, Plano Carpini, and
Wilhelm Rubrouck, for example, invariably speak of the
peoples they had seen with great sympathy. Even the
naturalistic conception of the primitive state, as Kosven
calls it[1], which put primitive man closer to beasts, a
conception which first was embodied in the epic of
Gilgamesh, which came down without substantial change,
through the whole of the antique and medieval tradition
to the 18th century[2], was not based on any idea of the
physical inferiority of primitive man but rather on the
primitive nature of primeval social institutes.

---

[1] See M.O.Kosven, Matriarchate, A History of the Problem.
(In Russian.) Moscow - Leningrad, 1948.

[2] An example is the work of Bernard Fontenelle, who
ridiculed primitive legends and traditions as pure
fantasy.

On the other hand, the idealist conception of an
original paradise, which has been counter-posed since
antiquity to the naturalistic conception, even exhalted
the social organisation and way of life of peoples at a
low level of social and cultural development by stressing
the naturalness of their way of life, the simplicity of
their customs, and the relations of amity and mutual aid
that bound the members of primitive collectives together.
Works like those of Lafitau, Vico, Montesquieu, Rousseau,
and many other thinkers, combined eulogy praise of the
idyllic life and closeness to nature with criticism of
the foundations of contemporary society and a negative
attitude towards Christianity, which in Montesquieu's case
developed into a sharp and venomous criticism of Christian
dogma. The humanist ideal, in which the American Indians
and other primitive peoples were regarded as representa-
tives of a pristine paradise on earth, was excellently
expressed by the great Montaigne, who wrote of the
Brazilian tribes: "They are savage in the sense that fruits
growing naturally in freedom are savages, for in truth one
should rather call savage the fruits which man has
artificially distorted by perverting them from their
natural growth. For it is the wild fruit that preserves
to the greatest measure their true and most useful
properties and qualities, whereas in the fruits we have
grown artificially we have only distorted them by adapting
them to our corrupt bad taste."[3]

Thus, the representatives of the Golden Age school not
only stressed the simplicity and artlessness of primitive
relations; they also realised the drawbacks of contemporary
society, shackled by misguided prejudices. While advocating
a return to nature, they criticised at the same time many
social institutions of their time. The doctrine of the
Golden Age was not only a social utopia, but often also

---

[3] Michel de Montaigne, Essais, Paris, 1965, t.I, p.234.

a social satire, harmoniously combining humanist ideals of
the equality of all peoples ("What similarities and what
coincidences exist between the recently discovered world
of West India and our world in its past and present!" said
Montaigne[4], for example) with politically progressive, anti-
feudal attitudes and opposition to absolute monarchy.

It was only toward the end of the 18th and beginning of
the 19th century that the intensive development of capita-
list relations and rising might of the European powers, as
the exploitation of colonial and dependent countries
increased, required a theoretical substantiation of the
right of major capitalist nations to world domination. It
was then that racialism emerged as an ideology of the
ruling classes in major capitalist states. By the first
half of the 19th century, racialism had come out as a
doctrine of the inequality of human races based on a biased
interpretation primarily of the comparative anatomy of the
bodies of representatives of various races and tribes.

The first steps of racialism in anthropology were
directly linked with the fierce struggle between polygenism
and monogenism that developed most forcefully in France
and America. The first of these trends was directed against
the Biblical myth of the origin of man from one ancestral
couple and initially, therefore, represented a progressive
tendency in the history of social thinking. Even by the
end of the 16th century, Giordano Bruno had sarcastically
ridiculed the idea of the origin of man in one place,
calling it a fable in his "Spaccio della bestia trionfante";
but the logic of the development of polygenism led
eventually to an exaggeration of the differences between
human races to ideas of the specific ways of their forma-
tion, and to negation of their equality. And by the 1840s
in fact S.Morton the celebrated polygenist anthropologist
played an extremely negative role in events preceding
the abolition of slavery in the United States by resolutely

[4]
Michele de Montaigne, Essais, Paris, 1965, t.I,p.644.

advocating preservation of the rightless status of Negroes.

A re-evaluation of the importance of morphological
differences between races and an attempt to draw parallels
between them and various species of ape in itself led to
fantastic hypotheses of the origin of each of the modern
races from a specific anthropomorphic species. In spite
of the criticism repeatedly levelled against these theories,
they persisted up to the beginning of the 20th century, in
the views for example, of the German anthropologist
Klaatsch and his followers, and those of the Italians
G.Sergi and D.Serra. Their theories on the descent of
Negroes from chimpanzes and gorillas, and of the Caucasoid
race from the more highly developed Dryopithecus, inevitably
led to racialism. Only after Vallois'brilliant research
which demonstrated from a study of variations in certain
morphological structures of no adaptational significance
that modern man as a whole, has a number of features in
common not found in apes, did the fantasies of the poly-
phyletics lose their last adherents and finally fall into
disrepute[5], though in recent years, R.Gates, a leading
contemporary geneticist, has defended the theory of the
polyphyletic origin of man; but his views, which I shall
consider have found no support and stand alone.[6]

Besides arbitrary constructions in the sphere of the
phylogenesis of man, anthropology has known many direct
attempts in the past hundred years to prove the inequality
of human races from morphological traits, and the greater
affinity of Negroes than Europeans to the apes.

[5]
H.Vallois, "Les Noirs sont - ils une race inférieure?" -
III Session de l'Institut International d'Anthropologie
à Amsterdam, Paris, 1928 ; "Preuves de l'origine mono-
phyletique de l'Homme"- L'Anthropologie, 1929, t.XXXIX.
[6]
For a fuller presentation, see R.Gates, Human Ancestry
from a Genetical Point of View, Cambridge, 1948.

Characteristic of most of these attempts are arguments based on studies of isolated organs, though such an approach in fact inevitably leads to false conclusions. The research of L.Gratioles[7] on skull closure in Caucasoids and Negroids, E.Loth's work[8] on variations in the facial tissues of members of different races, and studies of the larynx in Negroes. All these studies rest on observation of isolated traits without considering them as a whole and therefore do not take into account the important fact that primitive morphological traits are widely distributed among representatives of various races and manifest themselves in different combinations in, say, Europeans and Negroes, or in Australoids and Mongoloids. The factual material on which all these works are based is also far from flawless. Research by L.Bolk, J.Frederic, and Todd and D.Lyon[9] has revealed Gratioles' factual errors and demonstrated that his sequence of skull closure in Negroes and Europeans, on the basis of which he placed Negro skulls closer to the anthropoid is in fact wrong. The interpretation of data on variations in the mimic musculature and larynx aimed at relating the Negroid race to anthropoids, is also open to factual criticism.

Thus, the works on comparative anatomy whose authors attempted to establish a greater likeness of Negroes than other races with the anthropoid apes were based on completely arbitrary interpretations of the anatomical data. It is impossible to list here the vast number of works by anatomists, anthropologists and doctors dealing with the question of the size of the brain of members of the different races, particularly of Negroes and Whites, and seeking to prove that the former possess lower intellectual abilities than the latter. Of the works of morphologists discussing factual data and not simply groundless speculation may be mentioned those of Levin and Duckworth[10] devoted to a comparison of the macrostructure and brain size of representatives of various races. They came to the conclusion that brain size and certain features of cerebral convolution and fissure patterns represent racial traits which, may, allegedly, condition racial differences in intellectual ability to some extent. The abundance of available data makes it possible to refute all such conclusions as lacking any more or less serious substantiation and to conclude (a) that intellectual ability is not directly associated with brain size and, (b) that brain size is approximately the same for members of all modern races, varying within very narrow limits.

Many workers have carried out thorough investigations of the brain in different races, including size and morphological features drawing on a large body of material. Thus, the brains of Australian aborigines have been studied by Shelshear[11], the brain of Chinese by Chi

7
 L.Gratioles, "Mémoire sur le développement de la forme du crâne de l'Homme et sur quelques variations qu'on observe dans la marche de l'ossification de ses sutures." — Comptes-Rendus de l'Academie de Sciences, Paris, 1856.

8
 E.Loth, Anthropologie des parties moelles, Paris 1931.

9
 J.Frederic, "Untersuchungen über die normale Obliteration", Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie, 1906, t.IX; L.Bolk, "Uber die Obliteration der Nähte am Affenschädel, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Nahtanomalien", Ibid., vol.XV, 1913; M.Todd, D.Lyon, "Cranial Suture Closure, Its Progress and Age Relationship" in American Journal of Physical Anthropology,1924, No.3, No.7; 1925, Nos.1-2.

10
 A.Levin, "Racial and Inferiority Characters in the Human Brain", American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 1936, XXII, No.4; W.Duckworth, "Some Complexities of Human Structure", Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 1947, Vol.LXXVII.

11
 See J.Shelshear, "The Brain of the Aboriginal Australian — a Study in Cerebral Morphology", Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society (ser.B), 1937, Vol.227.

and Chang [12], the brain of Yakuts and Buryats by Bushmakin[13], comparison of size and structure of the brain in Negroes and Europeans is the subject of a comprehensive monography by Connolly[14]. All these demonstrate that individual variations in cerebral macrostructure are much greater than group variations, that is to say, individual persons differ much more among themselves than do averaged racial types. Incidentally, a similar idea was expressed fifty years ago on the basis of much less comprehensive data by the celebrated Russian anatomists Tikhomirov and Weinberg who specialised in cerebral anatomy. There can be no doubt that there are differences in brain size, but, first, they are not great in modern man; second, they are distributed not according to the main racial divisions of man but by smaller taxonomic subdivisions (in other words, it is not the major races that differ in cranial capacity but the racial variants within them); third, these variations are much more a function of body size than of racial stock, which means that brain size is directly correlated to growth and is not to be linked with a person's membership of this race or that[15]. The facts assembled in the articles can be supplemented by the findings of the research of

---

12
   See T.Chi, C.Chang, "The Sulcal Pattern of the Chinese Brain", American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 1941, Vol.XXVII, No.2.

13
   See N.Bushmakin, "The Brain of the Yakuts", American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 1936, Vol.XXI.

14
   See C.Connoly, External Morphology of the Primate Brain, Springfield (III), 1950.

15
   For the views of such eminent authorities in cerebral anatomy and growth processes as Bonin, and Beer, see A.Bonin, "Brain Weight and Body Weight of Mammals", Journal of General Psychology, 1937, Vol.XVI, No.5; G.de Beer, "Embryology and Taxonomy", The New Systematics (ed.J.Huxley), Oxford, 1940.

Simmons and Hambly[16] specially devoted to variations in cranial capacity and their distribution according to race. Thus, studies of the morphology of the brain yielded significant material refuting racialist claims.

