

APPROVED FOR RELEASE: 2007/02/09: CIA-RDP82-00850R000100060036-5

19 JUNE 1979

IN
INTELLECTUAL AND THE PCF
(FOUO 38/79)

1 OF 1

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/8525

19 June 1979

TRANSLATIONS ON WESTERN EUROPE
(FOUO 38/79)
COMMUNISM IN FRANCE: THE DISSIDENT
INTELLECTUAL AND THE PCF



WEST



EUROPE



U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE



FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

COPYRIGHT LAWS AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING OWNERSHIP OF MATERIALS REPRODUCED HEREIN REQUIRE THAT DISSEMINATION OF THIS PUBLICATION BE RESTRICTED FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

JPRS L/8525

19 June 1979

TRANSLATIONS ON WESTERN EUROPE

(FOUO 38/79)

COMMUNISM IN FRANCE: THE DISSIDENT
INTELLECTUAL AND THE PCF

CONTENTS

PAGE

COUNTRY SECTION

FRANCE

'L'URSS ET NOUS': The Continuing Controversy
(Various sources, various dates) 1

'Distorted View of CPSU,' by Edouard Beaumont
'Anti-Working Class Attitude,' by Edouard Beaumont
PCF Anti-Sovietism
PCF Anti-Sovietism Revisited, by Edouard Beaumont
Author Defends Book's Relevance, by Francis Cohen

The Dissident Intellectual and Formal Party Structure
(Various sources, various dates)..... 13

Relationship With Institutional Left, by Nicos Poulantzas
Political Role of Intellectuals, by Michel Cardoze
Role Within Communist Party, by Serge Wolikow
Concept of 'Collective Intellectual,' by Antoine Casanova
'Communist,' 'Intellectual': Contradictory Terms,
by Maurice Goldring

Dissident Intellectual Activities, Relationship to Society
(Various sources, various dates)..... 31

Totalitarian Societies and Individualism,
Vladimir Bukovski Interview

- a -

[III - 150 - WE]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Societal Tolerance of Dissidents, by J. Y. Bourdin Relationship to Working Class, by Maurice Goldring Relationship to French Society, by Jean Burles Einstein: Communism, Societal Models	
The Psychology of the Dissident Intellectual (Various sources, various dates).....	57
'Intellectual': Toward New Definitions, by Paul Jourdan Marxism, Humanism and Individualism, by Gilbert Wasserman, et al. Kehayans: The Soviet Experience, by Michele Cotta Survival Value of Individualism, Peter Schneider Interview	
Chronological Source Material, Bibliographical References (LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE, Apr 79).....	73

- b -

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

COUNTRY SECTION

FRANCE

"L'URSS ET NOUS": THE CONTINUING CONTROVERSY

'Distorted View of CPSU'

Paris LE COMMUNISTE in French Sep-Oct 78 p 5

[Article by Edouard Beaumont: "The USSR and Them"]

[Text] "It is a question of collective reflection by the communists as a function of the prospects opened up at the 22nd Congress of the PCF for socialism of a French hue." This is how the advertisement (p 7) for the book "The USSR and Us" reads.

To date the opportunistic leadership has first disapproved of and then condemned this or that aspect of the policy of the Soviet party and state under the double pressure of bourgeois propaganda and its unprincipled pursuit of an alliance with the PS [Socialist Party]. But with this official book, for that is the truth according to the statement drafted by the Political Bureau on 30 August 1978 and published on 4 September 1978, the fact is that the opportunists have just taken a clear and dangerous step into anti-Sovietism.

This is indicated first of all by the resumption of certain theses by the assistant director of the CERM [Center for Marxist Study and Research], to wit that the Stalinist deviation had its sources with Lenin himself, on the one hand, with an authoritarian side "on the principal level" on the one hand, and with an attitude tending "to be overly schematic and exaggerated" toward parliamentarianism on the other (p 48). Add to that the fact that the advent of socialism demands "a certain historical and political maturity on the part of the citizen" (p 43), reflected in the inability of the "ignorant peasants" to achieve "good" socialism, and note that the conscientious worker has become a simple citizen ripe for voting "right," and we find ourselves plunged into the "prospects opened up by the 22nd Congress."

From the abandonment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the French context, the opportunists very quickly proceeded to condemning coercive measures in the socialist countries, forgetting the reality of socialist

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

democracy to some extent. And now the five authors of "The USSR and Us" are willing to take yet another step, stripping away the economic and social system of the Soviet Union, viewed through the distorting lenses of the bourgeoisie.

Since it is particularly difficult to demonstrate the existence of an exploiting class, they are content to state that there is a caste, which is perhaps no longer that but which behaves like one in recruiting "extensively abroad, but remaining nonetheless exclusive" (p 95). Let those who can decipher this. Deserting the class positions one by one, these five thinkers who have no fear of contradiction can claim that in the USSR property is owned by the "public" but not by the "state," on page 19, while two pages farther on it is "public and state owned." What do words matter-- what counts is that "it is no longer the property of the associated workers" (!) (p 121). One would be plunged in total incoherence, but perhaps not to such an extent if we remember that since the opportunistic faction has no concept of the reality of the bourgeois state, the same may be the case for the socialist state. This degeneration of the foundations of the principles of communism reaches its peak when it comes to explaining the situation of the workers' class. Revealing that the worker always sells his labor in a socialist society, the question of what becomes of the added value thus obtained arises--let us note that in the book the term "deduction" is preferred (p 96). The authors propose no satisfactory answer to this question, preferring reference to the part "frozen, wasted" on weapons. Why? Again silence. The existence of aggressive imperialism is never taken seriously into account in all the 220 pages. Not a word about the use of this added value for social, cultural and other needs. It is easier to claim that the workers have no control over the use. Even if this is an untruth, it reveals more imagination than lengthy proof.

Having reached this point, nothing hinders Cardoze, in describing the book in the 2 October FRANCE CULTURE as philosophizing about "a majority workers' class, the younger portion of which is educated and excluded, but not under the same conditions as in the Western countries, from the circles where decisions are made, 'confronting' an intelligentsia which exercises the power and seeks an alliance with a backward and conservative rural mass to prevent this workers' class from gaining political power in the USSR." As we do not believe that Cardoze has lost his mind, the fact is he is not a communist.

There is nothing surprising then in the fact that the question of the socialist nature of the USSR is raised on pages 24, 124 and 213, a question which in each case goes unanswered, but leads to a magnificent pirouette: "We will no longer say that in the USSR there is collective ownership of the means of production and the power of the workers' class, ergo socialism. We will say rather that (there are developments) oriented increasingly in the direction of socialism" (p 216). With such quibbling, the opportunistic faction provides proof that it no longer has any coherent concept of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

socialism, and here we are back again at the "prospects opened up by the 22nd congress."

Indeed it would be easy to comment ironically on "the scientific spirit" --according to the Political Bureau--or the "serious reflection"--according to the authors themselves which underlie the book, or more modestly, a simple "attempted analysis"--according to Frioux, short of argument, of a FRANCE CULTURE journalist. It is a question of statements without proof extending in some cases to contempt and distrust of the workers' class. It is a little as if the opportunists were setting up their inability to undertake the revolution as a revolutionary principle.

Under these conditions, it is not surprising to witness the regrettable spectacle of the authors' incapacity to reduce the worst anti-Soviet slander to dust in the course of their "debate" on the anniversary of L'HUMANITE, when they preferred to hush the indignant protests.

After a reading of this book, a thought comes to mind: "Oh, how beautiful the Soviet Union would be if there were democracy, pluralism and self-administration there." In other words, if socialism in the USSR were dressed "in the colors of France."

(In the next issue we will discuss other falsifications in this book.)

'Anti-Working Class Attitude'

Paris LE COMMUNISTE in French Nov 78 p 6

[Article by Edouard Beaumont: continuation of "The USSR and Them"]

[Text] In last month's issue, we commented that the authors of "The USSR and Us" observed the Soviet Union "through the distorting lenses of the bourgeoisie." This attitude is confirmed by the articles by Martine Monod and Michel Cardoze in L'HUMANITE, and by the self-managing delirium of Pierre Juquin in the 30 October 1978 FRANCE NOUVELLE, in which he voices "a very violent opinion about the historical experience of more than 60 years."

These assumptions of extremist positions are to be found on the one hand in the book in discussions of questions basic to the interests of the workers' class, and on the other in the various articles on the excessive and false role assigned to the intellectuals. These are the problems we will take up here.

The five authors adopt veritable anti-socialist positions in their work, denouncing the artificial nature of the lack of unemployment and the establishment of prices. Our scholars do not understand why the socialist state voluntarily practices full employment, fixed prices, very low rents, free medical care and education for all. Well, it is very simply because socialism is not developing from crisis to crisis as the exploiting regime is, but is

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

being built voluntarily. It is not profits for a few which are being sought, but the interests of the workers and their mastery of affairs. We regret to have to say that this is on the elementary party school level.

It is entirely true that the authors noted some positive aspects in the USSR on these matters, for in fact wage-earners can pursue continuing education on all levels, the manual professions enjoy prestige and the workers are called upon to become the political and technical managers of society. One might be tempted to ask why and how, but is this not the proof of real socialism? This is not the concern of the authors of the book. These aspects with priority for the workers are drowned in a jumble of considerations designed to sow doubt, all with tones of mistrust for those who labor, and so for example the Soviet worker is apathetic toward progress, his labor efficiency is mediocre, and office workers are gratuitously described by the insulting petit bourgeois term "an army of petty officials."

To pursue this pseudo-analysis of the Soviet workers is to deny the constant effort to improve techniques made by the workers themselves, to be disappointed that the Soviet workers are not subject to the lock step against which their brothers in capitalist countries are struggling, and also to deny the decisive role of the trade unions in the administration of the socialist economy.

This denigration, this contempt for the laboring strata is accompanied by a glorification of the role of the intellectual. Let us note that this term is never exactly defined, but appears to mean one who has full freedom to think and write, which could not be the case for the assembly-line worker or the office employee at his desk. Thus Martine Monod takes up the defense of Rostropovitch without seeking to know what he says or does, simply because he has a "marvelous cello" (L'HUMANITE, 18 October). Thus Michel Cardoze praises the merits of "the truthfulness of the researchers" (L'HUMANITE, 21 October) and theorizes on "the specificity of intellectual work in the spheres of criticism and the necessary invention of modes of social life" (L'HUMANITE, 3 November). From that to making of the intellectuals the vanguard of the workers there is only one step to take, since "no one can replace their heads and pens" (L'HUMANITE, 3 November).

These arguments, in preparation without a doubt for the 23rd congress, are gravely serious in nature, for they show that the opportunistic faction has embarked on the negation of the ability of the workers' class to direct the revolutionary process and socialist society, even if on page 105 of the book "The USSR and Us" it is still assigned the role of a "decisive force." This will only surprise those who have failed to understand the full scope of the abandonment of the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Finally, this book is anti-workers' class, and in the broadest sense of the term. But in writing this we think we should warn that this would not be justification for an anti-intellectual attitude because of the gratuitous and erroneous assertions. It is out of the question to confuse the real

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

intellectuals with these equally real petit bourgeois, theorizing about their inability to adopt the positions of the workers' class.

To seek to discuss the Soviet Union without rejecting its own so-called "Stalinist" opportunistic deviation leads to the desire for self-justification at all costs in the eyes of the class enemies, and the best means of doing this is to go in search of arguments in the enemy's propaganda arsenal. But this entirely dogmatic attitude provides proof that the opportunistic faction no longer has any consistent concept of socialism, on the one hand, and that it no longer knows how to express the slightest solidarity, on the other, as is proved by the lack of protest against the bombing of the Tass offices in Paris.

If it seems relatively easy to denigrate the USSR, did the opportunists realize that this gives the bourgeoisie an increasing opportunity to attack our party? The most recent example is indicative. In connection with the abject statements by the fascist Darquier de Pellepoix, it was our party which found itself called upon to denounce . . . the alleged anti-Semitism of the CPSU.

Be warned, comrades: to engage in anti-Sovietism is to favor anti-communism, and in the final analysis it means weakening the workers' class.

PCF Anti-Sovietism

Paris LE COMMUNISTE in French Jan 79 p 6

[Article: "The CPSU and the Anti-Sovietism of the PCF"]

[Text] The anti-opportunistic militants could not help but feel encouraged in their battle by the article by four members of the CPSU which appeared in the Soviet periodical KOMMUNIST and which was reprinted in full in the French issue number 52 of TEMPS NOUVEAUX.

We wrote in our last issue that the military defense of the socialist camp would be improved to the extent "that it relies resolutely on a political strategy oriented exclusively toward revolutionary internationalism," and we commented that it does not suffice to attribute "to Claudin and Elleinstein alone positions which are also those of Marchais and Carrillo."

The authors of the article in KOMMUNIST, in attacking the book "The USSR and Us" under the heading "Against the Distortion of the Experience of Real Socialism," answered the attack by militants in our party who hoped to win the support of the comrades in the CPSU for their struggle against the anti-Sovietism of the opportunistic faction. This article shows that they are in the process of realizing that the hostile attitude toward the socialist camp evidenced in the PCF is not solely the work of some would-be liquidators who have broken entirely not only with internationalism but with communism itself.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

This article, the last section of which is entitled "The PCF Has Always 'Suffered' From Imperialism!" seems to want to say that it is on the level of the party as a whole that the liquidation of the internationalist principles on the basis of which it was created has been undertaken.

