

PIR
 1933
 RK 4/10
 1934
 1967
 56
 1934

NOTES ON THE EAST EUROPEAN ARTICLES ON
MARXIST HUMANISM

Bogdan Suchodolski in his article "Renaissance Humanism and Marxist
 Humanism" traces the philosophy from Bacon as the first attempt into the
 mechanics of human activities vs. human creativity. But the most serious
 article is by Mihailo Markovic "Humanism and Dialectic". It is he who not
 only speaks seriously of the dialectic but is not afraid of saying that it
 applies also to a humanist "ontology" as well as the humanist "epistemology":
 "Marxist dialectic is inseparable from its humanism. Marx noted that Hegel's
 dialectic is essentially a criticism of society, albeit 'concealed, unclear
 and mystifying criticism'". (pg. 79)

Markovic then traces the "alienated, ideological life of the Marxist
 dialectic" just as soon as the labor movement became a vast organization,
 how then Bernstein rejected "the dialectical scaffolding". (pg. 81), and
 finally because the first revolution -- Russian -- was in a backward country,
 technology and industrialization took priority over the human development:

"To be sure, it has been customary to talk of dialectic as a guide to action.
 But this has meant little more than a subsequent rationalization of various
 past political conceptions and decisions. This is why Stalinism did not
 reject dialectic as a whole in the way it rejected its key principle -- the
 negation of negation. The use of dialectical phraseology created an illusion
 of continuity in method. Furthermore: such a formalized and degenerated
 dialectic was needed to prove that whatever existed in socialism was necessarily
 such as it was, i.e., that it was rational."

He also manages to criticize Paul Sartre's extreme notion of freedom
 as an essential "ontological structure or as a condition of authentic existence
 which might make sense as poetry but could easily conceal forms of slavery,
 since freedom can mean something definite only under a certain set of con-
 ditions.

1934
 1934
 1934

all these are part
 of the same thing
 class struggle
 a condition
 a critique
 for the
 war

HERE

On page 85, the author deals with the relationship of abstract to concrete in Hegel and then the manner in which it is used by bureaucracy where "Marxist original conception of a human society has been reduced to the idea of an affluent society and this impoverished ideal has been pressed on masses of people as a goal for the future." The trouble with the essay is that it has hardly begun before it has finished and thus his conclusion remains an abstraction: "this humanist philosophy and dialectical method seems to presuppose each other."

CW
Karel Kesik raises some serious problems about "the philosophy of man" insofar as it became a question because it had been neglected by Marxists and taken up by existentialism.

Stachurski
PK
Bronislaw Baczko in his article "Marx and the Idea of the Universality of Man" likewise is abstract with the sole exception of the following paragraph: "For Marx, the measure of human universality is the degree of individualization of mankind. Individuality, for him, is neither the particularization of the species nor the epiphenomenon of history. It is for Marx a concrete phenomenon that is not reducible to any exterior conditions related to it, even though the premise of the entire diversity of individuality is the opportunity that history and society provide for the development of the plenitude of individuality." (pg. 176)

Individualization to mankind

Philosophy, economy, life

Philosophy
Best of philosophy
Philosophy
Philosophy

The really important one because it relates directly to Philosophy and Revolution is the one by Laurin Pejovic: "On the Power and Impotence of Philosophy": "Indeed, 'Philosophy and Revolution' is only another way of expressing Marx's well-worn catch phrase about the 'realization of philosophy' beginning as a revolution in philosophy in order to end as a revolutionary philosophy in the form of the philosophy of the revolution." (pg. 181)

9

The author also establishes that as far back as his doctoral dissertation Marx considered Prometheus "the greatest in the entire philosophical roster." The movement from this historic mission of philosophy to lead to the liberation of the world to its transformation into bourgeois economics about the production of goods is, for Marx, "the same process of the perversion of philosophy from an idea of liberation into the science of exploitation and enslavement."

Like Markovic, Pejovic stresses the fact that the perversions in philosophy by Stalinism could have occurred "only on the basis of a total or absolute organization of politics, economics and all spheres of Soviet life generally." For some peculiar reason both authors seemed bent on calling Stalin the Hegelian, although both say Stalin is counter-revolutionary and Hegel's philosophy is revolutionary. What they must mean is that Stalin "is the philosopher of the technological revolution par excellence." (pg. 187) He then brings in Chinese communism as outstripping Stalinism as "the bestial form". On page 189, the author introduces the fact "Stalinism is not just false; it is part of the truth: "As power, philosophy has already been realized in technology. As powerlessness, philosophy may be defined as the creative powerlessness to determine the full sense of the movement that reveals itself to a limited extent in various eras of history."

Markovic