Nevertheless, in spite of that, and in spite of the lack of factual proof of the idea of unequal intellectual abilities in different races, it has been common in the literature devoted to racial studies, and gave rise to the shameful fascist theories justifying imperialist wars and colonial exploitation. Thus, numerous studies of anthropologists of the Third Reich, such as Lenz and Günther, claimed the right of the dolichocephalic Nordic race to dominate the members of all other races, a claim based on the alleged purity of the Nordic race in respect of "Proto-Indo-European" physical traits. On the other hand, this role has been claimed though not so vociferously, for representatives of the Mediterranean race, that is, the dark-haired, dark-eyed brachycephalics. The late-19th century French anthropologists, like Mortillet, for example, considered that the Proto-Indo-Europeans were of the short, brachycephalic Alpine race. Poniatowski reconstructed a special, now extinct, type for them in which he combined the main features of the Alpine type with broad nose and extremely short stature. Tylor ascribed light eyes and hair and tall stature, to the originators of the Indo-European languages, in combination with brachycephaly. The choice has more often than not been determined by the nationality of the particular author himself.

---

16
   See K.Simmons, "Cranial Capacities by Both Plastic and Water Techniques with Cranial Linear Measurements of the Reserve Collections", Human Biology, 1942, Vol.14; W.Hambly, "Cranial Capacities, a Study in Methods", Fieldiana (Anthropology), 1947, Vol.36, No.3.

Race, of course, has been regarded as one of the fundamental ethnic traits and specific languages and cultures have been associated with specific racial types, in spite of the fact that anthropological, historico-ethnographic and linguistic boundaries do not necessarily coincide. Reche, the Austrian anthropologist and author of a number of concrete investigations that retain their value to this day, but an active exponent of the theory of the direct connection between psychic and spiritual traits, and between language and culture and racial stock, wrote that "language is a part of the racial spirit."[17] The result was the development of purely speculative historical constructions, the invention of migrations of peoples from continent to continent, etc. Workers who were subjectively opposed to racialism and openly denounced it, have frequently embraced such views. The eminent English ethnologist and palaeontologist Elliot Smith made a famous speech against racialism at the international anthropological and ethnographic conference in London in 1934, and in his works one finds many sharp criticism of racialist theories[18]. Yet at the same time he viewed the whole history of mankind through the prism of vast racial migrations; the trend represented by him has even been called hyperdiffusionism[19] by ethnographers.

An immense role in attempts to substantiate racialism has been played by various psychotechnical investigations, that is to say by attempts to determine "intelligence

---

17
O.Reche, "Rasse und Sprache", Archiv für Anthropologie (neue Folge), 1921, B.18, H.3-4, S.218.

18
See, for example, G.Elliot Smith, Human History. London, 1934.

19
It is interesting to note that this term belongs to another representative of the migration theory the French researcher J.Montodon, for whom, however, it merged with racialism.

-76-

quotients" by tests of all kinds. Most of this work has been carried out on adults, but there are also studies devoted to the formation of psychological traits and intellectual abilities in childhood. The body of observations does not, objectively speaking, provide any grounds for claims concerning the intellectual superiority of representatives of the white race over African Negroes or Asian Mongoloids. When these tests at first glance do enable such a conclusion, it subsequently turns out that the material is not sufficiently large to stand the test of statistical credibility, or the tests are illchosen, or,finally, and most commonly, the methods of processing and interpreting the data are open to criticism.

On the whole, all the material accumulated to date definitely indicates that the social environment has a decisive influence on intellectual development, while racial stock plays no appreciable part in the formation of psychological traits of the individual. That is the attitude towards the problem of the connection between race and psychology taken by many leading contemporary anthropologists and psychologists[20].

Today, when it is impossible to defend racialist theories and to cite arguments of any credence in their support based on morphological facts, when they have been discredited in the eyes of all progressive mankind by the atrocities of the German racialists, and condemned in such UNESCO documents as the 1950 Declaration and the 1951 Declaration on Race and Racial Differences, the only means of racialist ideological propaganda remains the comparison of intellectual and psychological traits of different

---

20
See, for example, O.Klineberg, "Racial Psychology" in The Science of Man in the World Crisis, Columbia University Press, New York, 1945; M.Jenkins, "The Upper Limit of Ability Among American Negroes", Scientific Monthly, 1948, Vol.LXVI; C.Seltzer, "Phenotype Patterns of Racial Reference and Outstanding Personality Traits", Journal of General Psychology, 1948, Vol.LXXII.

-77-

peoples or, in other words, the sphere of anthropology and psychology in which science has not yet gone beyond the stage of developing methodologies and accumulating fact.

Of the first orders of importance in this sphere are the views of the American anthropologist Gates, an eminent geneticist working mainly in the field of human heredity, and the author of a comprehensive survey of summary on human genetics[21] and of many special investigations into the herditary transmission of various morphological and physiological traits, who has repeatedly expressed racialist views in his theoretical works.

The results of psychotechnical investigations are extensively used to substantiate ideas of racial inequality in the book by the American psychologist A.Shuey, Testing of Negro Intelligence, published in 1958. Finally, the racialist conception is most fully presented by Garrett in one of his last articles.

Garrett, well-known for his work in the fields of anthropology and human psychology, held the chair of psychology in Columbia University during the Second World War. In 1947 he published an article entitled "Negro-White Differences in Mental Ability in the USA"[22]. This article was sharply and deservedly criticised in Soviet anthropological literature [23]. Garrett tried to show,

on the basis of psychotechnical investigations among the white and Negro populations of the United States, that Negro children displayed appreciably lower mental abilities than white children. He attempted to give his article an appearance of objectivity by stating his sympathy for Negroes, but the objectivity was only seeming and can be refuted even by the data he presented in his own work, which unequivocally indicated the decisive part played by social circumstances in the development of mental abilities. Thus, for example, judging by tests, Negroes in Northern states, where their living standards are considerably higher than in the South, displayed higher mental abilities than Southern whites. Nevertheless Garrett concluded that Negroes were mentally more inferior.

Another of his articles, published in Mankind Quarterly[24], Vol.1, No.1, a journal that began to appear in Edinburgh in 1960, bears the title "Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology"[25]. Insofar as it appeared in the first number of the first volume of the Quarterly, it can to some extent be regarded as a programatic work. Garrett made a critical analysis of the conclusions drawn by Klineberg in Race and Psychology[26]. This little book was published by UNESCO in its series on the racial question in modern science and, like others in the series, contained comprehensive critical information on problems raised by the 1950 and 1951 Declarations, specifically the problem of correlation of

21
    See R.Gates, Human Genetics, Vols.I-II,New York 1946.
22
    See H.Garrett, "Negro-White Differences in Mental
    Ability in the USA", Scientific Monthly, 1947, Vol.LXV.
23
    See M.G.Levin, Y.Y.Roginsky, N.N.Cheboksarov, "Anglo-
    American Racialism", Soviet Ethnography (in Russian),
    1949. "Anglo-American Racialism", Anglo-American
    Ethnography in the Service of Imperialism, (in Russian).
    Papers of Institute of Ethnography, 1951, Vol.XIII.
    On the whole Garrett's philosophical position is close
    to psycho-racialism. A critique of the latter trend
    in American psychology can be found in Contemporary
    Psychology in Capitalist Countries (in Russian),
    Moscow, 1963.

24
    See Mankind Quarterly (An International Quarterly
    Journal dealing with Race and Inheritance in the Fields
    of Ethnology, Ethno- and Human Genetics, Ethno-
    Psychology, Racial History, Demography and Anthropo-
    geography). The editor of the journal is R.Gayer, with
    R.Gates and Garrett himself, as associate editors.
25
    See H.Garrett, "Klineberg's Chapter on Race and
    Psychology", Mankind Quarterly, 1960, Vol.I, No.1.
26
    See O.Klineberg, Race and Psychology. Paris, 1956.

morphological type with psychic traits. Klineberg's
main conclusion — the absence of any connection between
them — was illustrated with numerous, well-chosen examples
from the vast literature devoted to the subject. It was
against this conclusion that Garrett mainly objected.

Garrett analysed mainly his own data, and also
information from pertinent literature relating to
comparison of the Negro and white populations of the United
States. The main method by which these data were collected
was the "intelligence quotient" (I.Q.) tests. A race or
individual is rated as mentally capable with an I.Q. of
100 or slightly more, but the level of "mental ability" is
adopted itself extremely relative. It has been repeatedly
demonstrated that I.Q. depends on many factors, notably
previous training, degree of contact between researcher
and test subject, the conditions in which the test is
conducted, etc., in other words, on conditions that it is
very hard, if not impossible, to standardise, which makes
it problematic whether it is po.sible to reliably determine
the intellectual standards of members of different races
and to make an objective comparison of them from test
results.

These doubts apply equally to the other psychological
tests employed by many foreign psychologists and anthropo-
logists, notably Garrett. In most cases these tests are
incapable of establishing a correlation of mental ability
in the narrow sense of the word viewed as the sum-total
of inherited psychophysiological reactions, with social
factors such as upbringing, living conditions, and
education, which substantially, and sometimes completely,
alter the inherited stereotype. Furthermore, the tests
usually reduce mental and psychological traits that are
based on complex links of elementary reactions to the
solution of some simple problem or some simple action.
Thus Garrett's methodology, which has been widely
criticised from many sides, is, despite its widespread

application, poorly adopted to comparative psychological
investigations[27]. His methodology has been criticised even
by many exponents of patently idealistic theories in
ethnography, sociology, and anthropology. Thus, for
example, Benedict, a follower of Spengler and author of
the theory of "cultural models", speaks in highly negative
terms of this methodology, calling the "intelligence
quotient" a measurement of indefinite group differences
in traits on which education has an indefinitely great
influence.[28] Similar statements have been made by
Steggarda, one of the authors of a well-known racialist
book on the mixed population of Jamaica[29], who, though he
has not rejected his racialist views in subsequent works,
has nevertheless been compelled to concede that the
"intelligence quotient" employed by him was ill-adopted
to substantiate his own conclusions.[30]

So as not to go beyond the material employed by
Garrett himself, that is, beyond a comparison of the white
and Negro populations of the United States, I shall limit
myself to the results of the broad investigations of
Beckham and Wheeler, published 30 years ago and doubtlessly
known to Garrett. The value of these studies consists in
the introduction of data pertaining to a wide range of
investigations, which in itself enhances the credibility
of the conclusions.

27
 For details see T.Garth, Race Psychology: a Study of
 Mental Differences, New York, 1931.

28
 See R.Benedict, Race: Science and Politics. New York,
 1940.

29 See C.Davenport, M.Steggarda, Race Crossing in Jamaica,
 Washington, 1929. For a critique see Y.Y.Roginsky,
 "On Psychotechnical Investigations of Different Tribes
 and Peoples" in Science on Races and Racialism, Papers
 of the Institute of Anthropology, Moscow State University,
 issue 4, (in Russian),Moscow-Loningrad, 1938.
30 See M.Steggarda, Maya Indians of Yucatan. Washington,1941.