But it would be wrong to attribute the responsibility for this undertaking to the authors of "The USSR and Us" alone. For this reason no one should be surprised that it was not specified that this book had been supported since it appeared by an official Politburo communique and that the leadership has organized a whole campaign of meetings to see that the membership "assimilates" it. Similarly, to attempt to contrast G. Marchais with the authors of "The USSR and Us," quoting a passage from the "Democratic Challenge" which came out in 1973 is to obscure the real picture of the extent of the faction hostile to the socialist camp within the party. In fact, re-reading these lines, it is easy to see the party secretary's heavy insistence on the fact that the CPSU was able to engage in public criticism "of its own faults," concluding therefrom that this "makes it necessary today to seek out everything which broadens democracy, everything which increases the responsibility of men." The "Democratic Challenge" was written a year after the signing of the joint program and three years before the 22nd congress. In reality, these few phrases, skillfully expressed, prepared and paved the way for the shameful campaign on the "violation of the rights of man" in the socialist countries and the scandalous denunciations of the need for these countries to use coercion against certain of their citizens pursuing activities hostile to the socialist regime.

After noting the abandonment of our party's attachment to the USSR and the socialist camp, the authors of the KOMMUNIST article ask what could have happened in these recent years "to lead these five French authors to question the answers to questions provided as long as a quarter of a century ago, by the French Communist Party itself, among others?"

Well, 15 years of the policy and practice of the joint government program and unity of the left, and the rally to Eurocommunism have transpired. Devoting particular attention to the shameful attitude of the leadership and the opportunistic faction during the necessary intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968, it was during this period that the propensity of the opportunists of all sorts to move away from the socialist camp and then to show ever-increasing hostility toward it appeared and then developed. To embark upon the path of class collaboration means inevitably moving into the realm of denial of the most basic internationalist principles.

Acting with a view to giving our party an authentically communist strategy, the anti-opportunistic faction is at the same time working toward the re-establishment of relations of internationalist solidarity with the USSR and the socialist camp. That is why it is entitled to expect of them all the understanding and political assistance necessary to the success of its battle, which comes within the context of support and strengthening of the international communist movement.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

PCF Anti-Sovietism Revisited

Paris LE COMMUNISTE in French Feb 79 p 9

[Article by Edouard Beaumont: "More on the Subject of the USSR and Them"]

[Text] On 5 February 1979 FRANCE NOUVELLE published a so-called document supposedly in answer to the criticism of the book "The USSR and Us" carried by the Soviet periodical KOMMUNIST. This article is strangely anonymous, a curious means of seeking to pursue a real debate. But this is not the only reason which leads us to return again to this subject, for the method of this anonymous author (or authors) is in flagrant violation of the basic procedure for dialog among communists.

In the final analysis, it appears that only the eminent "researchers" accredited to the CERM have the right "to criticize" the USSR. In fact, the Soviets are attacked for saying that this is no "criticism," while the "thinkers" of the opportunistic faction take offense. In the name of the clearly understood interests of communist fraternity, the Soviets are reduced to the rank of "adversaries," perhaps betrayed by their translators, and are accused in the manner of the anti-opportunistic militants of being incapable of understanding--indeed of reading--the illuminating writings of the opportunistic faction. In the final analysis, they find themselves labeled with the infamous term dogmatic.

And this is what the opportunists regard as discussion.

But we cannot accept such a state of affairs in silence. Since the defender (or defenders) of the book supported by the Politburo states without further reservation that "for French communists, historical truth is a compulsory element in their policy," we insist on taking a closer look at certain points.

How could FRANCE NOUVELLE allow this fable by French communists to be published in 1979 without even a suspicion of condemnation by the 20th Congress of the CPSU? In this connection the reader should refer to recent issues of LE COMMUNISTE. But where the dishonesty seems to us to exceed all bounds is where the article seeks to combine the repression of the period of Stalinist opportunistic deviation with the just coercion used against anti-Soviet elements working objectively for the imperialists when they have not asked for aid. Must we seek the explanation in the fact that the opportunistic faction felt it had more in common with the likes of Sakharov and Shcharanskiy than with the communists who were the victims of the Stalinist period? Moreover their eagerness to make pronouncements about that period comes more from a desire to appear respectable in the eyes of the bourgeois censors than any real historical analysis.

The assertion is made again gratuitously and in bad taste in connection with the socialist nature of the USSR. While the Soviet comrades point to the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

total lack of any clear response to these questions, the advocate (or advocates) of "The USSR and Us" gives a quotation from page 43 which should put the seal on 220 pages of doubt extending to the point of disparity. On the other hand, any comrade seeing that in the USSR there is a workers' class regime and the means of production are collectively owned and calmly concluding therefrom that "the USSR is a socialist country" would find himself accused by the eminent "dialectician" (or dialecticians) of surreptitiously reintroducing the "theory of the model," like KOMMUNIST.

The summit is reached when the Soviets are accused of deriving "unkind or insulting epithets" for the authors of "The USSR and Us," because they dared write that "the great misfortune of these authors . . . is that they showed themselves completely incapable of detaching themselves from the bourgeois democracy familiar to them." If it comes to that we must regretfully admit that this is the exact truth.

This matter of "answering" the periodical KOMMUNIST is diametrically opposed on the one hand to the method of Elleinstein, publicly slandering the socialist countries by comparing them to Nazism, and the friendly bourgeois parlor conversation represented by the publication of the letter from Figueres to Mme Carrere d'Encausse concerning his most recent anti-Soviet work. But none of this is in any way contradictory, being a perfect illustration of the current usage in bourgeois democracy.

When the analyses by the Soviets are not scoffed at, they are quite simply ignored. In fact, Boris Ponomarev criticized the policy of the Eurocommunists twice, at the theoretical conference in Sofia and in the periodical KOMMUNIST. The secretary of the CPSU explained that the attitude of "certain comrades" not only "cannot help but do harm to the workers' movement" but that it "in no way advances the expansion of the influence of the party over the masses, nor attracts new strata of voters to it," whatever the opportunists may think on the basis of the electoral results achieved by the party. Ponomarev stresses that "such a position encourages the class enemy to exert greater pressure on the communist parties." And isn't this how the French bourgeois press proceeded in connection with "The USSR and Us," and the preparatory documents for the 23rd congress, in a way which could be summarized by the headline in the 14 September 1978 LE MONDE: "Yet Another Effort, Comrades!"?

Author Defends Book's Relevance

Paris L'HUMANITE in French 2 Apr 79 p 6

[Article by Francis Cohen, member, Bitterolf cell, Croulebarbe section, 13th Paris Federation: "From 'The USSR and Us' to the Draft Resolution"]

[Text] Some comrades say they see a contradiction between the documents submitted for discussion on the one hand and the publication of "The USSR and Us" and the approval of it by the Political Bureau seven months ago.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

I on the contrary, as co-author of the book, have the feeling that our book has taken its proper place in the general advance of the party which led to the 22nd congress, its clarification by experience and the thought and confirmation the stage of the 23rd congress represents.

The idea of a conflict can only come from a false reading both of the book and the documents.

The book is not "what must be thought about the USSR in the future." It is based on a contemplation of the implications of a revolutionary strategy based on the drafting of an original path toward a kind of socialism which is itself original. This leads to two strong concepts. First of all, socialism is not achieved by carrying out a pre-existing ideal scheme: it "must be born of and grow as a specific response to the specific needs of each country" (draft resolution), and existing socialism must be studied as a function of these needs and their development. Secondly, socialism is a process; it will give rise to its own contradictions; it must constantly be perfected; each people contribute something specific to it; and where it exists, the struggle continues within it for more socialism.

But what is really at issue in this discussion is the overall assessment of socialism--as it exists--as an historic advance.

1. It represents a historic advance in the development of the modern world. There is no need for argument to demonstrate that the life of mankind in the 20th century is dominated by the emergence of socialism as a hope materialized, as a moral, political and material support to the struggles against imperialist exploitation and domination, as a world force interested in peace. Otherwise, the question of socialism would not be posed in France as it is.

Most certainly two substantial events with considerable effect on the balance of forces in the world have occurred since the draft resolution was prepared and must be taken into account: the serious defeat suffered by imperialism (American, primarily) in Iran, and the Chinese aggression against Vietnam. If it is clear that the former fact only confirms the assessment in the documents, the second demands a broader examination. I have three comments on this subject.

The stand taken by the PCC [Chinese Communist Party] on foreign policy may weaken the internal position of socialism. The relations established by the American and Japanese imperialists with China are not, moreover, lacking in a vague hope of bringing it within the capitalist orbit. This poses the problem of alternation on a scale which shows that when our party speaks of alternation, it is something quite different from the electoral concerns attributed to it. It is hardly likely that the Chinese people reject the prospects opened up to them by the socialist revolution, but one cannot regard asking the question of them as impossible.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

This is not the first time that force and threats have been used in relations among socialist countries. In taking over all aspects of the life of nations, socialism has not yet been able however to devise its own way of settling problems. But this time, something new has appeared. On the one hand the Soviet Union has attracted world attention with its double determination to aid Vietnam and to prevent the spread of the war. On the other hand, if China thought it could play at war, it was not as a socialist country and to settle a conflict between socialist countries, but embarking upon the game of the imperialist powers, which have not renounced war as a means.

In dealing with China and encouraging the aggression, the trilateral powers are prepared to take the greatest risks. For them, vast concessions may be made to China, even if it is socialist, if this might reduce the influence and the means of action by the USSR. This is the dazzling confirmation that socialism exists and that the USSR as it is is its main force. What, otherwise, would be the source of this unrelenting and unfailing concentration by the world capitalist forces on the same enemy since October 1917?

2. Existing socialism represents an historic advance for the fate of the peoples and the workers.

Barring an absurd demand for all or nothing, one cannot merely put down on the debit side for socialism, to the point sometimes of denying that it exists, the disparity between our ideal (more or less confused with a universal humanist ideal of which each individual has his own image) and the specific stages of its realization, the inadequacies which it criticizes itself in order to advance, and the sometimes unacceptable failings which affect the cause common to us all.

Even if it is difficult to calculate what the socialist countries would have been like had they remained capitalist, semi-feudal or semi-colonial, one can gain some idea by noting the poverty, the insecurity of life, the hunger, the social contrasts, the lack of education, the absence of any democracy, the conditions and rates of growth, and international importance of their neighbors or counterparts.

It must not be forgotten that what is asked of socialism, what we deplore not always or not yet finding in it, is something not to be found in capitalism either and something of which it is incapable.

To note what should be improved or replaced in socialism as it is does not therefore mean either rejection of socialism nor exclusion from it of the countries embarked upon that path. It simply means drawing the lessons from experience, which shows that there is no linear or unified development in socialism, but a process made up of contradictions overcome.

In the text under discussion I find this dialectical method which is based on the contradictions in things themselves.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Thus "unity is a battle" is not a simple statement that there is a struggle between adversaries and supporters of unity, but means that each step in unity creates new obstacles and demands new solutions. The convergence of anti-monopolistic interests is not the simple sum of objective convergences, but gives rise to and includes contradictions which must be overcome in struggling for and with the various categories in question.

I would like to stress two other aspects of the preparatory documents, which in my view are important.

On the one hand, there is the distinction clearly made between social alliances and political alliances: the latter do not derive from the former automatically or without problems. The link between the social struggles and the political--electoral or other--struggles are of a complex nature. One does not occur without the other, and one cannot replace the other.

On the other hand, a considerable effort was made to re-examine a certain number of concepts and formulae. Formulae can be exhausted or become ossified. They can be emptied of their meaning or become outmoded pure and simple. This is the fate both of the old and the new ones, when they are isolated from their historical, theoretical or political contexts.

For example in the draft preamble to the new bylaws, the basis of the party analysis is "scientific socialism." This strict concept is both broader and more open to development than that of "Marxism-Leninism." This latter concept is limited to the work of two men, great though they were, and the era in which they acted and thought, and evokes a kind of code they handed on to us.

Thus there is no more question of "mass organizations." There is nothing wrong with the term in itself, but it harks back to a concept of these organizations as channels of transition between the party and the masses.

The draft bylaws speak of the trade unions and organizations of associative life (the draft resolution adds the movements and specifies that communists must respect their "independence," and not just their "program and specific nature").

In this connection, I think it would have been useful for the purposes of discussion to set forth not only the new concepts, positions, and formulations, but also the reasons why the Central Committee is proposing them, as well as the objections which they must inevitably have raised in the course of preliminary discussions.

Haven't we some tendency to set forth the result of our contemplation and our discussion without explaining the paths that led to them? Such explanation however would facilitate discussion, comprehension and thus implementation. Isn't this an important aspect of the content of this

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

information for party members to which precisely the draft bylaws attach such democratic value? Oral reports, often heard by a minority of comrades and thus passed on per force unequally and impoverished to the extent that the distance from the origin of the concepts becomes greater do not always suffice. As to the tribunes for discussion, they only fill this function imperfectly, for most often they involve nothing but objections to the previously established positions, and ill serve the purposes of true collective exchange.

The experience of the authors of "The USSR and Us" persuaded them of the usefulness of circulating new ideas, even if imperfect or subject to criticism. In almost 150 discussions, they contributed to a real "exercise" of the book. Some individuals recoiled at first from the facts set forth, from the fact that they were being discussed, or from the consequences suggested. Others found confirmation therein right away. In the final analysis, the conflicts of ideas led to joint advances.

Finally, I would insist on the fact that it is as militants with special knowledge making it possible to do the necessary research (according to the terms of the draft resolution) on "the ideological and political struggle and the theoretical questions related to our strategy and its implementation" that we felt it our responsibility to write our book. This seems to me a capital aspect of democracy in the party. Democracy is not handed down from above, but implies mutual confidence and initiative on the part of everyone.