Beckham[31] studied 1100 Negro adolescents of both sexes, aged 12 to 16, in New York, Washington, and Baltimore, and obtained I.Q.s in the neighbourhood of 100 (for New Yorkers they reached 105). Wheeler studied the white population of mountain areas in Tennessee. A study of more than 1100 children yielded a mean I.Q. of 80[32]. This is quite convincing proof at once of the inadequacy of the test for determining hereditary abilities, and of the close relationship between I.Q. and social environment; for Negro urban dwellers proved intellectually more developed than the white inhabitants of backward mountain areas. Garrett, however, found it possible to neglect these eloquent findings.

Further proof refuting Garrett's conclusions concerning the low mental abilities of Negroes is provided by similar facts gathered in the course of psychotechnical investigations of other peoples, in particular, Asian Mongoloids. In comparing the degree of development of the mental capabilities of members of the Mongoloid race with Europeans and white Americans, the social factor proved even more pronounced than in the case of American Negroes.

The majority of Alaskan Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians tested for example, had scarcely any knowledge of English, and were unable to understand clearly what was required of them, to say nothing of their extremely harsh living conditions, which in themselves could have a detrimental effect on the development of their natural capabilities. Furthermore, the experiment placed these people in strange conditions which made it impossible for their customary

habits to manifest themselves.[33] The influence of such factors it would seem, should be excluded from the outset when comparing the psychological and mental traits of different races and peoples, and one should certainly be wary of adopting psychotechnical observations to prove the mental inferiority of these races and peoples. Garrett, however, apparently scorned an objective treatment of facts, as their biased interpretation enabled him to claim the mental superiority of whites over Negroes and the inevitability of Negro mental backwardness.

A rather similar stand has been taken by Gates. In a special article devoted to the genetics of psychological traits he attempted to extend to them the laws of hereditary transmission established for inherited morphological traits.[34] Although there is a comprehensive literature on this subject, it remains highly debatable and any attempt to view the inheritance of psychic traits from the angle of existing theories of heredity must be confined, given the present state of genetics, to the realm of only more or less credible hypotheses. Discussion of this problem is extremely difficult in view of the absence of any generally accepted and precise classification of psychological traits that could be presented in the form of elementary reactions. In other words, it is still difficult to break down the complex emotional and logical associations characteristic of man's mental activity into component elementary reactions which could then be subjected to genetic analysis. Yet Gates, ignoring all these difficulties and proceeding from a priori judgments about the existence of a direct connection between morphology

31
    See A.Beckham, "A Study in the Intelligence of Colored Adolescents of Different Social-Economic Statuses in Typical Metropolitan Areas", The Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, Vol.IV, No.1.
32
    See L.Wheeler, "The Intelligence of East Tennessee Mountain Children", The Journal of Education Psychology, 1932, Vol.XXIII, No.5.

33
    See W.Eells, "Mental Ability of the Native Races of Alaska", Journal of Applied Psychology, 1933, No.4.
34
    See R.Gates, "Genetics and Normal Mental Differences", The Biology of Mental Health and Disease, New York,1952.

and psychology, postulated the inherited quality of
intelligence and sharp differences between races in
intellectual ability. In his view, it was obvious to any
unbiased observer that the races differed in level of
development of mental ability. We have already had an
opportunity of seeing just how devoid of factual
substantiation such obviousness is.

All that has been said above can be repeated with
respect to Miss Shuey's book[35], which contains no descrip-
tion of independent investigations and includes no original
materials, but merely gives a detail of summary of the
available literature on the psychological intelligence
talents of various ethnic groups belonging to the Negroid
race. The author reviewed some 300 works, and her book
surpasses all previous summaries in comprehensiveness and
can sometimes even be a useful statistical and bibliographi-
cal reference work. But Miss Shuey retained her objecti-
vity only as long as she was merely giving an account of
the work of other authors. Once she started interpreting
their data her racialist conception immediately became
apparent and her desire to prove at all cost the mental
inferiority of Negroes and the substantial superiority
of whites over them. Thus she ignores both the relative
nature and inadequacy of tests of all kind, including
intelligence tests, for group comparison and, what is more
surprising, her own presentation and description of the
factual material. In many cases the groups Shuey consi-
dered were quite incompatible as regards social status;
and where they can be compared the differences between the
different observations do not meet the criteria of
statistical reliability. In other words, even the
materials Miss Shuey herself cited are quite unsuitable
to substantiate her far-reaching conclusions, which perhaps

---

[35]

See A.Shuey, Testing of Negro Intelligence, Lynchburg,
1958.

illustrate better than any other example the extent to
which racialist theories are divorced from facts and the
frankly tendentious nature of all attempts to substantiate
racialist views. That is why Miss Shuey's book was sharply
criticised even in America[36].

Notion that there is a direct connection between mental
traits and body structure or any complex of constitutional
or racial features or another, so characteristic of the
newer forms of racialism, has found vivid expression in
Garrett's latest work in which he challenged Klineberg's
conclusion that there is absolutely no link between racial
origin and criming tendencies, confirmed by numerous well-
documentated examples. Garrett writes that the crime rate
in the United States is much higher among Negroes than
whites, and links this with race, using statistical data
on the racial origin of criminals in the U.S.A. published
by the Federal Department of Justice in 1954, to substan-
tiate his claim. The data, however, indicate no more than
that racial segregation facilitates the growth of crime;
the blame for that lies not in membership of the Negroid
race but in the harsh economic and social conditions in
which the Negro population lives, and in the policies that
justify Negro unequality in the political and social life
of the country. The social motivation of crime is
obvious to many American workers, and from that stand-
point Garrett's statements have been sharply criticised
by Professor Comas of the State University of Mexico[37].
Similar views on crime as a socially, not biologically,
conditioned phenomenon have been expressed by Ashley
Montagu, one of the authors of the 1951 declaration on
race and race differences, who defended them not only from

---

[36]

See I.Brown's review in American Anthropologist, 1962,
Vol.62, No.4.

[37]

See J.Comas, "'Scientific'Racism Again?" in Current
Anthropology, 1961, Vol.2, No.4.

the standpoint of ethical and humanitarian principles, as
liberal minded bourgeois scientists do, but by citing many
facts in support of his ideas[38] .

A major section of Garrett's paper, though not
directly linked with the preceding ones, was also
characterised by indifference to, and arbitrary inter-
pretation of, factual data. It expounds the idea of the
inferiority of mixed types whose origin is a result of
hybridisation within the main racial stems. This idea
appeared simultaneously with the emergence of racialism
itself. Existing legislation in the United States equates
metis with Negroes; the theoretical justification for such
laws is found in anthropological and ethnographical
writings containing premises similar to Garrett's assertion.
These premises are clothed in scholarly form, but in fact
are nothing more than elementary speculation that counts
upon readers lacking specialised knowledge.

It must immediately be stressed that the idea of the
inferiority or lower viability of mixed types is in utter
contradiction with general biological notions concerning
crossing in the animal world. If anything can be said
about hybrids, it is that they are extremely well-developed
physically and display superior viability. Confirmed
racialists, of course, declare that in the animal world we
deal mainly with interspecific rather than intraspecific
hybrids, which, incidentally, was the argument of many
exponents of racialist ideologies, who asserted that the
mixing of human races was a crossing of intraspecific type
to which the laws observed in interspecific hybridization
could not be applied. But that assertion is completely
refuted by numerous observations on domestic animals.
Animal breeds, like human races, are intraspecific
formations. Yet crossbreeds display the same constitutio-
nal vigour and the same high physiological indices as

---

38  See P.Merton, M.Ashley Montagu, "Crime and the Anthro-
    pologist", American Anthropologist, 1940, Vol.42, No.6.

interspecific hybrids of wild forms, and that is in fact
of basic importance in the crossbreeding employed in
agriculture to produce new, productive breeds of domestic
stock.

What has been said, of course, should not be regarded
as a negation of the qualitative differences between race
formation in man and animals. The specific qualitative
aspects of human races, including the social conditioning
of the biological processes underlying race formation, have
been extensively studied in the works of Soviet anthropo-
logists. But the fact that biological tendencies find
expression in terms of social tendencies should not
prevent an objective examination of the purely biological
aspects of the crossing of the various races of mankind
today. The physical development of metis is just one of
these aspects. Therefore, keeping within the limits of
the purely biological aspect of the problem, it is possible
to draw analogies between hybridisation in man and in
domestic animals, and it is possible to claim with full
justification that biology provides no grounds for claims
that mestizo types are inferior to the initial stock. As
for the frequency of barrenness or sub-fertility of
interspecific hybrids in the animal world, that is a
feature not observed in intraspecific hybrids — such as
human races — and therefore is quite inappropriate as
regards man. Thus, the idea of the inferiority of metis
is in complete contradiction to contemporary notions about
the variability of organisms and the laws that govern it.

Garrett based his premise of the inferiority of
European-Negro metis on a consideration of four examples:
the anthropological composition of the populations of
Jamaica, Egypt, Brazil, and the Caribbean islands. The
utter groundlessness of his conclusions concerning the
dependence of cultural standards in these areas on the
degree of mixing of whites and Negroes and the inherited
predilection of metis for various diseases has been
convincingly demonstrated in Comas's article already cited

in which it was pointed out that the extremely generalised
nature of Garrett's statements made it impossible to verify
them on factual material; Comas also cited statistical data
concerning the high level of physical development of
mestizos. It must be said that he did not give any new
data, limiting himself to already published materials of
which Garrett could not have been ignorant. The fact that
he did ignore them can only be explained, as in many other
cases, by deliberate tendentiousness.

In a reply to Comas'article, Gates defended Garrett's
position by pointing out, first, that certain forms of
diseases of the blood circulation system occur more
frequently among the mixed Negro population of the United
States than in Africa and, secondly, that the countless as
he called it, child mortality in the Caucasus was due to
their mixed origin resulting from ancient racial interbree-
ding of Japhetic and Indo-European ethnic groups[39]. The
first example had already been cited by him in an earlier
work[40]. Comas rightly noted in that connection that the
high rate of blood diseases, and of negative Rhesus factor,
in American Negroes is not necessarily linked with racial
mixing and that analogous phenomena have been observed in
other peoples undoubtedly less mixed. As for the second
example, Gates apparently must have been dealing with data
more than fifty years old. The present level of child
mortality in the Caucasus is very low [41]. Again, in this
case, it is not a matter of the Caucasian peoples having
been doomed to extinction, as Gates would have it, but of
the level of social development and social conditions.

---

[39]
See Current Anthropology, 1961, Vol.2, No.4.

[40]
See R.Gates, "Disadvantages of Race Mixture", Nature,
1952, Vol.770.

[41]
See Population and Distribution of Peoples of the World,
(in Russian), Moscow, 1962, p.64.

One could also subject to critical analysis  Gates'
idea about the ancient mixing of Indo-Europeans with
Japhetides that allegedly determined the basic stages
in the ethnic history of Caucasian people; but any
specialist familiar with problems of the ethnogenesis of
Caucasian peoples knows that reality is much more complex
than Gates would have it. However, the statistical data
on the sharp fall in child mortality in the Caucasus makes
such analysis quite unnecessary in the present article.

These are some of the forms assumed today by the
reactionary idea of the inequality of human races, which
tramples underfoot the basic laws of ethics and morality
and justifies colonial slavery. Unfortunately, the number
of examples could be increased considerably for racialism
has raised its head again since the Second World War and
is making itself heard in West Germany[42] and other
countries.

In 1962, the American Association of Physical
Anthropologists adopted the following resolution at its
31st Annual Meeting: "We, the members of the American
Association of Physical Anthropologists, professionally
concerned with differences in man, deplore the misuse of
science to advocate racism. We condemn such writings as
Race and Reason that urge the denial of basic rights to
human beings .... (and) we affirm, that there is nothing
in science that justifies the denial of opportunities or
rights to any group by virtue of race."[43] In connection
with that resolution, some American scientists, not
satisfied with such a formula, demanded that it be stated
directly that the totality of anthropological and

---

[42]
See H.Beyer, D.Klemm, "Die faschistische Rassentheorie
einst und jetzt", in Rassen, Rassentheorie und
imperialistische Politik; H.Kühne. "Die faschistische
Rassentheorie in Dienst der Kolonialpolitik des
deutschen Imperialismus", ibid.

[43]
Current Anthropology, 1962, Vol.31, No.4, p.445.

psychological studies led to a single conclusion , that
all the races of modern man are physically alike and
equally capable of creating cultural values[44].

Soviet scientists share these principles of their
American colleagues and hope that progressive scholars
in all countries will join forces to combat racialism and
reaction in favour of race equality and the peaceful
coexistence of all nations.

---

# BOOK REVIEW

## GUNNAR MYRDAL'S SYSTEM OF VALUES

Gunnar Myrdal. Asian Drama, An Inquiry Into
the Poverty of Nations. Vols. I,II,III.
New York, Pantheon, 1968, 2284 pp.

"It would be almost unnatural if capital on a large
scale and on its own free will flowed into the under-
developed countries to facilitate their economic develop-
ment." Many years ago students of Cairo University heard
these words from Gunnar Myrdal, world famous Swedish
economist who lectured on the problems of overcoming
economic backwardness. Events have shown how accurate
was Myrdal's observation. Discounting several oil
Klondikes, nowhere in the Third World have foreign private
investments been a noticeable and effective contribution
to developing the national economy. This confirms Gunnar
Myrdal's opinions as to what factors and in what precise
way      can influence the economic fate of the Third World.

Myrdal spent ten years on his three-volumed work,
Asian Drama. This work displays the author's exceedingly
great erudition; his work is a treasure-house of factual
material. The eloquent subtitle — "An Inquiry Into the
Poverty of Nations" — shows the importance which Myrdal
himself attached to this work. In Asian Drama the subject
of his analysis is not only the economy but also the social
institutions, the political atmosphere, the cultural
heritage, demographic tendencies and ideological trends —
in a word all the more or less substantial aspects of

---

[44]
S.Diamond, "Statement on Racism", Current Anthropology,
1963, Vol.4, No.3; see also his reply to a criticism
of his article by M.Bruce, ibid., 1964, Vol.5, No.2.

social life in South-East Asian countries.

The author has interesting observations, astute remarks, original opinions and appraisals on every question examined. However, of specific interest is not the particular conclusions drawn by the author, nor his characterisations of individual problems, but his general conception and methodology.

"We conceive of the situation in each South Asian country—as in any other country — as a social system. The system consists of a great number of conditions that are casually interrelated, in that a change in one will cause changes in the others. We classify the conditions in six broad categories:

    (1) output and incomes;

    (2) conditions of production;

    (3) levels of living;

    (4) attitudes toward life and work;

    (5) institutions;

    (6) policies.

"This structure of categories represents the conditions in a country viewed from the 'economic' angle, which corresponds to the focus of the present study. The conditions in the first three categories represent broadly what is usually referred to as the 'economic factors' while categories 4 and 5 represent the 'non-economic' ones; category 6 is a mixture and is usually considered to belong to the 'economic factors' when policies aim at inducing changes in conditions 1-3, but not otherwise" (pp.1859 - 1860).

Such is the basis of Myrdal's theoretical classifications as he presents it. Actually, the entire book is Myrdal's detailed argumentation in favour of the conception he advances and which stresses the decisive significance of the "fourth and fifth categories" for any changes which can take place under conditions related to the first three categories.

The main theoretical premises from which Myrdal proceeds had already been formulated by the author long before the war. At that time Myrdal rejected the possibility of a "non-partisan" economic analysis, as, in his opinion, no political economy category can be so objective and abstract as to remain quite neutral as regards the interests of definite social and political groups and the values they recognise. Myrdal always attached great importance to the establishment of criteria and values which would serve as a measure of truth in all subsequent reasoning.

In Asian Drama he follows this rule strictly. The author explains in detail why, when undertaking a general analysis of social-economic problems of South-East Asia, one should first formulate the main criteria and values which will serve to guide the researcher. This is necessary "to see clearly how the direction of our scientific exertions, particularly in economics, is conditioned by the society in which we live, and most directly by the political climate (which, in turn, is related to all other changes in society)"(p.9).

What system of values does Myrdal advance? He himself defines it as the sum of "modernisation criteria". This includes a rationalist (as opposed to a "sentimental") approach to economic problems; the development of the economy on a planned basis; a rise in labour productivity and the level of living; social and economic equality; an improvement in social institutions and standards; national consolidation and national independence; democracy in political life and in the sphere of public relations; social discipline combined with "democratic planning" (pp.57, etc.).

There are two reasons why Myrdal chooses precisely these criteria of values. In the first place, in his opinion, they have assumed vital proportions, through the actions of society in the developing countries proper.

At the same time modernisation has become the order of the day for these countries and all other values, for instance such as "traditionalism", will eventually be rejected in the course of social development.

Myrdal in no ways considers that he had thus presented a picture of the morrow of the developing countries. He only armed himself with instruments for conducting an analysis, and with which he intends to appraise the real situations in South-East Asia. What remains for him now is only to measure the distance separating living reality from the utopia embodied in the criteria of values and to find ways and means for achieving "modernisation ideals."

Mr. Myrdal immediately discovers the principled difficulty of these quests, seeing this in the fact that "the modernisation ideals are all, in a sense, alien to the region. since they stem from foreign influences" (p.73). Hence, as Myrdal sees it, the inevitability of acute social, spiritual, political and national conflicts in the process of the renovation of social life in the South-East Asian countries. Under these conditions economic development, this major component of modernisation, cannot be viewed separated from close ties and divorced from the constant interaction and interpenetration of other "non-economic" factors of social life.

The logic of this reasoning leads Myrdal to the conclusion that the categories and methods of present-day Western political economy are unsuitable for analysing the economic problems of the developing countries. The conception with which Myrdal opposes the "Western approach" and which he proclaims as his theory places special stress on the importance of social institutions, social psychology and other like factors. He denies "pure economics" the right to exist. Moreover, Myrdal is of the opinion that this is dangerous and that this danger grows with the degree of abstraction increasing in theoretical classifications.

Myrdal is most severe in his criticism of econometric

models. He stresses that under the conditions of South-East Asia these models, being a component part of "Western theories", "provide a convenient escape from the fact that attempts to change attitudes and institutions in that part of the world ordinarily meet with strong opposition from vested interests and with other obstacles and inhibitions..." (p.1942).

The "purely economic" analysis and the solutions, Myrdal writes, are instinctively encouraged and supported by conservatives and reactionaries who are afraid of any changes of a social nature. This is why the intellectual elite which enthusiastically designs models, elaborates coefficients of "expenditure-output" and believe that they serve national progress, are actually deceiving both themselves and the nation. Their activities obscure stagnation and inertness in those spheres of social life where resolute actions are precisely required, while the fruits of their activities are in the main reaped by the existing privileged groups.

The quintessence of Myrdal's positive programme is formulated in the following extract: "The basic social and economic structure of the countries of South Asia is radically different from that existing in advanced Western countries. Conditions in the rich Western countries today are such that, broadly speaking, the social matrix is permissive of economic development or, when not, becomes readily readjusted so as not to place much in the way of obstacles in its path. This is why an analysis in 'economic' terms, abstracting from that social matrix, can produce valid and useful results. But that judgement cannot be accurately applied to South Asian conditions. Not only is the social and institutional structure different from the one that has evolved in Western countries, but, more important, the problem of development in South Asia is one calling for induced changes in that social and institutional structure, as it hinders economic development and as it does not change spontaneously, or, to any

very large extent, in response to policies restricted to the 'economic sphere'" (p.26).

Thus, Myrdal is of the opinion that only social transformations can advance progress in the South-East Asian countries. No measures to be found in the ordinary arsenal of economic policy are capable of evoking the social dynamism required for an advance leading to "modernisation ideals." The point of departure is in the sphere of social relations.

The author notes that no one in South-East Asia proper denies the need for serious and profound social change. However, a widely spread erroneous conviction claims that social renovation will come of itself as a natural result of economic changes. Myrdal devotes hundreds of pages in refuting such views: "'economic' policies are undoubtedly easier to carry out than are social policies that challenge vested interests, violate deep-seated inhibitions, offend cherished traditions and beliefs and work against the heavy weight of social inertia. If, however, development policies are for these reasons among others, mainly directed at economic development in the narrow sense, they will prove less than effective" (p.1907).

It stands to reason that in that "social system," the component elements of which Myrdal classifies in the six "broad categories", close interaction exists between economic and non-economic factors. The growth of the national income, for instance, leads to subsequent reactions in social psychology. However, as Myrdal sees it, the "effect of dissemination", caused by any economic change, under the conditions of South-East Asia cannot be compared in any way with the "cumulative influence" of one or another progressive change in the sphere of social relations or the social-psychological climate.

The idea of a cumulative development was also to be found in Myrdal's previous works. It was an expression of his protest against the theory of the equilibrium of forces which while interacting return the system to a state of

-96-

rest. According to Myrdal, any change in the social economic system inevitably evokes a chain reaction of other changes, as every individual change provides impetus and acts as an impulse for the entire process of transformations.