Much remains to be done in order, as the draft resolution demands, to raise the specific contribution of the communist intellectuals to theoretical and political research and the political battle to the level of the needs of the party and the aspirations of the communist intellectuals themselves. The party has acquired a considerable volume of very positive experience in this realm, but the needs have increased enormously, as has the number of individuals involved. The solutions without a doubt require work organization measures, but they can only result from an intensive, diversified and patient joint effort.

5157
CSO: 3100

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

COUNTRY SECTION

FRANCE

THE DISSIDENT INTELLECTUAL AND FORMAL PARTY STRUCTURE

Relationship With Institutional Left

Paris LE MONDE in French 29-30 Oct 78 p 2

[Article by writer and sociologist Nicos Poulantzas: "The Contribution of the Intellectuals"]

[Text] A chasm separates the institutional left from the party of the intellectuals, rallied for more than a year around certain basic themes. It is false to maintain that the intellectuals deserted the camp of the popular forces, out of opportunism, out of fear of losing their power, or again that the left, out of a simple instinct for self-preservation, has shied away from the truth presumably revealed to it.

However it is by means of such simplistic reasoning that each side is salving its conscience, at the cost of the other. Thus the intellectuals are justifying their disagreement with a left wing deaf to the basic problems of our era, and the left can heap contempt on the petit bourgeois intellectuals who could in a critical political situation be recovered by the right wing.

There should however be no prohibition on thinking that the questions raised by the intellectuals are real questions badly put, thus allowing the official left wing, whose purpose this suits, to express contempt toward them.

Here are some examples.

One of the decisive virtues of the discussion on totalitarianism is the comprehension of the totalitarian phenomenon in its full breadth, not merely as a situational phenomenon, but as a basic coordinate of modern times, in the East as in the West.

But how has it generally been explained? According to some, totalitarian phenomena can be imputed to the leading philosophers, Hegel, Marx, etc, who having drafted a so-called "closed" system of thinking, invested the state with the rationality of society in the end and thus led the modern Leviathan

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

to devour civil society. According to others, totalitarianism is the product of the zeal of princes to achieve a great harmonious unity, to abolish the divisions within society and between society and the state, to merge society and its other aspects into a single sameness, while democracy would involve the reasonable administration of these divided aspects.

The first explanation, which in the final analysis reduces history to the production of ideas, does not offer us much. The concept of the state as a radical evil which underlies it necessarily leads to a merger between the really totalitarian forms and the democratic forms of the state. Totalitarianism would be the essence, the true secret of any state. It is a paradox that this approach echoes certain highly debatable aspects of the thinking of Marx himself about the state, as well as a number of the analyses of fascism by the Third International (fascism revealed as a truth of the liberal state). How on this basis can the positive value of political democracy be established, how can the struggle to expand it be waged? In the name of what can totalitarianism be combated?

How then can one be surprised at the distance between this faction and the discussion within the left wing, pursued just recently in a search for institutional guarantees of liberties which the state of law should provide?

The second explanation is still more serious, while being more descriptive: "The denial of social divisions is not specific to totalitarian regimes, but more or less marks the historic development of every modern state." Still further, if we see the foundations of democracy without distinction in the social and political divisions, how can we avoid the justification pure and simple of any division then (between the haves and the have-nots, the leaders and the led) necessary to democracy? Do our present societies, based on these divisions, spontaneously contain freedoms, do they have an irresistible tendency toward democracy, which only the efforts of perverse leaders to achieve unity serve to oppose?

If totalitarianism is a general phenomenon of modern times, would it not be to the extent that its roots are found in the materiality of social and technical divisions of power characterizing present society, in the East and in the West? Wouldn't this mean totalitarianism which cannot be combated except by changing that materiality, and therefore without sinking into the utopia of overall unity?

Another subject of intellectual discussion is the relation between the thinking of Marx and the "gulags." The fact of having made the existence of these camps known to the broader public is not the only virtue of this discussion. Having been one of the first to attack the new philosophers, it is the more difficult for me to admit they have another virtue: having expressed, with less originality than is sometimes claimed, but what matter, the basic idea that the existence of the camps cannot be conceived simply as a deviation of Marxism (Stalinism), which would exempt the original and

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

and supposedly "pure" Marxism from guilt. It was simply that Marxist discourse could be used to justify the camps.

Indeed, some aspects of the thinking of Marx (his eschatological prophecy, among other things) which can be challenged could be used to justify the camps. But the heart of the affair lies elsewhere: to explain the "gulags" in terms of Marx's thinking again means reducing history to the production of ideas. The theory would be made responsible for the real to the extent that it gave rise to it.

Now there is always a structural distance between theory and practice. Marxism is not "responsible" for the totalitarian regimes in the East any more than the Lumieres philosophers were "responsible" for the totalitarian regimes of the West. This distance between the theoretical and the real is valid, to an unequal extent, naturally, for all theories, including Marxism, despite its pretensions of absolute scientific rigor. One of the great teachings of this time is perhaps that there is no theory, however liberating, which can of itself prevent those trying to close the gap between theory and reality from using it for the purposes of totalitarian power.

But the fault then does not lie with Marx, nor with Jesus, Rousseau, Nietzsche or Sorel. Only this persistent distance can explain that it is to these thinkers, undeniably less state-oriented in the context of their epoch than others, that totalitarianism is ascribed--to Jesus, Rousseau (Bonaparte), Nietzsche (Hitler), Georges Sorel (Mussolini), and finally, Marx, whose constant and primary concern was the decline of the state.

The main gain, finally, from the intellectual discussions is that power does not come down to the state, but resides in a network of relations which covers the whole of the social fabric.

The undesirable aspect is the development of this problem in total concealment from the state. At a time when authoritarian state power is gaining ground everywhere, an approach to consideration of the state would disappear to the benefit of a concept scattering power throughout a multitude of social microsituations. There is a trace of something like moral rejection here, with the state still appearing as a radical evil. To wage a battle on the terrain of the state would be to expose oneself to the risk of contamination by the state, which might recoup in the struggle.

This is a real problem, but poorly put here too. If power indeed involves a series of relations going far beyond the state, it does not prevent the state, insofar as it condenses the relation or balance of forces from remaining an essential apparatus of power.

The basic question which the left wing recently set forth is how, in a transition to democratic socialism, to articulate the self-administration struggles and the deployment of centers of direct democracy in society as

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

a whole, on the one hand, and the profound democratic transformations of the state (but also the parties of the left) which would guarantee the freedoms, on the other.

One of the effects, and not the least, of the division between the left wing and many intellectuals, is the fact that the field was left free for a right-wing offensive such as has surely not been seen for a long time. But the actors themselves are affected, the intellectuals delighting in a convenient fantasy of generalized dissidence, running the risk of plunging ever further, with the aid of the media, into the role of state intellectuals, traditional in France. The left wing is barricading itself still further in its fortress, while it is in the process of losing, at increasing speed, an ideological influence which it had maintained for a long time. It certainly falls to the intellectuals to take the initiative in a rapprochement. The crisis on the left may facilitate this.

Political Role of Intellectuals

Paris L'HUMANITE in French 9 Jan 79 p 2

[Article by Michel Cardoze: "What About the Intellectuals?"]

[Text] The Committee of Intellectuals for the Europe of Freedoms (CIEL) will voice its views this evening in an open discussion on FR 3 [radio and television channel 3] (the CIEL will be represented, in addition to its secretary-general, Alain Ravennes, by Eugene Ionesco and Jacques Henric, as well as Paul Goma, a writer who left Romania last year).

The platform of the CIEL (January 1978) was contradictory enough that the individuals who put their signatures to it were diverse: let us say for the sake of simplicity that they ranged from the confirmed right to the usual and well-known phases of social democracy. This platform proclaimed the desire to free culture and cultural values from the realm of political conflict, on the one hand, but it also clearly asserted--and several weeks before March 1978--the necessity of avoiding change. "The present crisis, even its aggravation, remains preferable to the outcome which appears likely with every developing doubt: the totalitarian certainty." Let us overlook (but should one, really?) the quality of the intellectual method involving reducing the choices offered to the societies of Western Europe to these two alternatives--either moral, political and economic crisis, or else "totalitarian certainty."

On the basis of this "choice" (one can clearly see, in relation to the alternatives of political life, what this involves in terms of support and rejection) the CIEL developed a concept, for European space, of intellectuals as the guardians of freedoms above all. The distortion of the great tradition of the intellectual as a "moment in human awareness" (a term used by Anatole France at Zola's funeral) is accompanied by a kind of terrorism turned against all those who reject the false choices of the CIEL: if you want change, you

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

are enemies of freedom. The defense of Dreyfus today means the maintenance of the framework of crisis, the only guarantee of pluralism! This is the theme of Carter's speech, among others.

The purpose of these few comments is not only to recall that the choice has never been that, from the point of view of the PCF: its strategy breaks with the crisis (unlike the temptation toward social democratic compromise) by means of democratic development and expanded and developed freedoms. Without this democratic development, the strategy of struggle of the 22nd congress has no meaning.

The frequent and quite proper stress placed, in very broad intellectual circles, extending far beyond the CIEL, on the need to resist any attack on the freedoms to think, to write, to publish anywhere, instead of being a burden, joins with and strengthens a vital component in the life chosen by the PCF.

And it is precisely to implement this that we are making a break with the concept of intellectuals as witnesses, beacons, consciences, as pertinent to a time when freedom may have seemed like a bonus, a supplement to other gains, advances and revolutions in the economic and social order.

The role, the number and the place of intellectuals also leads to a turn away from a concept of the intellectuals--precisely that of the CIEL which is basically a distortion, limiting them to the role of witnesses of morality for a decaying society.

According to the PCF, the intellectuals have other and better things to do.

Citizens and workers, they are not separate beings, and social change, democracy in business--self-management--is their business: this is the specific realm of the alliance with the workers.

As to those who choose active participation in political life in the PCF, they are neither intelligent ornaments nor the talented illustrators of documents the essence of which escapes them. Contrary to the concept of the Giscard d'Estaing ideologs who founded and direct the CIEL, who want to keep the intellectuals apart from "politics," from its drafting and implementation, assigning them instead a "noble" function as the lighthouse-keeper of freedom. Let us repeat, and the Vitry meeting bore living witness to this, that the PCF does not endorse this desire to mutilate the participation of those intellectuals who have opted for direct political engagement.

Does this mean that, where the PCF is concerned, equality among communists means uniformity? To study, to discuss, to publish, to debate burning subjects as Marxists--this was the appeal issued by the Political Bureau at Vitry. A party which has become an intellectual collective needs within it the specific contribution intellectuals can make because of their special capacity for amassing knowledge, for research, for the production of ideas.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

This is far from the concept asserted and implemented--for example in the CIEL--by the Giscard d'Estaing right wing,

Role Within Communist Party

Paris L'HUMANITE 29 Mar 79 p 7

[Article by Serge Wolikow, Honore de Balzac Secondary School Cell, Guy Moquet Section, Paris Federation: "On the Subject of the Intellectuals"]

[Text] I am struck by the rarity of the contributions which deal with the problems of intellectuals in society and the work of the party in leading them, and I have been astonished to note the lack of participation by communist intellectuals in matters affecting their role, their activity and their own responsibility in the party. These observations explain why I am risking the comments which follow.

The problem of the intellectuals cannot be taken up outside the strategy and the general activity of the party. The draft resolution deals with it in several places. I would like to stress here the most important aspects and, it seems to me, the newest in its analysis.

The Intellectuals and the Crisis

The intellectuals are involved in the crisis, since the Giscard d'Estaing policy has affected the life and work of many of them. In the enterprises, technicians, cadres and engineers are suffering from dismissal and deterioration of working conditions. In the public services, in education and health, the effects of the regime's austerity policy affect them directly. The draft shows how, in this situation, the intellectuals have been led to defend their demands by struggle and to take their place in the democratic battle.

But if the crisis creates a substantial potential for the convergence of the struggle, it has contradictory effects affecting the intellectuals too. It affects them in fact in differentiated terms and by this token gives rise to contradictory behavior. This is an objective hindrance to the alliance between the intellectuals and the other workers and creates a base allowing intervention by the regime and the owners' class.

The Intellectuals at Issue

In its description of the counteroffensive pursued by the Giscard d'Estaing regime to extend its positions, the draft resolution is stressing, in my view in a new way, the assets to be won which the intellectuals as a whole represent.

For the regime, it is no longer only a question of neutralizing the intellectuals, but of winning them over ideologically and politically for recovery of monopolistic domination as a function of the crisis. To this end,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the regime is exploiting the diversity of situations to set one group against the other and to isolate them from the workers' class, pursuing a vast ideological campaign.

This ideological undertaking is being pursued globally with the help of the social democrats. The draft resolution emphasizes its new nature and terms it ideological warfare.

This "situation" of the intellectuals within French society is necessary in order to define what the policy of the party should be with regard to that.

The draft resolution seems to me to reveal the need to abandon once and for all a certain idyllic and linear view of the alliance of the intellectuals with the workers' class and the other categories of workers.

Because of their very nature, it is necessary for the communists, in order to overcome the obstacles to alliance, to approach the intellectuals with a presentation of the whole of the party policy, to discuss the overall political conditions for change with them, and thus to make them understand the role and the place the workers' class must occupy therein.

But at the same time the political and ideological activity of the communists has been too general to date. In order to be effective, it must take into account the diversity of the intellectual strata and their specific aspirations. Moreover, this is something quite different from the simple adding together of corporatist demands.