In his time Myrdal in his book American Dilemma attempted to introduce even a quantitative measurement of the intensity of such cumulative effects. In Asian Drama he confines himself only to general theoretical considerations on this matter. And although he continuously repeats that the initial impulses for the development of South-East Asian countries should come into being in the sphere of social relations while the economy will only be the sphere of their cumulation, concrete recommendations are nevertheless absent in the book as to what should be done in the first place, what in the following stage, etc.

In general Myrdal is inclined to the viewpoint that individual, isolated "impulses" are insufficient. At best they can evoke a slow and tortuous evolution. Additionally, the impression is created that his former unconditional belief in the "cumulation of changes" has somewhat been undermined by the observations and deliberations of the past years. He already allows the possibility of an attenuative reaction to an impulse. This is why he elevates the idea of a "starting pulse" which has on many occasions been advanced in economic literature.

A "starting pulse", or in another version "a minimum effort", presupposes a simultaneous concentrated investment in the underdeveloped economy in order to provide it with an initial impetus for development. Myrdal in accordance with his general conception introduces a substantial correction to this term. Although he does not deny the economic aspect of a "starting pulse", from his point of view the "coordinated combination of social measures" is of incomparably greater importance. In this connection he develops the idea of "an offensive along the entire front" as "in many respects a large and rapid change of attitudes and institutions is not more difficult

-97-

than a series of small and gradual changes" (p.1910).

From all this one can draw the conclusion that Gunnar
Myrdal,who is known as an adherent to the traditions of
liberalism and reformism, in his new book almost becomes
a herald of social revolution. The thesis of a "frontal
attack" on development problems is substantiated by
references to the example of the socialist revolution in
Russia.

Although the idea of social revolution is present in
Myrdal's system of values, the author himself, nevertheless,
uses it in a most restricted sense. Here is how Myrdal
describes it as applied to India: the constitutional
proscription banning the caste system is being carried
out; measures proclaimed in principle which are aimed at
increasing social mobility and facilitating social equality,
are already being carried out; for instance, an effective
land reform; livestock breeding is being improved "even
if the slaughter of many half-starved cows is required
to achieve this; corruption at all levels of the state
apparatus is being uprooted: the observation of fiscal
legislation is being ensured; the tax on land incomes is
being strictly collected; resolute measures are being taken
to put an end to the "unemployment of the educated" in
order to overcome the reluctance to engage in physical
labour: i.e., "in general, enactment and enforcement, not
only of fiscal, but also of all other obligations on
people that are required for development" (p.1910) are
being carried out.

This is all. In fact social revolution appears
nothing more than enforcing administrative order. In
addition there is no place in Myrdal's scheme for any
whatsoever active social forces if they are not directly
presented by the government and the state apparatus. It
remains unclear why in this "social revolution" the
people are only given the role of an object to be assigned
duties, the fulfilment of which is required for development.

Apparently when matters reach the stage of practical
advice the chains of reformism are nevertheless heavy for
Myrdal. The programme of social transformations which he
advances do not go further than recommendations aimed at
clearing the ground for effective economic development.
However, the social nature of this development         is
not explored. It becomes obvious that Myrdal is far from
embracing the adherents of really radical social transfor-
mations directly in the interests of the working majority
of the population.

Nevertheless, Asian Drama has its logic, which partly
is not subordinated to the author. The absolutely correct
formulation of the question, which presupposes that
progressive transformations in the social structure are the
only reliable prerequisite for economic growth in the
conditions of South-East Asian countries, gives rise to
a chain of reasoning and conclusions which go far beyond
the framework of Myrdal's reformist restraint. As a
result his book objectively sounds as a condemnation of
all inhibitions and restraints of reactionary economic
features and political theories which turn away from the
basic, i.e., the social, problems of society.

Perhaps this is why Asian Drama was given an
attentive but cold reception in the West. Myrdal's book
was received in the developing countries with considerably
greater attention and greater seriousness than in the West.
In particular, the Indian press especially stressed in its
comments Myrdal's warning that "economic revolution may
stop" and that "eternal stagnation may set in if reforms
do not become an integral part of development plans."[1]

It is repeatedly noted in Asian Drama that "often
modern Western economists have taken over theories from
Marx, usually without crediting him with them. Sometimes,

-----
[1]
See, for instance, Hindustan Times and National Herald
for March 12, 1968.

they are unaware of their intellectual debt, and sometimes they deny it exists..." (p.674). Although Myrdal in this respect strives to be punctilious, his position nevertheless, time and again, appears in a most strange light. He often attempts to unite Marxism and Western bourgeois political economy into a single theoretical complex. The argumentation which he advances holds no water. In Myrdal's interpretation, present-day Marxists allegedly assume that only a highly efficient technology on the basis of industrialisation can open up the road for economic growth in developing countries. Although it is most paradoxical, Myrdal nevertheless actually writes that social relations are not a subject of special interest for Marxist theory.

As it is difficult to suspect Myrdal, major and undoubtedly honest scientist, in conscientiously distorting the truth, one can assume that here another sin is manifested — that of being ill-informed. This is partly also confirmed by the fact that the list of authors whose works Myrdal quotes contains actually not a single present-day Marxist researcher. However, Myrdal uses materials from Marx and Lenin. And if he interprets them in such an awkward and vulgarised manner, one can only lift one's hands in dismay.

Myrdal has taken an enormous step forward as compared with his Western colleagues when he worthily appraises social relations as a major factor determining all aspects of life in the South-East Asian countries and in the developing countries in general. He has in a real way reached the question of the class structure of society in these countries, of class interests and positions. Shortly after Asian Drama was published Myrdal visited Moscow. In the Institute of World Economics and International Relations he pointed out that precisely Marxist theory, unlike Western bourgeois political economy, is capable of opening up new horizons in studying the problems of "underdevelopedness and development," that it

precisely can tackle this as it devotes the necessary attention to the social aspects of development. Why this admission was not made in Asian Drama remains a riddle.

Apparently there is no sense of attaching special importance to Myrdal's waverings which at times bring him closer to Marxism and at times lead him to take up arms against Marxist theory. It is sufficient that he towers over the majority of present-day bourgeois theoreticians–economists as a result of his "system of values" in which the central place is occupied by criteria of social progress on the basis of social transformations.

L.Stepanov.

## MARX THE HISTORIAN

Marx The Historian, Edited by E.Zhelubovskaya
(editor-in-chief), L.Golman, V.Dalin and
B.Porshnev. Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1968,
712 pp.

The study of K.Marx's heritage is a problem of
paramount scientific and political importance, and yet
this subject has not in recent years been in the focus
of the Soviet researchers' attention.[1] The collection of
articles published for the 150th anniversary of Marx's
birth will undoubtedly attract the attention of Soviet
and foreign historians. The merit of the book as a whole,
as well as of each article in particular, is that they
cover a wide range of problems, each of which is of
considerable and independent interest, and skillfully and
clearly raise new important questions.

Marx's great discovery — the materialist conception
of history — was a revolution in science. Before Marx,
as V.I.Lenin put it, "chaos and arbitrariness" reigned in
the views on man's past. Lenin wrote: "At best, pre-Marxist
'sociology' and historiography brought forth an accumula-
tion of raw facts, collected at random, and a description

of individual aspects of the historical process ....
Marxism indicated the way to an all-embracing and
comprehensive study of the process of the rise, development,
and decline of socio-economic system"[2]. Of course, Marx
did not draw his conclusions in a void; his genius
manifested itself in the answer he gave precisely to the
questions already raised by the social thought of the
19th century. The part of the book entitled "Historical
Thought at the Period of Formation of Marxism" and
containing an analysis of the conceptions of the French
historians of the time of the Restoration, the English
historical science of the 1830s-1840s, and the German
historiography of the end of the 18th and the first half
of the 19th centuries, is therefore quite appropriate.

The book opens with Dalin's article which offers a
clear idea of the basic postulates and class essence of
the conceptions of the French historians of the epoch of
Restoration. Dalin's article is also important because
it outlines the problems for new research. The author has
shown the total collapse of J.N.A.Thierry's conception,
his spiritual drama which made him abandon his studies
of history. That was not only Thierry's tragedy, but also
a tragedy of the whole school of French historians of the
Restoration era. It would be desirable to continue the
investigation of the final stage of activity of this
school, particularly the activity of F.Guizot, one of its
most prominent and influential representatives.
The Revolution of 1848, as is well known, considerably
deepened the crisis of bourgeois historical science. It
destroyed Guizot the politician and forced Guizot the
historian to abandon scientific studies. The sharp change
in his political and historical views was very clearly
manifested in his works On Democracy in France and

---

[1]
M.N.Pokrovsky,"Marx the Historian", in Collection of
Articles in Memory of Marx, Moscow, 1918; N.M.Lukin,
"Marx the Historian" in Lukin's Selected Works, Vol.3,
Moscow, 1963 (all books in Russian). After these
articles Soviet historians hardly ever dealt with this
subject.

---

[2]
V.I.Lenin. Collected Works, Moscow, 1964, Vol.21,
pp.56-57.

## Why Did the English Revolution Succeed?[3]

M.Yerofeyev, the author of the article "English Historical Science of the 1830s-1840s", has shown that by the time Marxism came into existence the English historians had accumulated quite a number of facts on the social development in England. A.Smith and D.Ricardo made use of these facts in their works. Nevertheless bourgeois researchers proved incapable of learning any lessons from the rich past of England, the experience of its social history and the English Revolution. This work was performed by K.Marx and F.Engels independently.

Yerofeyev's interesting article is rich not only in factual material, but also in its inferences and generalisations. It would be expedient, however, to continue the study of the evolution of Thomas Carlyle's views after the Revolution of 1848 by using for this purpose Marx and Engels' review of Carlyle's book Latter Day Pamphlets. Whereas before 1848 Carlyle, by his defence of the actions of the French people during the Revolution of 1789, his sympathies for the Jacobins, and sharp criticism of various aspects of bourgeois society, had won the sympathies of a number of progressive thinkers, during the Revolution and, especially subsequent to it, he became a bitter enemy of the revolutionary movement and democracy. F.Engels wrote: "The February Revolution made Carlyle an inveterate reactionary; his just anger against the Philistines was replaced by venomous Philistine grumbling at the historical wave that had cast him ashore"[4]. It would also be appropriate to mention Carlyle's favourite doctrine -- hero worship.

_____

[3] F.Guizot, De la democratie en France, Bruxelles, 1849; Pourquoi la Revolution d'Angleterre a-t-elle reussi? Paris, 1850. For greater details see M.A.Alpatov, Political Ideas of 19th Century French Bourgeois Historiography, (in Russian). Moscow and Leningrad, 1949,pp.84-122.