This presumes a complex battle and profound thought. On this point the draft resolution is headed in the right direction. I am thinking in particular of the decision to study--finally!--the social classes in systematic fashion, creating a work group for the purpose in the Central Committee, or again the decision to link the party work with the ITC [engineers, technicians and middle management people] with the "business" sector.

Much work remains to be done. This presumes further thought.

The Communist Intellectuals and Their Place in the Party

The idea that the role of the intellectuals in the Communist Party cannot be formulated in terms of an alliance between the workers and the intellectuals seems to me to be undoubtedly one of the basic propositions confirmed at the Vitry meeting. Although it did not provoke open rejection, how can we fail to see that in fact it is often ignored by the very individuals who claim to be concerned with the position of the intellectuals in the party?

Thus it seems to be useful to return to this question in order to note how and why it is indispensable to evaluate our approach to the question of the intellectuals properly.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

In discussing their role in the party, there has long been a tendency to place exclusive stress on their contribution to the specific activities of the party with regard to the various categories of intellectuals within society. As I have noted, this contribution is indispensable and irreplaceable, providing the Communist Party with the means of integrating the specific information characteristic of the strata with which it is dealing in its thought and activity. But this kind of approach does not suffice for a consideration of the role and place the intellectuals can occupy as a whole in party activity.

We ourselves have often used the term "relations" (between the party and its intellectuals) in discussing the problem. Was this not an indication of a limiting concept of the links between the party of the workers' class, on the one hand, and the intellectuals, on the other?

We reject the concept according to which there is a choice between only two roles for the intellectual in the Communist Party: either effective propagandizing of the party policy as a brilliant commentator knowledgeable in handling the oral and written language, or else a critical mind, a spokesman and Cassandra which role only an intellectual can play because of his training and intellectual sensitivity.

These two images of the role of the intellectuals in the Communist Party lead to a restrictive concept of their role, because then they are placed by definition outside the process of drafting policy, expected either to illustrate and propagate it, or to contribute a contemplative supplement to it.

To judge from their writings, is it not clear that some retain the outdated idea that creative and living intellectual activity is not the business of the revolutionary party as a whole, which is incapable of it?

Specific Contribution, Specific Responsibilities

The direction of the Communist Party seems to me to be radically different. To confirm this it suffices to examine the address by Georges Marchais in Vitry and the part of the draft resolution devoted to the party and its theory.

The activity of party contemplation is expressed in very diversified fashion, in the drafting of its strategy, the concept and the practice of party functioning in its various forms: theoretical research, education, propaganda. "Today, our party itself has become an intellectual collective developing its theory and policy. The intellectuals who are members of the party contribute fully to this process."

It seems to me that the entire party activity is inseparable from intellectual activity, which cannot be reduced to the mere process of understanding society, including the reflection by the party on itself, this activity being inseparable from the revolutionary policy of the party in all its dimensions.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The party does not say to communist intellectuals: "You have a specific contribution to make," in order to please them or for tactical reasons. Similarly it does not say to them: "You have an awareness, a good knowledge of your circles," simply to help the party to effect the alliance. In fact, because it must undertake ever-broader, more complex and differentiated intellectual work, the party absolutely needs the specific contribution of the intellectuals to the theoretical and political development related to the conception and implementation of the democratic path.

This reflection by the party is thus the business of all communists, and not just the intellectuals.

He who says specific contribution also implies the specific responsibility of the party leadership to facilitate the work of the intellectuals, and the responsibility of the intellectuals themselves to embark upon this work.

Developing Research

The strategy of the democratic path and the new analyses on living theory set forth in the draft resolution create the most favorable conditions for the development of party activity on all levels. But they also make the inadequacies clearer, the more so since the bourgeoisie is systematically undertaking to organize its ideological offensive.

It is not a question of ignoring the research work published on various questions, nor above all the theoretical advances made in connection with the development of the party strategy. It seems to me however that research, as well as the ideological initiatives of the party, have failed to advance to the extent demanded by the needs resulting from the ideological struggle and the development of our policy.

Critical examination of these inadequacies should in my view be pursued in close relation with the positive thought which leads to proposals. I have been struck by the disparity between the potential of the intellectuals' our party boasts and the state of our ideological battle. The development of study and reflection seems to me to have been sadly out of balance.

The advances in our political theory which I have already mentioned serve, it seems to me, to make the importance of developing research still clearer.

On the level of our strategy, the links relating research, general theoretical reflection and the policy of the party are beyond question. But this link does not develop spontaneously, because political activity and research are different things and do not develop at the same rate.

Political and ideological activity are designed to alter the level of awareness and the political conduct of individuals. In this connection, it is different from the scientific knowledge of society, but at the same time,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

it must incorporate its results, and in relation with policy, in order to be more effective.

This produces a number of consequences. It is necessary to organize theoretical reflection and research according to specific modalities, with their own resonance, in order to have an overall view of them and to be able to give them an impetus linked with the general political and ideological activity of the party and its needs.

Two Proposals

These remarks and comments lead me to put forth two proposals:

1. The congress resolution should explicitly contain, within the chapter devoted to the party, the idea that "the relations between the workers and the intellectuals in the party is not the same as that in society. It is not viewed in terms of alliance. Party unity is the unity of all the members of the party with equality of rights and duties on the basis of the fundamental goals they define together and for which they fight together." This is the wording in the report delivered by Georges Marchais in Vitry, and I am surprised that it was not used textually in the draft resolution!
2. The Central Committee elected by the 23rd congress should prepare and adopt a new document pertaining to intellectuals and culture and in particular the problems of the ideological struggle and research, as the Political Bureau proposed in Vitry.

Concept of 'Collective Intellectual'

Paris L'HUMANITE in French 7 Apr 79 p 6

[Article by Antoine Casanova, Paul Eluard Cell, Besancon Section, Doubs Federation: "The Party as Vanguard and the Communist Intellectuals"]

[Text] After an already long history, the French Communist Party has become the party of the workers' class in our country, the revolutionary vanguard in France. These precious gains are in no way, however, a frozen asset. Doesn't their living and real extension require that we make a more precise and proper assessment of what this role and this vanguard function imply in today's France?

Doesn't the exercise of this role pose more forcefully and urgently than yesterday both the question of increasing the capacity of the entire party for intellectual activity and action and the problem of the need, more indispensable and replaceable than ever, for a contribution by the communist intellectuals to the life of the whole of their party?

It is these problems, I believe, which are at the heart of our life, our action, our questions, our thought. The Central Committee meetings of 1978 and 1979 and meetings such as that in Vitry last December bear witness to this.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Dealt with and set forth in the draft resolution, they are however still too rarely found, it seems to me, in the contributions to the discussion preparatory to the 23rd congress. This observation coincides with that made by Serge Wolikoff in the 29 March issue of L'HUMANITE. It is also along a line consistent with his thinking that I take the liberty of making some comments and suggestions.

What the Vanguard Role Demands

I would mention first of all some of the aspects I see as implications of the vanguard role of the French Communist Party under today's conditions.

Being the vanguard political organization of the workers' class entails taking the possibilities, questions and contradictions inherent in the popular movement and the class struggle as a whole into ever-better account in all of its documents, undertakings and actions. In other words, to focus on the essential aspects, taking into account:

The enrichments of knowledge, analyses, membership, and potential for action which, against the policy of the state and major capital, arise from the convergence of unprecedented depths between the workers' class and the working people as a whole, and developing at the same time on new terrain (from women's liberation to the quality of life) in which aspirations for freedom, for control of existence in all realms of collective and personal life are rising;

The questions, difficulties, searches and undertakings which also give rise to disparities, the illusions characterizing these struggles and aspirations, with in particular a tendency to experience them partially, separately, easily recoverable by the various reformist "solutions";

The intellectual research effort, answers both basic and speedy, diversified and consistent, required by the counteroffensive (which is particularly acute in France), both political (making every revolutionary prospect and attitude repulsive, wherever it has developed or may develop) and philosophical (denying the intellectuals and the worker-citizens as a whole any rational and consistent prospect, rendering them incapable of going beyond partial and splintered views).

At the same time, and above all under today's conditions, the communists cannot jointly establish the goals and the tools for this vanguard action, with equality of rights and duties, unless the party constantly and more extensively nurtures these documents and activities by diversified contributions, experience and knowledge which only the great diversity of the practical roots of the communists can provide. In other words, as G. Marchais stressed in his report at Vitry, "the vanguard which is the party of the workers' class is not only the vanguard of the workers' class. It is the vanguard of the entire historical movement. The policy of our party is the policy of the whole vanguard, made up of workers, office employees, peasants and intellectuals."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

These requirements and these needs posed by the vanguard activity developed in unity from the diversity of contributions finds its answer and should ever increasingly still find that answer in the functioning of the PCF as a collective intellectual body.

The analysis of the historical process of the development of the present mode of party functioning as a collective intellectual body (in other words the members of the party as a whole: workers, peasants, intellectuals, etc) would require both development impossible here and analyses (historical, epistemological) which are just beginning to emerge. Let us say only, in summary and very tentative fashion, that the method of knowing the real and acting upon it suited to the party would seem to be the constant correlation, nurturing and mutual enrichment (according to various, complex, developing modalities) of the heritage (made up of gains and questions) of Marxist theory, multiple knowledge (in particular of social processes), experience developed in common (on the basis of different social situations which serve to complete the experience of the workers' class while also being illuminated by it) in the overall movement of social relations and class struggles, and also the experience, constantly renewed and enriched, in the form of organization best suited to guaranteeing freedom of thought and efficiency of action in the revolutionary battle against heavy capital.

The process of activity and the drafting of the theory and policy of the revolutionary party in France, as it exists today (that is to say as opposed to the 19th century or the beginning of the 20th century) has to do with the organic links among all the contributions, factors, living sectors of experience. The functioning of the whole of the party as a collective intellectual body cannot therefore be reduced either to knowledge viewed separately nor to a type of experience in the struggle continued separately. This functioning of the whole does not seem to lend itself to reduction to the mechanical or sociological sum of these contributions and factors either, or again to the hegemonic predominance of one element (the worker or intellectual element, for example) or the other. It is a living, original functioning (also inseparable from the overall movement of social relations, which merits extensive study and examination, moreover) in which the drafting of guidelines and analyses needed by the party results from this circulation of contributions, exchange among them, their mutual nurturing and enrichment. And all this in a process in which the relations among worker, peasant and intellectual members exists on the basis of organic unity and equality, not in terms of juxtaposition or even alliance.

Improving the Work of the Communist Intellectuals

Today more than ever, the process of Marxist and revolutionary development involves the drafting by the party, to use Lenin's words, of "an assessment of the experience gained enlightened by a profound philosophical concept and by an extended knowledge of history" ("Works," Vol XXV, p 440). It is a question at the same time of a movement in which the special contribution of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

each type of experience or knowledge, far from being dispensable, is essential to increasing the capacity for knowledge, development, initiative and struggle of the whole of the party, that is to say the full realization of its vanguard role.

In this connection it is indispensable, for example, for the party to put into use the forms of organizing reflection and work which will allow the militants in the large enterprises to compare their experience more effectively, to benefit from the contribution of the problems as well as the knowledge of the whole of the party. Conversely, this gives the various party organizations (cells, sections, federations, Central Committee) an opportunity to benefit from the precious assistance which better knowledge and more effective action in this decisive sector of the class struggle represents.

The same is true today where the organization of the exchange of thought and work by communist intellectuals is concerned. The considerably increased role (both qualitative and quantitative) of the intellectual strata in the country and the capital importance, as well as complexity of achievement, of their alliance with the workers' class, the need for substantial improvement in the capacity of the entire party for intellectual activity are such that it is vital and profitable to find and put into use the forms of organization and labor most likely to allow communist intellectuals to give the full measure of their specific contributions: in the knowledge of their own environment, indeed, but at least to the same extent and above all in the development of concrete research as well as the drafting of categories which will make it possible better to comprehend the trend of the sciences and knowledge, the movement of social relations, and thus, against the various and massive irrational crusades, to contribute to ensuring a better perception and mastery on a Marxist and rationalist basis of the movement of unity and specificity which in complex and inexhaustible fashion the process involves.

To help the communist intellectuals in this connection by such meetings as that held in Vitry and those held by the federations in January, by the establishment of new or improvement of existing premises and bodies for thought and research--this will mean for the party as a whole providing the means to guarantee a theoretical, political and practical vanguard function which will be ever-increasingly that of the historic movement as a whole, with the stakes inherent in it in France today.

Two Suggestions

Thus I would conclude these few comments with the following suggestions:

The proposal that in the portion devoted to the revolutionary party, where it says: "What distinguishes our party from all the other groups is that it represents the vanguard political organization of the workers' class," the congress should add: "and thereby the vanguard of the entire historical movement."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

2. I would in turn support the proposed amendment suggested by Serge Wolikoff, i.e. that the resolution of the congress explicitly include in the chapter devoted to the party the idea that "the relations between the workers and the intellectuals in the party are not the same as in society. They are not viewed in terms of an alliance. Party unity is the unity of all the members of the party, with equality of rights and duties, on the basis of the fundamental goals they define together and for which they fight together." This quotation from the report by G. Marchais seems to me to clarify and complete the draft resolution, with which moreover it is profoundly consistent.