[4] K.Marx and F.Engels, Works, Vol.2, (in Russian).Moscow, p.513.

A deep analysis of German historiography from the end of the 18th century to the 1870s is contained in B.Veber's article which not only reveals the socio-political and gnoseological nature of the different trends of German historical science, but also describes Marx and Engels' attitude to them.

In the part entitled "Formation and Development of Marx as an Historian" the authors have shown that the materialist conception of history played a very important role in the genesis of Marxism. It helped to elaborate the economic theory of Marxism and was fundamental to the creation and development of materialist dialectics.

V.Mosolov's original article "K.Marx's Study of World History in 1843-1844 as One of the Sources of Formation of the Materialist Conception of History" is a vivid and convincing recapitulation of the initial period of this process.

G.Bagaturia in his work "Marx's First Great Discovery: the Formation and Development of the Materialist Conception of History" subjects a number of complex and multifarious problems to an all-round analysis on the basis of his profound knowledge of Marx and Engels' works and a fine understanding of their ideas. The question of the "Asian mode of production", as it is raised in the article, appears to us to be controversial. Soviet researchers have discussed this question, and a continuation of the discussion would probably prove fruitful, but mention should be made of the positions of other authors, at least E.Bregel and B.Porshnev, whose articles have also been published in the book. We also regard as debatable the author's assertion that in 1857-1859 Marx presumably "passed from a periodisation according to juridical form to a periodisation according to economic content" (p.158). In our opinion Marx periodised the epochs of world history "according to economic content" at least since his Poverty of Philosophy.

E.Bregel's article "K.Marx's 'Capital', the Historical

Work" and V.Vygodsky's article "The Place of the History of Political Economy in Marx's Economic Theory" are concerned in detail with the problems of formation and development of the capitalist mode of production and set forth the general lines and regularities of the evolution of bourgeois political economy.

Three articles in the second part of the book deal with Marx's studies of French, German and Russian history. E.Zhelubovskaya("The History of the Second Empire in Marx's Works") tells clearly and convincingly about Marx's profound analysis of the historical events that were just occurring or had only just occurred. This is revealed by the example of Marx's study of the history of the Second Empire. S.Obolenskaya has devoted her interesting article to Marx's investigation of the political and socio-economic essence of the events of the 1850s-1870s in Germany. She has shown that Marx and Engels combined the study of history with the practical struggle of the working class. B.Itenberg in his article entitled "Marx's Studies of the Socio-Economic History of Post-Reform Russia" outlined and revealed the main problems of Russian history in Marx's works, related Marx's attitude to the Russian community, the problems of revolution in Russia, the abolition of serfdom and his studies of the Russian form of landed property.

L.Golman's article "Historical Sources of the 1860s" shows the importance of Marx's publicism as a source of elucidating his views on the most important questions of the historical process of his time. Although Golman limited his task to a summary exposition of the main trends of Marx's historical writings reflected in his publicism, he was able to collect and generalise extensive and original material, reveal many new interesting facts and draw important conclusions. The critical review of the literature on the question is the incontestable merit of the article.

Of unquestionable interest is B.Porshnev's article entitled "Marx's Historical Interests in the Last Years of His Life and His Work on the 'Chronological Notes'", in which the author tries to show that the vast diversity of Marx's scientific interests in the last years of his life was subordinated to a definite dominant idea. It was the idea of the unity of world history, both in the synchronous sense, i.e., in the sense of mutual relations of all the particular histories, and chronologically, hence, incidentally, Marx's greatest attention to the problems of the beginning of history, its most ancient time.

The third part of the book deals with Marx's studies of the working-class movement. It opens with M.Karliner's detailed article entitled "Stages in the Development of Marx's Methods of Studying the Working-Class Movement" and is a fruitful attempt to generalise Marx's multifarious heritage in the theory of the working-class movement. The author used Marx's and Engels' works exclusively. But it is hardly proper to ignore the works of one's predecessors, researchers in particular. M.Karliner defends himself with the assertion that "the problem has not yet been considered in this aspect either in Soviet or foreign literature" (p.435). This is but partly true; no articles or books have been written on this subject, but different aspects of the problem have been examined in the articles of B.Porshnev, V.Vygodsky[5] and other authors. Karliner's reluctance to make use of the works of his predecessors has, in our opinion, adversely affected the general standard of the article.

_____
[5]
B.F.Porshnev, "Problems of the Class Struggle of the Proletariat in Marx's "Capital" in the book From the History of the Working-Class and Revolutionary Movement, Moscow, 1958; V.S.Vygodsky, "Marx's Economic Theory and the Working Class" in Novaya i Noveishaya Istoria (Modern and Contemporary History), 1967, N 5.

Y.Kandel treats his subject ("Marx and Problems of
the History of the Communist League") very interestingly.
The author carefully watches the still unending ideological
struggle over questions of the history of the first
international communist organisation and consistently
exposes the fallacious falsifying conceptions of the
history of the Communist League. Kandel arrives at the
conclusion that in 1848 Marx and Engels relinquished their
mandates as members of the Central Committee of the
Communist League. This is an entirely new statement of the
question, and reference to a document would be very
desirable.

Very appropriate, in our opinion, is the fourth part
of the book — "Marx's Research Laboratory". The attention
of researchers will undoubtedly be drawn to S.Leviova and
I.Sinelnikova's article on Marx's manuscript heritage in
the field of history, which contains a detailed analysis
of the unpublished manuscripts of the great founder of
scientific communism. The value of V.Dalin and N.Nepom-
nyashchaya's article "History Books in Marx's Library"
is not only in that it helps to determine the range of
questions studied by Marx, but mainly in that it contains
an analysis of the method of his work with materials. A
number of important inferences, which make it possible
to ascertain the range of Marx's historical interests, were
made by L.Gamayunov in his small, but exceedingly interesting
article on socio-economic problems in Marx's Chronological
Notes on the History of India.

The book ends with Y.Chernyak's article "Marx and
Contemporary Trends in Bourgeois Historiography", the author
showing the influence exerted by the theory of historical
materialism on modern bourgeois historiography and analysing
another aspect of the problem — the polemic of bourgeois
scientists against historical materialism, both theoretically
and in concrete studies.

The book under review does not, of course, exhaust
all the questions connected with the problem posed in it.

It has, for example, no article on Marx's summation of
the Revolution of 1848; nor have certain other questions
been treated in the book. But the book does contain a
number of interesting and valuable articles which make a
good contribution to the study of the problem.

M.Mikhailov.

CONCERNING THE METHODS OF CRITICISING BOURGEOIS
ECONOMIC THEORIES

Criticism of the Theories of Modern Bourgeois Economists
(R.Theobald, G.C.Means, P.Samuelson and S.Kuznets).
Collection. Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1968.

The collection of articles "criticism of the Theories
of Modern Bourgeois Economists"[1] discloses certain new
tendencies in bourgeois economic science. At the same it
provokes reflection on the methods of crytical analysis of
bourgeois conceptions as a whole. The authors of the
articles have chosen as their subject for critical analysis
the conceptions of a number of prominent bourgeois
economists. This method, in addition to extending the
general range of Marxist criticism of bourgeois science,
also has other advantages. It is well known that bourgeois
economists are carefully watching new economic events and
phenomena vying with each other for first place in their
desoription and apologetic interpretation. It is obvious
that a Marxist analysis of the new tendencies in the
development of capitalism requires that the bourgeois views
be disproved promptly before these views through books and
articles have assumed the form of a theory and a trend.

The apologetic basis of the methods of bourgeois economic
science is eclecticism, and the theoretical substance of
many trends therefore often consists of ideas borrowed from
other trends. Very often it is sufficient to disclose
the sources of these borrowings in order to reveal the
fallaciousness of such "synthetic" theories.

Furthermore, the choice of the most characteristic

---

[1]  Authors: First Part — I.Dvorkin; Second Part — S.Dalin;
    Third Part — Y.Olsevich; Fourth Part — S.Nikitin.

and significant works and conceptions of the bourgeois
economists as the subject for critical analysis facilitates
the identity of the sources of these new trends and affords
a scientific orientation enabling us to single out among
the numerous works of bourgeois political economists those
who play the leading role including authors of secondary
importance.

The articles in the book under review criticise the
theories of four American economists each of whom has exert-
ed considerable influence on the development of modern
bourgeois economic science.

The collection opens with R.Theobald, a prominent
representative of the technological trned in American
economy which in the struggle against Marxism uses the
thesis of the determining role of technology in the
development of society. Theobald opposes the Marxist
teaching on the interaction of the productive forces and
the production relations, the teaching which scientifically
establishes the inevitable downfall of capitalist society.
He tries to prove that capitalism can be saved if the reform
of the distribution of material wealth proposed by him is
effected. His conception is based on a "socio-economic
system" with relations of distribution as the determining
factor. Already the initial premise contains a flagrant
perversion of reality for, although these relations
characterise every socio-economic system, they themselves,
as also the system as a whole, are completely determined by
property relations.

The heretofore existing socio-economic system, which
Theobald wrongly identifies with the system of distribution,
was due, in his opinion, to an insufficiency, a scarcity
of material wealth. The functioning of this system was
regulated by the free market mechanism, the distribution
of the rights to the available production always being, to
his opinion, a by-product of the economy striving for an
increased output. For this reason "this meant that
distribution of the rights to the available production was

always a by-product of the central drive of the economy to increase production. For a lengthy period there was an adequate approximation in the relationship between the distribution of rights to production and the ability to produce."[2] In other words, if we are to believe Theobald, in the capitalist system there has been no deepening of the contradiction between production and consumption as the manifestation of the basic contradiction of capitalism between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation. According to Theobald, only "cybernation is rapidly destroying this relationship, for it increases the ability to produce out of all proportion to any rise in rights to consume."[3]

The "cybernetic revolution", by which Theobald implies the modern scientific and technical revolution, creates an "abundance". However, this abundance is inevitably accompanied by an increase in unused production capacities, increased unemployment, etc. the author of the theory of cybernetic revolution therefore, considers the prospects for most people becoming unemployed quite feasible since the use of automatic machinery together with electronic computers rapidly excludes people from all spheres of production.

The inevitable result of cybernetisation which reduces the number of employed factory and office workers and is conducive to a reduction in wages is, according to Theobald, a crisis. In one of his works he predicted that the traditional punishment in the form of overproduction — a world crisis — will occur in the nearest future.[4]

In his analysis of the prospects of capitalist society as regards the scientific and technical revolution Theobald is very far from the optimistic pictures which many

_____

[2] R.Theobald, Free Men and Free Markets, New York, 1963, p.165.

[3] Ibid.

[4] See R.Theobald, Free Men and Free Markets, New York, 1963.

bourgeois theoreticians endeavor to draw. Nevertheless he is convinced and is trying to convince others that all the contradictions of capitalism can be eliminated if the existing system of distribution is replaced by a new one, at the same time retaining capitalist private property. For this purpose he suggests a plan for ensuring economic security which envisages such state regulation of distribution as would guarantee an income to all the unemployed. Theobald is consistent in his reasoning and therefore draws the conclusion which worthily crowns his conception: the salvation of capitalism is in moving towards total unemployment. Suffice it, however, to imagine a society whose main feature is the inactivity of most of its members, to become convinced of the total fallaciousness and reactionary nature of the utopias which make it their aim to change the principles of distribution without changing the whole system of capitalist production relations.

Theobald fails to see that the automatic system of machinery and electronic computers can not by themselves, without the participation of man, produce the national income which represents the newly-produced value. And, since Theobald's ideal capitalist society of social justice must be a society of general idleness served by electronics and mechanisms, and not by human slaves, this society will have no income to distribute. The recipes, invented by Theobald, to save the capitalist system, as, incidentally, all other recipes, turn out to be useless.

The author of the second part of the collection dealing with the theoretical views of G.C.Means, prominent American economist, set himself the complex task of revealing the substance and evolution of the views of a bourgeois theoretician who in the 1930s started out by criticising the monopolies, created the theory of a "corporate revolution", "collective capitalism" and "administered prices", and in the 1960s attested his political loyalty by stating: "I am strongly in favour of big business

and what it can contribute to our society"[5]

But in the 1960s the same Means undertook to study the prices on steel and proved that they had increased not because of a rise in workers' wages, but as a result of the actions of the steel companies' directors who strove to increase profits. The very same Means, who now utters honeyed words about what "big business" can contribute, proves on the basis of detailed calcultations that "we can aocept the idea that the industry is willing and able to pass on to customers the increase in taxes"[6]. While defending capitalism, he nevertheless states: "Clearly, the drive for corporate profits cannot be expected to serve the public interest in either efficient operation or unbiased arbitration"[7]. The fundamental and thoughtful analysis of these contradictions constitutes the unquestionable merit of this part of the book.

Means has arrived at the conolusion that the economy of the U.S.A. and other capitalist countries is characterised by an increased conoentration of production in corporations (stock companies), predominantly in the largest ones. This once more confirms the correotness of Lenin's teaching on imperialism, the growth of monopolies and dominance of the finance oligarchy in the economy and politics of the capitalist countries. But Means tried to give these facts a different theoretioal interpretation by means of the theory of the "corporate revolution". In the first place he tried to explain why the stock form of enterprises has become so widespread. By completely reduoing the cause to the technological fact or, i.e., the need to carry on

5  G.C.Means, The Corporate Revolution in America, New York, 1962, p.155.

6   G.C.Means, Pricing Power and the Public Interest, New York, 1962, p.85.

7   G.C.Means, The Corporate Revolution in America, New York, p.170.

production on a large soale, Means thereby ignored the capitalist concentration of production that inevitably leads to the rise of monopolies and their dominance. It is oharaoteristio that subsequently many defenders of the monopolies tried to justify the existence of the monopolies by the "technological need" argument.

The other basio postulate of Means' conception — his thesis of the growing separation of property from control that oharaoterises the modern oorporation — was used for similar apolgetio purposes. K.Marx, F.Engels and V.I.Lenin disoovered and scientifically explained the fact that with the development of the stook form of oapitalist enterprises capital as property becomes separated from oapital as funotion. This prooess, intensifying during the epoch of imperialism, manifests itself in an inorease in the number of rentiers, whioh undersoores the growing parasitism and deoay of oapitalism in this epoch. It also fosters an inorease in the dominanoe of the finanoe oligarohy for whioh the stock form of enterprises ensures actual control of the economy.

The factual material oolleoted by Means confirms these oonolusions, but his bourgeois narrow-mindedness prevents hims from being consistent throughout. Instead, and notwithstanding facts and logio, Means proolaims modern oapitalism to be not monopolistio, as it follows from the faots he himself has oolleoted, but "colleotive" in whioh oorporations unify the interests of workers, oapitalists and oonsumers. Means maintains that the theory of "oolleotive capitalism" has not as yet been elaborated, but in his opinion it must be based on the fact that, as a result of the "separation of property from control", profit oeases to be the aim of a oapitalist enterprise and oorporations begin to oorrespond to the "public interests". Since the end of the war, espeoially in reoent years, this apologetio version has been eohoed by many bourgeois theoretioians in the U.S.A. who have

futilely tried to find "nonprofit motives" by which
corporations are presumably guided in their activities.

According to Means, the directors in their activities
are supposed to coordinate the contradictory (as he himself
admits) interests of the stock-holders, workers and consumers.
The corporations, as the predominant form of enterprises of
"collective capitalism", develop a "criterion of social
responsibility". True, Means considers "collective
capitalism" in this form a thing of the future and therefore
criticises various aspects of modern capitalism in order to
improve it and bring it closer to the "ideal". But, firstly,
Means, who proclaimed the coming of "collective capitalism"
in the 1920s-1930s, has had enough time to become convinced,
at least by the results of his latest research, that during
this period capitalism has not changed. Secondly, Means'
theory is based exclusively on an attempt to prove the
possibility of a compromise between the interests of the
working class and the bourgeoisie. While it is not original,
it is disproved by reality. Increased profits of monopolies
due to increased exploitation of workers on the one hand,
and the intensified struggle of workers against monopolies,
on the other, conclusively indicate that the antagonistic
contradictions of capitalism do not mitigate, but intensify.

Means has introduced into the bourgeois economic theory
the term "administered price" which is in his interpretation
neither the price that spontaneously forms in the market,
nor a monopoly price. Presumably, it is the price
established by the corporation administratively for the
purpose of obtaining the "maximum value", yet, according
to Means, "maximum profit and maximum value are two quite
different objectives and each involves quite a different
calculus"[8]. However, despite his declarations the
"maximum value" (according to Means, it will be ensured
for the corporation when none of the competitors will be
able to out the price) turns out to be nothing but the

_____
[8] Ibid., pp.162-163.

maximum profit with the only difference that this maximum
is achieved not only at a given moment, but also for
extended period. The "administered price" is therefore at
best but a euphemism for monopoly price, and Means' own
concrete study of "administered prices" is the best proof
of their monopoly character.

Prior to the war, proceeding from the fact that the
"profit motive forces the corporation leaders to take
decisions which may cause the collapse of the whole
economy", and deeming it necessary to prevent this danger,
Means proposed a programme of state interference for the
purpose of restraining the monopolies. After the war,
Means abandoned the programme of liberal reforms. Now he
holds that state interference in the economy must be
reduced to the minimum and must be limited to elaboration
of such recommendations which, being acceptable to the
enterprises, would make it possible to effect the necessary
coordination between them. For purposes of state
regulation of the economy Means proposes the use of a budget
policy, moderate inflation, stimulation of demand, taxes on
superprofits, etc. Like all the theories of "planned
capitalism", however, Means' theory only proves, despite
its author, that the modern level of development of the
productive forces which requires planned management is
incompatible with the capitalist mode of production.

The third and fourth parts of the book are a criticism
of the works of the well-known American economists
P.Samuelson and S.Kuznets. Like Theobald, Means and many
other bourgeois theoreticians, Samuelson concentrates
primarily on problems of state regulation of the
capitalist economy, which he calls "mixed". Characteristic
of this author is the admission that the market mechanism
does not of itself ensure an "optimum" development of the
capitalist economy because the market element inevitably
leads to crises, engenders monopolies, violates "justice"
in the distribution of incomes, etc. He tires to prove,
however, that the economy will be able to maintain a state

of "equilibrium" if deviations are promptly eliminated by forces acting within this system, i.e., the same market mechanism.

In other words, admitting that capitalist production relations do not correspond to the character of the productive forces Samuelson nevertheless tries to prove that a "mixed economy" based on private property and state regulation is able to eliminate the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism which lead to its downfall.

The fallaciousness of the "neoclassical synthesis" conception (Samuelson thus calls his theory) is adequately and consistently revealed in the book under review by Y.Y.Olsevich.

The concluding part of the book is a criticism of a number of problems of reproduction elaborated by S.Kuznets. This part written by S.M.Nikitin criticises mainly the methods of bourgeois statistics of the national income as proposed by Kuznets and his theories of "revolution in incomes" and the "diminishing rate of accumulation". Noting that some works of this American economist and statistician contain valuable material for analysing the development of capitalist economy over an extended period of time the author at the same time shows the bourgeois limitation and apologetic essence of these theories obscured by a semblance of scientific objectiveness. The criticism of Kuznets's theory is based on a theoretical analysis and generalisation of considerable statistical material.

The authors of the book have used different approaches to the solution of their problems, and, although the different parts of the book are not interconnected formally, the book nevertheless possesses definite unity. The book reveals scientifically the essence of the general methodological basis of the modern apologies for capitalism, depicts the concrete methods by which these apologies

are made and proves the theoretical fallacy of attempts by bourgeois theoreticians to find recipes for saving capitalism. The differentiated approach has enabled the authors to augment considerably the criticism of theoretical views of bourgeois economists.

L.Nikolayev

L.S.Gaponenko, A.N.Sakharov, G.L.Sobolev.  The Great
October Revolution and Its Present-Day Bourgeois Critics

The authors make an attempt to examine the principal
works produced by bourgeois historians and publicists in
connection with the 50th anniversary of the Great October
Socialist Revolution, emphasising that bourgeois historians
are partly renouncing their former primitive frontal attacks
on the history of the October Revolution and are seeking
new methods of ideologically opposing communism in the
sphere of history. To achieve this purpose they elaborate
"liberal" versions of the history of the October Revolution;
the same end is served by diverse modern bourgeois concep-
tions, notably the latter-day theories of "convergence" and
of a "single industrial society."

The article discloses the genetic connection of these
new bourgeois conceptions of the history of the proletarian
revolution in Russia with the former anti-Soviet and anti-
communist views shared by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois
researchers in the history of the October Revolution.

S.I.Kuznetsova.  The African Working Class in Soviet
Historiography

Analysing the works of Soviet scientists published
between 1963 and 1967, the author focusses attention on a
number of urgent tasks facing researchers in the history of

the African working class, notably the sources of its
formation, numerical strength, social composition, economic
conditions, the attained level of socio-economic and
political maturity, as well as the place of the working
class in the social structure of contemporary Africa.