'Communist,' 'Intellectual': Contradictory Terms

Paris LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE in French Apr 79 pp 41-43

[Article by Maurice Goldring: "Inward Look: Permanent Tension"]

[Text] Maurice Goldring initially tried out as a polemicist at LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE. Accordingly, it is undoubtedly superfluous to "introduce" him to our readers. Let us however recall that while teaching at Vincennes he published books on Ireland and "Surviving in New York" after spending a year in the United States. He also wrote "The Accident," his reflections as of March 1978 and whose continuation includes the political introspection below.

A communist intellectual. A large mass of clay laid on the floor. Large gobs are first perceived which then outline his form and then more flexible bits become evident and the lines become clearer. Churning around the floor shoe soles crush the fatty earth.

A growing number of intellectuals are present everywhere in society, in production, the arts, communications, education, and research, everywhere, even in politics. The first difficulty is that they are diverse. Let us accept the following as a definition of the intellectual: "The one who professionally uses skills, knowledge, and 'savoir-faire' of a high caliber, generally acquired through advanced education." He can thus be a teacher, a researcher, an inspector of finance, a television producer, a president of France, an engineer, or a police commissioner. In a circle which has common characteristics, the communist will bring out differences. He is badly brought up. His language, cultural references, gestures, books, films, weeklies, and evening paper are often those common to other individuals except for his choice of the morning newspaper, L'HUMANITE.

There are differences and contradictions. There are material differences between a young teacher who is starting at who knows what wages already and the no less young sprout to whom a firm in the private sector pays 30,000 French francs a month--two worlds separated by a Chinese wall.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

There exists a cultural community divided by the class struggle. To whom am I closer--the sprout who has become president-general manager or the activist who is a steel mill worker? I could answer this spontaneously but moderation and reason prompt me to reply as follows: I move away from the intellectual integrated in executive circles because his social position inevitably prompts him to consider my intellectual activity suspect. I am close to the activist steel mill worker because his militant effort creates between himself and me a solid field of possible understanding.

A Marginal Comment

I shall make a marginal comment here. People call it a heterogeneous, contradictory circle. People say that the crisis of capitalism generates new contradictions. Is the working class immune from this analysis? There are conventional hierarchical contradictions with cadres. There are contradictions between skilled and specialized labor, under new forms, connected with the fact that the most unskilled labor consists mainly of immigrant workers and women.

One should not thus consider the heterogeneous nature of the intellectuals as one of their specific traits whereas the working class is supposedly welded as a homogeneous bloc. The difference--there are many others--is that the "intellectual community" is divided by the fundamental clash of classes. In the working class the goal is to overcome existing contradictions of all kinds to better secure its unity. Among the intellectuals what is involved is to "break" this community, to break some loyalties, to break unanimity.

When I defend my ideas in an intellectual circle I shock people. When I assert my specific status as an intellectual in my party I cause friction. I unquestionably feel that people expect me to mold myself according to the most conventional form of the activist, to plane all those rough edges which make the brotherhood of battle more difficult. I have at times given way to this pressure to speak of my circle with a certain condescension. You will understand that my colleagues are frail while at the Renault automobile plant... Enough said. I fight for my ideas uncompromisingly, but I refuse to consider as negative the loyalty that ties me to my social and cultural circle. That is where I work, that is where I live, and that is where I struggle.

To Abdicate?

The class adversary who undoubtedly feels somewhere the frailness of the interim period exerts pressure in the same direction. For him an intellectual who joins the communist party is no longer an intellectual. Rather, he abdicates his freedom. He swaps his critical spirit for Marxism, its pomp, and its dogmas. As soon as he speaks he displays his chains. He talks of exploitation, class struggle, inequalities, revolution and reformism. He is lost. All of this, naturally, in the name of the struggle for the rights of men. The gulag: Look where it leads when men who use the same

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

language achieve power. Thus, the struggle against the gulag begins with the silence imposed on criticisms leveled at capitalism. The sought goal is to create a situation where the unemployed worker--who instead of declaring in a playful tone "I seek work" will say in a somewhat sorrowful tone "I am unemployed"--will find himself treated as a Stalinist, a Sta-lin-ist!

In high places where people cogitate, these themes recur insistently. I hear people repeating objections to Marxism which I thought childish or outdated. In the high places where people reflect there now rules a worldly terrorism which raises obstacles to any social criticism. These people are the colleagues of the Soviet officials. So, you have decided to participate in the struggles of the working class. You have chosen exile. Very well, you will have asked for it. You are divested of your intellectual citizenship, we are relieving you of your passport, we close our borders to you. You will not be able to cross them again except at the price of a reneging, of making a declaration on your honor: "I regret my pledge. Never again. Give me back my passport." They offer a choice between rallying to the cause and silence.

Well then, silence no way. Silence is something of the past. My intellectual citizenship depends on my activity, on the work that I produce. It can do without your bureaucratic seal.

I struggle for my liberty, also for yours which is inseparable. An intellectual who makes someone else shut up could not be free. When you take my passport away you put on the uniform of the border guards. I want your thoughts to be printed, thoughts which excite me. And let what I have in mind, which irritates you, be printed. I shall return blow for blow under conditions that I want to make the same for everyone. This is on one condition, insufficient and necessary, that no one, neither you nor we, has the official or unofficial right to withdraw anyone's passport.

The conventional images of the revolutionary intellectual are crumbling amid noise and dust.

The prophet intellectual, the messiah who brings light to an exploited mass. Dust.

The besieged working class: the intellectual joins its positions and fights at its side. He shouts: "Father, take care to the right; father, take care to the left." Dust.

Another dislocated image. The intellectual lauds the struggle of men. Hey, you there, you have a nice voice, an attractive pen, a handsome brush, a nice drum. Take the lead and sing. He takes the lead and he sings. He sings in the lead. He thus thinks of himself as a general. Outside, they also take him for a general. He is happy and proud. He realizes that he is not the chief at the first word that he wishes to change, at the first change that he wants to make. Dust.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

From all sides some wish us to believe that an intellectual can only be either an official of someone in revolt. Dirty hands or a naked heart. As always, this trap can function because it is not completely alien to reality. This is not a reason to allow one to be taken in.

Firms have available house engineers and those who graduated from the "grandes ecoles" [prestigious professional schools]. The latter have more advanced theoretical training generally enabling them to better adjust to technological and scientific changes. The former, trained in large numbers, have acquired great experience but in a very specialized field. They are less well equipped to face reassignment when called for, and unemployment affects more of them and for a longer time. Modern production needs high-caliber engineers with theoretical training, but this high level of training makes them less docile, more difficult to control.

What type of intellectuals does the communist party need? It needs intellectuals not subject to control.

Everything begins when one wishes to please one's father. With the purring, the track, and the path already traced, words which please, sounds which caress, the grass which leans with the wind. And tell me, how should one never please? It is indeed necessary that at one time or other ideas should coincide, resolves should overlap, externalities should recognize each other, and everything freeze in the pleasure of being together, in that harmony of the jelly which takes the form of the other, the water mattress, the feather pillow. I like what you have just said, that is, your words have assumed my forms, I lie comfortably in them. The will to displease is another form of dogmatism. Surly, never satisfied, what else will he say. To do the opposite is still to imitate.

Neither one nor the other. The communist party needs intellectuals who raise questions in their time, in keeping with their work and changes in the world, without censure, without self-criticism, without the paralyzing need to please or displease either their party or any coterie whatever. That is not easy, there is a constant contradiction in it which can become conflictual or enriching for political activity. The idea that activist work could be confused with intellectual work or that intellectual work could coincide with militant activity is an attractive, generous, and erroneous idea. Tension is permanent.

Among you that is private. You are in a special milieu. No one else but you raises those questions. Let us turn down these stifling comments, for privacy is the only mode of existence of the collectivity. Who is it who lives in a nonprivate milieu?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The Richest Symphonies

Let us reject these comments for another reason: They threaten to impoverish our perception of the world. How often have I heard it said when concrete examples of repression in a socialist country were injected into a discussion, "That is an intellectual concern"? Even if this were the case such "concern" should indeed be faced. But this is not the case. This concern is general, and the refusal to see it seems to me to disclose a fairly scornful attitude vis-a-vis the working class which is judged, in the name of I don't know what fabricated image, to be insensitive to attacks on liberties. Let us leave to the right and the reformers this idea which degrades the struggle of the working class.

No matter where you may be, whoever you may be, you are never alone, you never ask solitary questions. Everywhere the entire world accompanies you. Thus, each time that you keep quiet thinking: "It is not important, it involves only a small minority, I shall not disturb the others with my specific questions," not only do you silence a voice which is not so unimportant--yours--but additionally you silence a large number of people who might have identified with your question or your comment. It is not because some will keep quiet that others will talk more.

If everyone talks, that naturally creates noise and it will be more complicated to convert this noise into music. But the richest symphonies are those which succeed in blending contradictory melodic lines. Otherwise one hears: "Hey, this is rubbish," whose only effect is poor enough.

I shall not deed to anyone the gift of the intellectual who was led astray in the communist party and exhibits his torn conscience. My activity is irreplaceable. Even if it at times irritates those who cannot bear not to master everything because it never knows in advance either the questions or the answers. They will have to learn to live with it because it is precisely for that reason that it is irreplaceable.

If all that is involved is to copy, duplicating machines are quite sufficient.

COPYRIGHT: 1979, Les Editions de la Nouvelle Critique

2662
CSO: 3100

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

COUNTRY SECTION

FRANCE

DISSIDENT INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES, RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIETY

Totalitarian Societies and Individualism

Paris PARIS MATCH in French 10 Nov 78 pp 70, 71, 103

[Interview with Vladimir Bukovskiy by Jean Elleinstein: "Is Communism Perverse?"]

[Text] Vladimir Bukovskiy is the Soviet dissident who was exchanged for the Chilean communist leader Luis Corvalan in 1976. Bukovskiy, who now lives in Great Britain, spent long years in various prison camps and a psychiatric hospital in the USSR, as described in his book published by Robert Laffont entitled ". . . And the Wind Blows Again." Here, in a fully illuminating discussion on communism with Jean Elleinstein, the French historian of the communist party, questioning whether it is basically perverse or has been corrupted by the sequence of historical events.

[Elleinstein] I believe that you are right in denouncing a certain number of entirely basic characteristics in the modern Soviet Union, characteristics from which you have suffered physically, in your life. But you go all the way in your reasoning: the aspiration toward social equality is utopian and any effort to achieve it can only lead to a dictatorial regime. Any communist or socialist movement in the West or in the East must end in the "gulag" phenomenon. I think that it is there that we disagree basically.

[Bukovskiy] The question is whether it is possible to build a socialist or communist society in my country. We have been forced to study our Marx and I think I am not wrong in telling you that Marx predicted a victory for socialism in the most advanced industrial countries first of all.

[Elleinstein] Precisely, Russia in 1917 was a country which had never had any structure, any tradition, any organization which was democratic, a country which was relatively backward economically in part, and in any case, culturally. The revolution was followed by an atrocious civil war at the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

end of which the bolsheviks found themselves the sole masters of power, inheriting precisely centuries of barbarism, exercising an iron dictatorship due to the civil war. This naturally does not serve to excuse the bolsheviks. Nothing can be excused. But the civil war in particular was not the doing of the bolsheviks alone, that is to say there were the White armies. They committed as many atrocities as the Red army. There was also foreign intervention. This was the product of the civil war which cannot properly be isolated from the role of the Cheka or the GPU. Or, in the years which followed, precisely the conditions under which these bodies, as you note in your book, emerged and developed.

[Bukovskiy] It seems to me that you disagree with the thinking of Lenin on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

[Einstein] Yes. I criticize certain aspects of Lenin's thinking in particular on the problem of political democracy. He underestimated the role of the formal freedoms which the Marxists called bourgeois freedoms for too long, and which I think have a universal and permanent value. If I referred to Lenin, it was not so much in the context of freedom. Rather I had in mind the monograph he wrote on the development of capitalism in Russia. Lenin showed that Russia, after passing through the capitalist stage, had entered into the stage of imperialism and that as a result, Russia was entirely ripe for the proletarian revolution. In this work Lenin gave many examples and figures showing the very high level of industrial development in Russia at the time.

[Bukovskiy] I have little to say about history in what I have written. It is not at all that I have not thought about it, and not at all that I have not tried to study it, but I know that for the public at large, historical digressions are likely to be boring. Now I tried to write for that audience. I told of my experience, my life as a dissident, it is the memoirs of a dissident which I have written. My intention in this book was not to write a history of these last 60 years, but to describe my life in the psychiatric hospital in Leningrad, in the Lefortovo prison in Moscow, the concentration camp in Voronezh.

[Einstein] This is where the interest of your book lies. It is a human document, but at the same time you contribute supercritical assessments of Marx, of Eurocommunism, of socialism and communism in general.

[Bukovskiy] Let us come back to history. In the West, it is often and wrongly thought that Russia which had a supposedly barbarous tradition, a tradition of slavery, made a serious error in espousing Marxism, which it was only able to alter and distort. As a result the blame is removed from Marxism and placed on the shoulders of Russia. Now a study of Russian history from the end of the last century and the beginning of the 20th century shows that slavery had been abolished two years before this was done in the United States.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Einstein] For the blacks, but not the peasants. The difference is that the peasants represented the bulk of the Soviet population, while in the United States barely 10 percent of the population were slaves.

[Bukovskiy] Perhaps, but it was an identical problem. Similar psychological structures within the framework of a society tolerating slavery were involved.

[Einstein] No, Russia was not barbarous.

[Bukovskiy] Politically and psychologically, society had ripened, the abolition of slavery had come before it did in American society. This is but one aspect of the question. Similarly, the fact that the reforms of the 60s established justice in Russia which was "just," and that regionalization, local authority, was a highly developed institution, are forgotten.

[Einstein] Cultural lag is not an inherently Russian characteristic, for we find it in China and in a large number of other countries in Africa and Asia or in Latin America at the present time. What is at issue it seems to me is the lack of formal freedoms, such as freedom of the press, of association, of universal suffrage. And none of these existed in Russia in the epoch of the czar, even if a certain number of these freedoms developed after 1905 under the pressure of the revolution, precisely, and the czar had to make concessions. I would like to come back to the essential thing because it seems to me this is a basic problem you are posing. You write in your book: "Men do not find absolute equality except in the cemetery. If you want to transform your entire country into a vast cemetery, then yes, join the socialists. But man is such that the experience of another, the explanations of another never convince him. He wants to try everything for himself. And it is with horror that we are now watching events in Vietnam, in Cambodia, as it is with sadness that we listen to the patter about Eurocommunism and socialism with a human face. Strange, no one speaks of fascism with a human face, but why?" Why? Fascism with a human face cannot exist because the inherent aspect of fascism is its inhumanity, because it is based on racism, on hatred, on terror, and on a whole series of dictatorial methods.

Finally, this leads you to the most abject pessimism, and to acceptance of Western society as it is because to challenge it, as you say in a very clear way, and I believe that your thinking has the merit of clarity, means risking the conversion of our whole country into a vast cemetery. I believe that this is the crux in a way of our discussion. As to socialism with a human face, you tell me, there is none. But the fact that history has not created it does not mean that history will not. History shows that many things have been created which did not exist before. Otherwise, we would still be at the Adam and Eve stage.

[Bukovskiy] Marxism is based on hatred as much as fascism is. Marxism is based on class racism.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Elleinstein] Marxism recognizes the existence of a class struggle, that is all. But it is not based on the class struggle. It recognizes the existence of social classes with opposing interests in history. It is based neither on racism nor on hatred. It is a problem of economic relations, social relations, political relations. From this analysis we can today conclude that a democratic, peaceful, gradual, legal path toward socialism is possible in the West today, not a brutal, dictatorial and barbarous path such as history has created to date. I think that you are beginning with an interpretation of Marx which is perhaps what is learned in the Soviet schools, in the courses on dialectical materialism and historical materialism, but one which does not correspond . . .

[Bukovskiy] Has the PCF abandoned the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

[Elleinstein] About two and a half years ago.

[Bukovskiy] Has your party then emerged from barbarism?

[Elleinstein] The French Communist Party began with the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat which did not correspond in any way to the historical practice in Russia since 1917. It was on different bases that we viewed these problems and finally, a perversion, a distortion of these ideas occurred.

[Bukovskiy] You have raised very serious problems and I would like a moment to try to formulate an answer. I would like to stress once again that at the end of the last century and the beginning of this one in Russia, for a period of two generations, there was a multi-party system. There were numerous political parties. Where political punishment, legal political sanctions were concerned, they were only applied to terrorists. I agree with you entirely, we fall far short of absolute freedom. There were people, there were communists, who were sent into exile and even forced labor. This is a fact, but the specter of opposition political parties was rather considerable. There was almost total freedom to emigrate. And to escape from political exile was nothing. One had to be lazy to stay in exile! There is one reality: to seek the route of Soviet communism in the barbarism of historic Russia would be a mistake. How many Soviet citizens who tasted communism ended up in the camps? But let us not limit ourselves to Russia . . .

[Elleinstein] Even such developed countries as Czechoslovakia have been subjected to Soviet influence.

[Bukovskiy] I sense that you would like to broaden the field of discussion while I would have liked to answer your first question. My conclusions in no way lead me to believe that a historic tradition in the socialist countries is involved, that there is no question of ethnic characteristics.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Einstein] I never said that ethnic characteristics were at issue.

[Bukovskiy] None of the results familiar to us can be attributed to these characteristics, although they have certainly had some influence. Marxist ideology, wherever it may be implemented and whatever the era in which this is attempted, will fatally and inevitably lead to the result of which we know. I know a little about the dialectical method. One can well imagine now that France might be accused of having a barbarous past if by misfortune it were to undertake to build communism which would lead to the "gulag" phenomenon. There would be references to the Great Terror, to Bonapartism, to the colonial empire, it would be noted that in France there really had never been any real freedom. It would be said that the French are a violent people, that they have always loved revolutions and the barricades. This is an example to show you that after the fact, in dialectical thinking, it is always easy to find explanations like that you have just given me for what happened in Russia. If tomorrow we were to see communism in Germany, then it would be said that indeed there was Nazism first, and that the Germans have a great propensity for things totalitarian.

[Einstein] I did not say that the people were to blame. I simply said that there have been a certain number of historical conditions which have led to the historical situations of which we know. I do not extrapolate from the situation of Russia. I simply say as a historian how things happened and under what conditions they happened. I believe that this is exactly the way the state functions. For look at what is happening in Nicaragua, for example. There it is not Marxism which is at issue, but I presume that you condemn what is happening in Nicaragua?

[Bukovskiy] Naturally.

[Einstein] It is not Marxism which is at issue, but the functioning of a state. And that state is receiving aid from the American authorities in a certain number of fields. I think that this has nothing to do with Christian thinking and this is not because Carter is a Christian. It is not because Somoza or Videla in Argentina are Catholics that the rights of man are being violated there. It is the functioning of a state which is at issue. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the criticisms you make of socialism or Eurocommunism on the basis of your own experience lead in the end--and I think that this is the basic point on which we differ--to a final rejection of any possibility of liberation based on what you call egalitarian utopianism.

[Bukovskiy] I think that as a historian you will agree that there are the rudiments or embryo of totalitarianism in every country?

[Einstein] Exactly.

[Bukovskiy] Thus it is not in history exclusively that the genesis of totalitarianism should be sought. It is not in the social structures to

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

which you have often referred that one must seek the sources of the totalitarian system. In each person, in each individual, the rudiments of totalitarianism are to be found. This is the danger of any utopia, whether it be of the right or a utopia described as of the left. For a utopia based on an idea which may be sympathetic appeals to bad instincts. Dostoevski was right when he said that one of the sources of energy, one of the most powerful motives for action in man is the hunger for a universal order.

[Einstein] I understand your passion, your indignation very well, but why criticize Marx only?

[Bukovskiy] It is precisely there that the danger of Marxism lies. These are indeed universal phenomena, as you have said, not characteristics inherent in the Russian. It is these characteristics which make the doctrine of Marxism so dangerous. I would say that the Church, at one time, when it renounced secular power, when it restrained and limited itself, showed that it was aware of the totalitarian danger, and that it was aware of the problems which the inquisitional phenomenon raised. In each one of us there is a seed of totalitarianism. There is a desire for superiority. There is a utopian in each one of us, there is an egalitarian will in each of us. My conclusions are not based on my experience, but rather on long observation of human nature. What Marxism and fascism have in common is the hatred which has a focus, a hatred which is directed. This is in reality a psychological phenomenon. There is some demonology in all of this. European Marxists should have renounced the secular and limited themselves to the spiritual.

[Einstein] You are comparing Marxism to a religion. Now this is one concept of the world, but lacking faith, and it is a method of analyzing reality.

[Bukovskiy] I see that we disagree entirely. Where I am concerned, I take my own experience as a basis and I describe the reality of a communist regime under which I have lived and suffered.

[Einstein] I would like to ask you two more specific questions about your book. You say that according to your most careful calculations, the number of persons being detained today is at least two and a half million, approximately one percent of the population, one citizen in a hundred. Where do you get this figure, and how can you justify it?

[Bukovskiy] This is a calculation which took us a great deal of time, in the prisons above all, where the prisoners are transferred. Transfer is a supplementary punishment . . .

[Einstein] How many camps are there currently in the Soviet Union?

[Bukovskiy] One could say about a thousand camps, with 2,500 prisoners per camp.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Einstein] Are these common-law prisoners?

[Bukovskiy] Yes, basically. The figure of 10,000 political prisoners quoted by Sakharov is doubtless correct, but to this must be added religious prisoners, the members of sects.

[Einstein] What is the death rate in these camps?

[Bukovskiy] In the North and in Siberia, the mortality rate is much higher than elsewhere.

[Einstein] Of a hundred prisoners sent to the camps, how many survive at the end of five years? It is important to try to make this precise because in your book you touch on the problem but only touch on it. You say either not enough or too much.

[Bukovskiy] Very approximately, of 100 detainees spending 5 years in prison, there may be a mortality rate of 3 percent. This is not very high.

[Einstein] In brief, I think that this very clearly illustrates the definition I gave of the USSR today when I spoke of false Stalinism. But finally, is it your feeling that the dissident movement is but the tip of the iceberg?

[Bukovskiy] I am entirely persuaded that the Soviet people do not accept this regime in their thinking.

[Einstein] You also said that "the West too is seeking to pacify its conscience."

[Bukovskiy] That is true.

[Einstein] For what would you reproach it?

[Bukovskiy] Beside the reproach the Soviet regime merits, it seems to me minor.

COPYRIGHT: 1978 par Cogedipresse S.A.

Societal Tolerance of Dissidents

Paris L'HUMANITE in French 20 Dec 78 p 5

[Article by J. Y. Bourdin: "Tolerance, Pluralism and the Struggle of Ideas"]

[Text] In the current anti-communist campaign, the idea of tolerance is used as a club-argument to silence the communists. To criticize a journalist or denounce anti-communist hatred would be to show intolerance, opening the way

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

to the "gulag" phenomenon. This is only possible through the reduction of the concept of tolerance, a value which is a part of the common heritage of mankind, to an insupportable caricature.

In the usual sense "to tolerate" one's neighbor, "to tolerate" the Arabs, means simply to bear, to take upon oneself, to suffer. At best, it means to show indulgence, to be conciliatory, to smooth rough corners. In brief, the existence of others being the limit of my freedom, by definition, to tolerate is to resign oneself.

One can clearly see the advantage for the regime, in a period of crisis, in having it believe that to be tolerant is to resign oneself, to accept (if necessary, "complaining" to oneself). But the trap in this definition is perhaps less obvious, for "there is a limit to what one can tolerate" must mean that there are bounds to human resistance, and the only solution then is . . . violence! When one can no longer "tolerate" the noise young people make with their motorcycles, then one seizes one's weapon.

Thus the communist militants are needed to remind their neighbors that tolerance is first of all dialog, going to talk with the young motorcyclists and to learn of their problems. It also means to act, to wage a struggle with them to get them a motorcycle track, for example.

Another common interpretation of the concept of tolerance is expressed in the phrases "that's his affair," "no need to concern oneself with what the neighbors do." Each individual is "free" and does what he wants. In a sense, this attitude is a proper reaction in view of the constraints imposed against oppression. But too often it is only another word for indifference, each man for himself. It is in the name of this concept of "tolerance" that people become deaf and blind to the vast cries of distress which rise everywhere in our society in crisis.

But no! When a young person takes drugs, when another attempts suicide, this is not the expression of their "freedom," a choice to be respected, but an extreme form of expressing the unhappiness which a society causes but does not want to hear about. The weight of the crisis on people's minds is such that we have come to conceive of intervention as exclusively repressive, because the laws are arranged to punish afterward, never to provide help before.

Here too one can easily see the interest of the regime in restricting thinking to the inhuman alternative of repression or retreat into oneself, indifference. But to want a more just and more fraternal society is to proclaim that there is no right to unhappiness or freedom to suffer. Here too tolerance involves first dialog, help, acting and struggling together, and as of the present, without waiting for better tomorrows. For those who take drugs, those who try to kill themselves, for the young unemployed woman forced into prostitution, tomorrow will without a doubt be too late.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Tolerance indeed involves recognizing the right of each individual to have his ideas, and to express them without censure or repression. But "to allow" the ideas of others in no way implies belief that all ideas are valid. This very current maxim which permits "to each, his own truth," most often used to cut short a discussion, does seem to have a "tolerant" air. In fact it expresses profound dogmatism and a profound contempt for the other. You can talk as much as you like, it is indeed your right, but for my part I retain my truth, and I will not re-examine it.

It is men who must be respected, not ideas. An idea is not respectable or contemptible, it is true or false. To allow another "his" truth contrary to our own is to regard him as unworthy or incapable of the truth. A communist does not respect, does not "allow," racist ideas, for example. He combats them all the more if the one expressing them is a respectable person, and precisely for that reason.

One can also see here how the regime benefits from the belief, in the name of tolerance, that all ideas are valid: what good is there, in such a case, in working for change? But tolerance is not silence, it is active dialog, it is also the confrontation of ideas. Without such open confrontation, which to be sure does not derive from the confrontation of ideas in order to attack men, there is no real pluralism, and no true tolerance.

But to speak of the scientific nature of Marxism--is that not intolerant, pushing into the shadows of ideology all that is not orthodox, seeking to impose a truth?

Let us admit openly that dogmatism among the communists is not at all amiss, either as regards the past or all too often, the present. But let us also say as clearly that the terrorist usage of the term "science" but communists has to do with their return, most often unconsciously, to an ideology which is not their own--positivism. It is a false conception of science which leads to the rejection of all ideology, the unquestioning acceptance of science. Science on the contrary demands discussion, debate, contradiction, it is in itself the opposite of dogmatism. To speak of the scientific nature of Marxism is to invite discussion, contradiction, criticism. As to ideology, far from representing the shadow of anti-science, it is according to Marx the way in which men gain awareness of the conflicts of their era. It is thus necessary, for the development of science and for Marxism itself, among other things.