The article accentuates, in particular, such distinctive
features of the African working class (in the area south of
the Sahara) as the bigger proportion of the modern proleta-
riat among all the other contingents of wage labourers and,
conversely, the smaller percentage of proletarian elements
among the peasantry and the lower urban strata compared with
other countries of the Afro-Asian world. The author singles
out The Working Class of Afro-Asian Countries (Moscow, 1967)
as a major work which, on the basis of a close analysis of
concrete factual material furnished by many countries,
created a model of the "principal type" and "regional
varieties" of the Afro-Asian proletariat.

E.V.Gutnova.  The Main Stages of Soviet Research in
Medieval History

The author singles out the following three principal
stages in the development of Soviet historiography of
medieval history: the first stage (from mid-1930s) is marked
by the rise and development of Soviet Marxist-Leninist
research in medieval history, which proceeded in a tense
ideological struggle with the bourgeois methodology of
history and bourgeois historiography; the second stage
(from mid-1930s to the end of the Second World War) is
characterised as a period of creating the theoretical,
scientific and organisational foundation of Marxist-Leninist
historiography of the Middle Ages; the third stage (from mid
1940s to the present time) is a period of further extending
and deepening the thematical content of medieval research
and of the heightened interest shown by researchers in gene-
ral sociological and methodological questions.

The author gives a general survey of the principal
scientific trends, problems and most important researches
in medieval history, and characterises the major discussions
which took place in this sphere of historical science. In
conclusion of the article the author draws attention to the
most important problems of Soviet research into medieval
history which are still awaiting solution.

S.I.Bruk, N.N.Cheboksarov, Y.V.Chesnov. Problems of
the Ethnic Development of Asian Countries

Asia is ethnically the most complex part of the globe.
This is explained by the historical peculiarities that
attended the formation of Asian nations and by the highly
uneven rate of their social and economic development. At
the present time Asia (excluding the Asian part of the
U.S.S.R.) is inhabited by several hundred peoples and
nationalities which have attained different levels of social
and economic development and belong to multifarious ethnic
groups. In the postwar period the processes of consolidation,
assimilation and formation of new nations and nationalities
have been proceeding at a much faster pace.

The rich variety of ethnic forms existing in Asian
countries do not fit into the generally accepted tribe-
nationality-nation scheme. Besides these main ethnic
entities, there are transitional forms in most countries of
this region. In conclusion the authors give a classification
of countries according to the peculiarities of the ethnic
processes occurring in them.

S.L.Senyavsky. The Soviet Working Class in the Period
of Consummating the Building of Socialism and in the
Process of Full-Scale Communist Construction (Social
Problems)

Drawing on extensive factual data, the author carefully
analyses the most important specific features and objective
laws governing the development of the Soviet working class
during a long period of transition from socialism to
communism. The article graphically shows the deep-going
changes taking place in the sources of replenishment, in
the forms and methods of training high-skilled contingents
of the Soviet working class on the basis of successful
economic development and rapid technological and social
progress, emphasising the decisive significance of these
changes in altering its inner social structure and tracing
the impact the altered structure and composition of the
working class have on the changes in the social structure
of society as a whole.

The author examines in particular the changes in the
national, territorial, age, sex, industrial and professional
structure of the working class, notably the profound changes
in its general education level and professional skill,
disclosing their meaning and social significance. In
conclusion the author highlights the importance of the
growing creative and socio-political activity of the working
class as the guiding and directing force of socialist
construction in the U.S.S.R.

A.K.Klevansky. The Consistent Efforts Made by the
Soviet Government to Normalise Soviet-Czechoslovak
Relations (From the Close of 1918 to the Beginning
of 1920)

The author's attention is focussed on the participation
of Czechoslovak armed forces in the anti-Soviet interven-
tion organised by international imperialism. Drawing on
newly discovered archive materials, the author shows how
the Czechoslovak government replied to the Soviet govern-
ment's consistent policy characterised by a series of peace
proposals directed towards eliminating the armed conflict.
The author arrives at the conclusion that all the efforts
of the Soviet government proved ineffectual and that the
persistent attempts to settle the conflict were crowned
with success only in early 1920, following the crushing
defeat inflicted on the interventionist and Whiteguard
forces in Siberia.

M.Y.Domnich. The Christian Trade Unions and the
Establishment of Fascist Dictatorship in Germany

The author of this article makes an attempt (the first
of its kind in historical literature) to establish the
degree of responsibility devolving on Germany's Christian
Trade Union Centre (the General Federation of Christian
Trade Unions) for the comparative ease with which the Nazis
seized state power in 1933. It is emphatically stressed
in the article that the General Federation of Christian
Trade Unions (GFCTU) represented a mass organisation
possessing substantial cadres and periodical press publi-
cations which exerted a measure of influence on a segment
of Christian workers. Nevertheless, the GFCTU rejected
all the proposals of the Communist Party and revolutionary

trade unions to form a united front and declare a general
strike. The Christian trade union centre actually surren-
dered to the Nazis.

The available documents and materials inescapably lead
to the conclusion that the causes that prompted the
Christian trade unions to betray the fundamental interests
of the working masses and of the whole people are deeply
rooted in the methodological vices intrinsic to the social
doctrine of Catholicism by which they are guided, in certain
points of similarity and identical features existing in the
views shared by Christian syndicalism and national-socialism.

N 3

A.I.Sobolev. The Communist International and
the Topical Problems of the Communist Movement

Defining the historical place of the Comintern, the
article stresses that for a quarter of a century this
international revolutionary organisation stood at the head
of the class battles fought by the world proletariat, being
invariably in the centre of all progressive developments
in the period following the October Revolution. The Comin-
tern came forward as the successor and creative continuer
of the glorious traditions of the Communist movement which
were established under the leadership of Marx and Engels
and which found their direct embodiment in the activity of
the Communist League and the First International.
The Comintern also inherited all the finest traits of the
Second International, taking over everything that was va-
luable and progressive in its activity.

The article makes a point of stressing that in the
conditions obtaining today following the dissolution of

the Comintern, new forms of unity of the communist movement
are coming into being. Among the most important principles
underlying the interrelations between the Communist parties—
principles evolved in the days of the Comintern and further
developed in the contemporary period — are proletarian
internationalism, complete equality and independence of
each individual communist party, and fraternal mutual
assistance.


**R.Y.Akopov.** How Agrarian Overpopulation Was Eliminated
in the U.S.S.R.

Tsarist Russia was a country where agrarian overpopu-
lation predominated. Its industry was unable to absorb
the redundant manpower which could not find employment in
the countryside. Agrarian overpopulation continued to
prevail in the early period following the victory of the
Great October Socialist Revolution. Only the socialist
system could cope with the problem of eliminating the over-
population in the countryside and wiping out unemployment
in the towns.

The article cites a number of concrete facts showing
how the socialist transformation effected in the country's
economy, undeviating implementation of the Leninist plan
of socialist industrialisation and all-round collectivisa-
tion of agriculture contributed to the solution of this
important problem.


**Y.A.Kisilov.** The Main Prerequisites for the Eastern
Slavs'Transition to Feudalism

The article shares the experience gained in the compa-
rative study of the principal variants of class-formation
in different natural-historical zones. The earliest and

crudest form of exploitation known to history — the
universal form of appropriating surplus labour performed
free of charge for the benefit of landowners — appears
among the peoples of the East (commune of the "Asian" or
"Eastern" type). At a more advanced stage "distortion"
of the forms of primitive society spread to the peoples
of Ancient Greece and Rome, where the free citizens of
independent cities had already achieved private ownership
of their land and the predominance of the slave-owning
system in the country's economy.

The process of class-formation assumes an entirely
different character among the Germanic and Slav peoples
who attained a higher level in reaping the fruits of labour
invested in crop cultivation but did not yet reach the
stage of distributing land among the members of the commune.
Here too the patriarchal slave-owning system played an
important part in the emergence of privileged elements from
the communes, but the scope of this process was rather
limited. In ancient Rus the predominance of feudal and
early feudal forms of appropriating the surplus product
created by the immediate producers in agriculture and
associated branches began to manifest itself in the early
stages of feudalism on the landed estates and patrimonies
owned by the top stratum.

## NEW BOOKS ON HISTORY

### / In Russian /

Y.Tyomkin. V.I.Lenin and International Social-Democracy.
1914-1917. Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1968, 623 pp.

Leaders of the October Revolution on Religion and Church.
Articles, Speeches, Talks, Memoirs. Compiled by
M.Persits, Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1968, 239 pp.

V.Trukhanovsky. Chronicle of the Soviet Foreign Policy.
1917-1967. Dates and Facts. Moscow, Politizdat
Publishers, 1968, 120 pp.

M.Andreyev. Catholicism and Problems of Contemporary
Working-class and National-Liberation Movement.
Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1968, 343 pp.

D.Davidovich. Ernst Thaelman, Life and Struggle. Moscow,
Nauka Publishers, 1968, 462 pp.

Cuba, Ten Years of Revolution. Collective monograph.
Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1968, 462 pp.

History of the USSR. From the ancient period to the present
day. In two series. Twelve volumes. Vol.5 —
Development of Capitalism and Raising of Revolutionary
Movement in the Post-Reform Russia, Moscow, Nauka
Publishers, 1968, 731 pp.

West Europe and the USA. Essay on political relations.
Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1968, 447 pp.

Near and Middle East, History, Culture, Review of Original
Sources. Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1968, 190 pp.

From the History of the Countries of South-East Asia.
Collection of articles. Moscow, Nauka Publishers,
1968, 208 pp.

Ancient History and Culture of Countries of the Mediterra-
nean and the Black Sea Region. Collection of articles.
Leningrad, Nauka Publishers, 1968, 351 pp.

## FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

Karl Marx and International Working-Class Movement in the
XIX Century. Collection of articles and documents.
Moscow, Politizdat Publishers.

V.I.Lenin, The Chronicle of Life and Activities, 1870-1907.
Collective work. Moscow, Politizdat Publishers, Vol.1.

V.I.Lenin and the History of Classes and Political Parties
of Russia. Collective work. Moscow, Mysl Publishers.

V.I.Lenin and the Soviet Foreign Policy. Collective work.
Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya Publishers.

The Documents of the Communist International, 1919-1924.
Collection. Moscow, Politizdat Publishers.

Y.Molchanov. The Communist International; the Sources of
the United Proletarian Front Policy. Moscow, Mysl
Publishers.

T.Burmistrov. The National Question and Working-Class
Movement in Russia(Lenin's Policy of Proletarian
Internationalism, 1907-1917). Moscow, Mysl Publishers.

A.Blank and Br.Löwel. Free Germany: Our Aim. ( Concerning
the history of antifascist movement "Free Germany",
1943-1945). Moscow, Mysl Publishers.

E.Chernyak. Gendarmes of History, Counter-Revolutionary
Conspiracies and Interventions. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye
Otnosheniya Publishers.