Dogmatism and intolerance do not derive from recourse to science, but from a false concept of it. If there is no right to error or ignorance any more than there is a right to unhappiness, if there is only the freedom to know through recourse to science, this means recourse to research, to dialog, to confrontation, and this precisely is tolerance.

Where then does intolerance originate? Here too, a ready-made answer is available: intolerance is said to derive from difference itself. In the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

final analysis, intolerance is said to be an integral part of the human soul. It would suffice for two individuals to have different opinions, religion, or skin color in order for conflict and intolerance to arise immediately and naturally.

Here too one can understand the benefit to the regime of concealing the role of colonialism, of over-exploitation of immigrant workers, in brief of class interests in the birth and the diffusion of racism. One can see its interest in having it thought that the development of violence in politics is explained by the simple existence of different opinions and the rallying of these different opinions in different and opposing parties, for it thereby further conceals the class roots of political opposition, by reducing politics to a mere matter of personal opinion.

Anti-communist hatred, verbal violence, the desire to destroy and intolerance --all these have class roots. And it is correct to say that every class society creates irresistible obstacles to the concept of tolerance. As long as antagonistic class interests exist, the conflict of ideas will never be just that, but will express the objective antagonisms.

The idea of tolerance, carried to its extreme, thus leads to a search for a society in which there are no longer any exploiters or exploited, any antagonistic classes. It is only in the socialist society that tolerance conceived in active fashion as dialog, as positive pluralism, can flower, because it will be possible finally to build together. It will be even more necessary that the end to class antagonisms, if it removes the need for intolerance, avoids suppressing contradictions. Socialism does not mean uniformity, the negation of differences and contradictions, but merely offers the possibility of and need for dialog and confrontation, not to destroy the other but in order to advance together.

This active and positive concept of tolerance must be implemented in the struggle beginning now. Democracy as a form of struggle is active dialog. The struggle against anti-communism is the struggle against intolerance and violence in political debate, and thus involves all those who are devoted to tolerance. The daily struggle for the immediate goals, to re-establish the conditions for change, means restoring the meaning of hope, of joint work, of positive dialog--tolerance.

Relationship to Working Class

Paris L'HUMANITE in French 10 Jan 79 p 5

[Article by Maurice Goldring: "Intellectuals: Some Questions"]

[Text] The writers who comment on the Communist Party hardly bother with shades of meaning. Not so long ago, the party had no more intellectuals, had lost all influence in this sector. Then these intellectuals who had disappeared set about making a frightful racket, one would think some kind of zombie returned from beyond the grave.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

L'HUMANITE reported on the discussions which occurred during the Vitry gathering. Gathering is without a doubt the proper term. It was neither a meeting nor a worldly debate. It was a gathering at which the great political problems were discussed with passion, and without the paralyzing concern for pleasing anyone at all.

This long-awaited gathering recurred before the eyes of the readers of L'HUMANITE. This was a kind of happiness in two stages. First, my daily newspaper reported what had happened in Vitry. Secondly, it described how these developments tripped up our observers. Forced to draft their reports on the basis of notes carried in L'HUMANITE, they were all confused about it and did not know exactly what to say. I hope I will be forgiven for this lack of fraternal charity, but I prefer difficulties caused others by far to those which sometimes affect us.

In small matters, of course. Overall satisfaction and partial gaps can very well coexist. The main thing is the expressed desire that the discussion continue, that it be given space to develop.

Here then are some items for contemplation.

1. The workers' class is excluded from management of the affairs of the country. This situation is conflicting increasingly acutely with the role this class plays in production and in society. But as of the present, in the struggle for its emancipation, it is intimately intermingled with all the other strata of society. It is obvious to anyone who gets about a bit that the efforts of capitalism to compartmentalize the workers in the role of silent producers proved in vain some time ago. Never, when I go to an enterprise or workers' site to discuss or debate with wage-earners, have I had the impression of being in foreign territory. In one form or another, I find there the major trends, the great political and ideological confrontations in our society.

The workers' class has not withdrawn into a ghetto and the intellectuals are not isolated in an ivory tower either, and when they take action in politics, they rarely pose questions external to the overall confrontation. A first conclusion must be drawn from this situation: whenever difficulties develop with "the intellectuals," they should be heard as an alarm signal indicating much more general difficulty. Under the conditions of the class struggle in France today, when it is not possible to understand an intellectual, we are very close to being unable to understand a worker either.

Rooted in the national realities, the workers' class cannot guarantee its revolutionary role by laughable "protection" against ideas which in any case do penetrate it. Our policy requires direct struggle with whatever is not "us." It should involve permanent and shameless incursions into enemy or foreign territory, rather than fearful protection against any incursion from outside.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

2. As a working hypothesis, more careful study should be given a certain number of foreign experiences which reveal that the desire to decrease or eliminate the influence of the workers' class is accompanied by a break with the vanguard intellectuals. In Ireland, the alliance of the more conservative elements within the nationalist movement forced the vanguard of the workers' class into foreign exile and the great intellectuals into exile pure and simple. Reformism is very capable of attracting technocratic abilities, but it inevitably reveals chronic mistrust of the "critical" intellectuals, and also the creators of the vanguard, who are condemned in the name of a so-called popular culture.

Finally, the experience of the socialist countries, as an analysis outlined in "The USSR and Us" shows, indicates that the difficulties in relations with the intellectuals cannot be isolated from the difficulties of the workers' class in playing its full role in society.

The need to consider this is urgent, for the imperialists are reorganizing and trying to counteract what appeared in the 1960s to be an inexorable retreat. There is an effort to re-establish a mass base among the intellectuals for capitalism, for all the forces which reject the revolutionary break. The campaign on the subject of dissidence and the rights of man makes it possible to fill the breach. This campaign is serious because it is functioning. It is designed to paralyze any revolt against, any criticism of capitalism.

It is serious that after 30 years of war in Vietnam, a campaign can be waged against the Vietnamese people without arousing more indignation. It would have been impossible, three years after the end of World War II, to convert the extermination of the Jews by the Nazis into collective suicide. Some recent efforts have provoked powerful reactions. Three years after the end of the war in Vietnam, this is what has happened in the United States and in our country. The American president is able to address his people in a televised speech on the rights of man if you please, stating that his country owes Vietnam nothing because "the destruction was reciprocal."

It is serious, it is not normal, for the non-communist intellectuals to be in some cases in a better position, more aggressive, for denouncing what they call "the Western ideology of dissidence" designed to remove the intellectuals from the popular struggle.

Only a fraternal debate, if carried through to the end, can make it possible to free the energy, intelligence and capacity for struggle.

Relationship to French Society

Paris LE PARTI COMMUNISTE DANS LA SOCIETE FRANCAISE (The Communist Party in French Society) in French 1979 pp 76-80, 114-121

[From the book by PCF Central Committee member Jean Burles, Editions Sociales, 172 pages]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Excerpts] The Communist Party and Its Intellectual Activities

Its existence for the past 60 years has rendered this external nature concrete in France, and at the same time its internal nature with relation to the workers' class, always in development.

It has expressed the theoretical and strategic activities necessary to the workers' class for a knowledge of the movement of French society and its action in accordance with the veritable historical process of its development.

This is why historical reflection on the Communist Party is only possible because it relies on the real existence of the revolutionary party itself. In brief, this object is present, is there. It must be dealt with as such.

The reflection of the French Communist Party on itself reveals the potential of the need for this activity, both for the development of its theory and to integrate its rich experience in the current struggle.

Theoretical activity, strategic elaboration and the practice of policy are in fact inseparable in the movement of the revolutionary party.

This is why it seems necessary to take up these specific aspects of the revolutionary party here: on the one hand, its theoretical and political activity, and on the other, the relation of the intellectuals and the revolutionary faction, and more particularly, the intellectuals in the revolutionary party.

Very often these questions are posed (intellectuals and the revolutionary faction and intellectuals in the revolutionary party) on the basis of the historic example of the role played by Marx, Engels and more particularly Lenin, because of their part in the establishment of the Communist Party (b) and in the October Revolution. From this it is explicitly or implicitly concluded that the workers' class needs another social category both to contribute knowledge to it and to define its political strategy and its forms of organization.

In fact, this concept represents in part the transposition of the movement of society into the activity of the revolutionary party: the social division of labor between manual and intellectual labor. Since the former is subordinate to the latter, this should be reflected in political terms in the subordination of the workers to the intellectuals.

In addition, if one wants to use the historic examples of Marx, Engels and Lenin correctly, it is necessary to take numerous factors into account. Since their day, the changes which have come about have moved in the direction of greater specialization in intellectual activity in general.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Marx, Engels and Lenin functioned less as the bearers of specialized knowledge than as bearers of overall knowledge of the movement in society (we are familiar with the efforts made by certain "Marxologists" to limit the field researched by Marx to political economy alone).

Finally, their intellectual activity was within the context of the political struggles (the titles of numerous of their works bear witness to this) in a given period in the workers' movement when, for Marx and Engels in particular, and for a long period where Lenin was concerned, there was no revolutionary trend organized as a party.

In our day, the problem of the external aspects is set forth differently. First of all, we must begin with the real and enduring existence of a revolutionary party. Now an inevitable need derives from its nature as a revolutionary party: its intellectual activity. This activity is indeed the activity of the party as a whole, and is not limited to the activity of its intellectual members. It does not constitute a sector separate from the overall activity of the party. Intellectual activity encompasses that which makes possible the drafting of the communist policy--the drafting itself, its best possible expression and the raising of the political and ideological levels of its members and the masses. It includes not only the sum of the knowledge we have referred to above, but also education and propaganda.

Thus the theoretical activity of the whole of the revolutionary party includes the specific activity of the intellectuals, but is not limited to that. This implies that their presence in the party is not viewed solely as serving as a link with their social circle. Communist intellectuals, like all communists, function in their own circles, but again, like all communists, their role is not limited to this. This also means that their specific place within the party of the workers' class is not viewed in terms of an alliance with the workers' class. Otherwise, we would have again here the concept of a kind of social division of labor wherein, as in present society, specialized intellectual work would be assured of a privileged position.

This concept would mean in fact either that the presence of the intellectuals in the revolutionary party had only a utilitarian and temporary purpose for the party of the workers' class, or conversely, that the specific activity of communist intellectuals needed for analysis and investigation would imply a special right to party leadership.

The fact that all of the theoretical activity of the revolutionary party, which thus assumes its function as a collective intellectual body, involves the party as a whole, implies its ability to train worker leaders having gained a knowledge of the real movement of society and its transformation.

Thus to situate the exterior aspect other than in a social category which would not be the workers' class raises the question of the need for the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

revolutionary party, having knowledge of the contradictory movement of capitalist society and its negation, socialism, capable of drafting the functional concepts taking the form of political strategy and slogans, and defining the forms of organization and functioning it requires.

Thus it is a question for the French Communist Party of defining the revolutionary goal and the means for achieving it, linking the immediate struggle with the global struggle. The 22nd congress took this concrete step, defining the concept of socialism for France and democracy as a means.

Requirements of Intellectual Activity

We have already seen how intellectual activity is included in the very concept of the revolutionary party and what need it meets. Let us recall simply that in order to play its role, the Communist Party must be capable, by its collective intellectual activity, of reproducing the contradictory movement of society in its whole sense.

Let us return here to a particular aspect of this knowledge: it is knowledge of the overall movement of society and the conditions for its transformation. As knowledge of the movement, it must necessarily include everything which influences it, and among other things the activity of the revolutionary party to transform the real aspects.

For example when one studies the problems of unity at a given moment, one cannot proceed as if there were no history to that unity, in which the conscious efforts of the PCF have played a transforming role, profoundly integrated in the objective movement of social classes and strata. An example is the Popular Front, and the consequences and image of it which remain for the various social categories.

Thus a slogan such as "unity of the people of France" takes into account first of all the profound social subfoundation which defines the objective and measurable potential for alliance. But it also takes into account all of the political, ideological, cultural and even moral aspects of this alliance, and within these aspects, it thus takes into account all the historical effects of the activity of the communists (in the long range).

Moreover, the establishment of the effects of the activity of the PCF must itself be global: this activity occurs in fact through the implementation of an overall strategy oriented toward change. On the basis of this strategy, the political practices of the PCF as a whole and its action in this or that sector at a given stage in social development are defined. The effect of these practices cannot always be measured immediately (in the form of electoral results, among others), and there may be substantial inequalities in the implementation of this strategy. Only the determined implementation of the strategy as a whole in the sectors of party activity as a whole can alter the balance of social forces in depth.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Serious assessments of the effects of party action and a better understanding of its consequences in the movement of society thus presuppose that this strategy is allowed to be deployed in reality. The very character of the knowledge developed in the revolutionary party (all of the social reality in movement), the fact that its validity is judged not in terms of detail but in relation to the whole of society, and the fact that the contacts between this knowledge and reality are expressed in the form of a long-term strategy imply that one cannot question on a day-to-day basis a strategy conceived to be implemented over a very long period.

Finally, it is a question of an overall knowledge of the whole movement. Now as we will see farther on, if this depends necessarily on the experience and the knowledge of all communists, if it cannot do without this contact with what is real, this overall knowledge is not a simple juxtaposition of specific knowledge and partial experience. In order to lead to a consistent strategy, it must then be unified. Exchanges of specific knowledge and partial experience may be necessary under certain conditions, but their theoretical and political generalization in various places in horizontal form, sometimes urged, apart from a single direction or as the only solution to the problem of drafting revolutionary strategy, would only simultaneously codify the abandonment of the process of knowledge and the structuring of functional concepts, the rejection of a political strategy and the negation of the experience accumulated by an organizational structure.

The organizational form of the PCF should therefore make it possible to develop this unification of knowledge necessary to the drafting of strategy and revolutionary practices. Without this unification stage, it would seem difficult to draft a conceptual apparatus, concepts or slogans making it possible to act upon society effectively. There are multiple conditions for this unification, found both on the level of information for all communists and on the level of their discussion. In this connection, the multiple forms of education, making the greatest possible number of the results of research available, integration in propaganda itself of preceding thought and work, the materials drafted by the work commissions, the further meetings of the various party bodies and the reports of the leadership represent major opportunities for making available to the communists the largest possible number of elements of understanding. On this basis, the phases of unification themselves are multiple.

Democratic centralism is this form of organization and life which the PCF has fashioned for itself in the course of its rich historical development, in order to take on all of its theoretical and political responsibility.

The congress is the unifying phase par excellence for reflections of a theoretical and political nature, the analysis of the experience in the class struggle and their incorporation in the strategic orientation of the PCF. The 22nd congress represented that phase in 1976, but the movement of society does not function according to the congress schedule, and thus the unifying phases on the level of the party as a whole are multiple:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Central Committee, Political Bureau, national conferences. Let us say more generally that the different phases of discussion are each in their way phases in the unification process.

Factions

It is obviously necessary constantly to improve the conditions for the collective contemplation and drafting of strategy and its implementation. However, this cannot be done in violation or negation of the methods in which the PCF functions as a whole.

This is why the search for better internal functioning, toward which it is constantly necessary to aim, cannot involve the organization of the party into factions. This form of functioning would not be a positive development of the mode of internal life.

The PCF is a voluntary association. It is led by its experience to welcome men and women characterized by their diversity, and it exercises no discrimination with regard to membership. It has in fact members of different nationalities, expressing different concepts of a religious or philosophical nature, individuals whose behavior, personality and social life, as well as the way in which they practice these and formulate them in moral terms, can be reduced to no code. Thus we can immediately see very great diversity in the manner of experiencing and understanding reality and in the way in which each individual will assimilate his own history and that of the PCF. The development of knowledge, the assimilation and deepening of the specific theory of the PCF as well as this diversity of experience and sensitivity to what is real make up the means of expressing its revolutionary nature.

This diversity can indeed, under certain special conditions, involve a manner of comprehending reality and making a political response which, temporarily, might--for example in connection with the content of the joint program and the attitude of the PS toward it--approximate the position of the other faction in the workers' movement: reformism.

But if this similarity quite simply reflects the fact that the PCF is not a closed body, turned in upon itself, the fact nonetheless remains that there is no justification either for the desire to maintain this concept within it nor for the organization of these influences within the party. The behavior related to the reformist trend has already, in particular with regard to the PS, developed its own specific forms of political structure, moreover.

One could further add that a given opinion may even correspond better to the strategy, the form of activity, the necessary historical reflection on the PCF and on the international communist movement than the overall opinion of the PCF itself.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

But it is not in organizing that opinion into factions nor in enclosing it in the specific logic of a faction, that is to say in leading it to direct its thrusts at the elected leadership, that the PCF can advance in its revolutionary strategy.

It is on the contrary because of these characteristics of the revolutionary party, anchored in the movement of capitalist society, its historical experience and its method of functioning, that by its own autonomous movement, including the collective and specific contributions of its members, the PCF develops its revolutionary effort under particular historical conditions.

External support is only given, under the present conditions of ideological struggle, in order to hinder the process of the development of the revolutionary nature of the PCF and the method of functioning allowing its strategic use.

In addition, the efforts to define internal discussion needed to materialize the "factions" the PCF might include seem to me ill-founded theoretically. Certainly the social sciences hardly help us: they only recognize, strictly speaking, "currents of thought"* or ideological-cultural trends designating relatively consistent complexes of representations, symbols and ideologies (for example religion). But as of the moment one goes beyond simple representations and ideologies and places oneself on the level of society, as of the time one thinks of the relation of concepts, practices and individual behavior to the movement of society as a whole, the use of the word "trend" or "faction" must be stricter.

We have seen how the factions were established and structured on various levels of social life. It is this which enables us to understand the affiliation of the PS with the reformist trend and the PCF with the revolutionary trend. Thus each party is not the simple result of a balance of internal forces between the two trends, the difference between the parties being reduced to a mere question of "dominance" (the reformist trend would be dominant in the PS, and the revolutionary trend in the PCF).

A double conclusion can be drawn. First of all, the existence of trends in the PS does not mean the existence in this party of different "factions." In the PS there are no trends which would be affiliated with the revolutionary faction. The interplay of trends reflects other demands in the functioning of the reformist party in relation to the reformist faction it develops: the trends only reflect the incapacity of the PS to comprehend reality in its totality and the need to add, by means of its organizational structures,

*For example, when Roland Cayrol took up this problem in a study on "Movements, Trends, Factions" (Criticism of Political Practices, 1978), all he basically did was to theorize in his fashion on the speeches and practice of the socialists themselves.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the different reflections of reality provided by each of these trends. With greater reason, the real diversity among the members of the PCF does not reflect the existence of factions which would only have to be established to have the certainty of a scientific policy. I would even say that the effort to define diversity as creating factions within the PCF is an effort designed both to sterilize this wealth by consigning it within factions (each individual would then no longer seek to express the specificity of his contribution to the collective intellectual body, but rather to guarantee his predominance over the others) and to justify the organization of a factional structure from the bottom upward.

Now the consequences would be particularly serious for the PCF, because at the outset, they would contradict the demand for unification in the realm of knowledge, of intellectual activity, for the drafting of strategy and the consideration of experience.

COPYRIGHT: 1979 Editions Sociales, Paris

Elleinstein: Communism, Societal Models

Paris LE FIGARO in French 7 Apr 79 pp 65-68

[Discussion between Jean Elleinstein and Thierry Maulnier]

[Text] [Maulnier] Jean Elleinstein, you are going to publish a book with Julliard in April, "A Certain Concept of Communism." You have just published a book entitled "Stalin-Trotsky, or the Power and the Revolution." This book urges us to turn our attention to the struggle for power as it developed between the successors of Lenin in the USSR, and in a more general way, to take up the problems of power in modern socialist society, in the USSR in particular. The question which arises in a number of discussions concerning the present orientation of the Communist Party in France is this: "Should one date the excesses or abuses of the dictatorship in the USSR from the triumph of Stalin over Trotsky, or must one go back to Lenin? Is it possible to relieve Lenin of the responsibility for the development of Russian communism toward totalitarianism?" Stalin seized power in a rather short time thanks to his key post as secretary general. In fact, he was elected to that position in March of 1922, making what had been a mere administrative job into the key post in the life of the country. In short, the secretary general is not necessarily a bloody tyrant, but he has every means to become one very easily if he so desires.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

All the Power

[Einstein] He has all the authority.

[Maulnier] Thus it is for him to establish to what extent he uses it. We are faced with the conjunction of a man and a system which gives him access to supreme power under relatively speedy and economic conditions, and with the assistance of a certain number of bodies, perhaps basically the political police.

[Einstein] His power was based on the fact that the party apparatus became important after 1921. The number of party employees increased to colossal proportions, for by 1928 there were 100 or 120,000 in the Communist Party. Thus this already gave him considerable strength.

[Maulnier] Unlike Hitler, who brought with him assistants, who created a new form of society, Stalin for his part appeared in an established situation. The revolution had been effective, but had made no change in the institutions of the Soviet Union, had only used the system as a stairway or step toward power, establishing itself in power and using means available to it to establish its own dictatorship.

[Einstein] Your comment is entirely correct. In the end, Stalin used the existing institutions and did not really transform them.

Unlike the Hitler case, there was no popular movement which brought Stalin to power. He was applauded and invested by acclamation. The Soviet people were in no way consulted about him personally.

[Einstein] No. Moreover, the people hardly knew Stalin, who began to be renowned as of 1924-1925.

[Maulnier] It is interesting to note, moreover (we have just seen this again in connection with "Holocaust") that a good many Germans accept a certain blame for Hitler's rise to power. Now there has never been any question of the Russian people accepting or being assigned any responsibility for Stalin's dictatorship. The rise of Stalin to power came about in a way outside the Russian people.

[Einstein] Yes, because the dictatorship of the Communist Party was already established when Stalin took power.

[Maulnier] The Russian people were truly reduced to silence, and their opinion was not asked.

[Einstein] In fact, it was the conditions of the revolution and the civil war which produced a single-party system and led in brief to the situation in the USSR, just after the civil war from which Stalinism

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

emerged. I mean as a sort of consequence (which could perhaps have been avoided but which was not) of an authoritarian and purely state political system.

[Maulnier] One of the great problems posed by this kind of regime is that what is produced can be reproduced.

[Elleinstein] Obviously. Unless you have cut the roots of the phenomenon.

[Maulnier] If another Stalin were to appear on the horizon, does the present Soviet system contain obstacles which would prevent him from reaching the point Stalin did, or are there none? The question of the personality cult has been raised, but has anything at all been created which would prohibit another personality of the same sort from developing in the same fashion?

[Elleinstein] No, nothing.

[Maulnier] Tyranny remains possible, to the extent that one can say that Brezhnev is but a demi-tyrant.

[Elleinstein] Since Stalin we have moved from hard Stalinism to soft Stalinism. What is called Stalinism is tyranny by the state. The very foundations, the roots of Stalinism were not cut off.

[Maulnier] You are right in that.

[Elleinstein] We have moved from a bloody world of concentration camps in Stalin's era, however, to a very different world today. There are still concentration camps with political prisoners and psychiatric hospitals, but this does not have much to do with what happened in the Stalin era, although this does not exempt the current system from condemnation. The basic foundations which allowed the development of this system remain, for the single party remains, and the lack of freedom of the press, of association and assembly remain, i.e. in reality the only means which might make it possible to challenge the foundations of the system and to prevent the resurrection of hard Stalinism.

[Maulnier] Here one question should be asked. Why was the truth about Stalinism, which was known in the West, rejected for so long by the communist intellectuals as a whole? Until Budapest, entirely, and until Czechoslovakia, almost entirely. And even in the course of recent years, to a great extent.

[Elleinstein] They say that it is a question first of all of general policy. For a very long time you had the problem of Hitlerism which existed, and it was not possible to combat Hitlerism and Stalinism at the same time. For decades this played a very important role. A certain number of people who knew what was happening kept silent. This was the case for

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

example with Romain Rolland. And after Hitlerism, there were other factors which made the matter very difficult.

There is a second reason. The communists live (and some of them still do) to a certain extent in an extremely enclosed mental world, and one in which everything outside it is in the end regarded as false. When people speak truths outside their universe, this is enough for them to be judged wrong.

I experienced a very eloquent personal example of this viewpoint. I participated in a meeting in Budapest in April of 1951, when I was 25. I returned to Paris. My father, who read LE FIGARO every day, said to me: "You know, 25,000 Jews were arrested and put in a camp in Budapest while you were there." I responded: "That is not possible. I saw nothing, and no one said anything to me. I talked with the people, many people in Budapest speak German. I never saw any evidence of such a thing." And I strenuously denied that this was possible. Why? Because it was LE FIGARO which reported it, and from that fact it was clear that it was false. I was neither better nor worse than others. What I mean is that it is necessary to have the courage to recognize what one was, the errors one may have committed.

What Is Dying in Marxism?

[Maulnier] What is dying is a certain aspect of Marxism. That is dogmatism. To the extent that the thinking of Marx was transformed into a dogma which still continues to dominate in the Soviet Union and in a certain number of countries affiliated with it, this thinking is obviously dying. It no longer means much, and it is difficult to defend.

[Maulnier] Yes, a certain number of events have occurred after Budapest--Czechoslovakia and the revolt of the Soviet intellectuals, and perhaps also, on other levels, the break between the Chinese and the Russians.

[Einstein] The wars in the Far East . . .

[Maulnier] And the fact that there is no country--although a large part of the world is presently socialist, or at least claims socialism, or is subject to regimes which claim to be socialist--there is not a single of these countries which can supply us, which can provide the Marxists of today with an acceptable model of socialism. Moreover, it is certain that in the realm of science as such, in the field of genetics, for example, in the discussion on heredity and environment, the Marxist formula does not after all quite fit.

[Einstein] There I am entirely in agreement with you, but quite simply because Marx was contemplating the state of the sciences in the middle of the 19th century, and if there is a field in which you have had considerable change, it is indeed that. You know the comment he made to Engels about geology. He said finally that a doctrine had been established according to

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

which there was a relation between the nature of rocks, mentalities and politics. Precisely, you know, like Montesquieu's theory on climates. And Engels had to write him saying: "My dear Karl, you exaggerate, because obviously everything is related, but this relation is however not very great and does not play a very great role in history."

Like Decadent Rome

[Maulnier] It should be noted however that if Marxist thought, as thought, had entered into a period of challenge or re-examination, the power system created in the name of that thought is more effective than ever from the political-military viewpoint.

[Einstein] I read the other day of a survey in the United States. They are having difficulty in recruiting the number of volunteers needed for the American army despite the material benefits offered the soldiers. The military power of the United States is something else, at least equal to that of the USSR.

[Maulnier] Yes, but in an atmosphere which has become anti-militaristic, in particular for American youth!

[Einstein] To me this is precisely reminiscent of the end of the Roman Empire. Finally, the empire was obliged to ask the "barbarians," that is to say those who were not Romans, to fight for it. Similarly, it is now necessary to ask the peoples of the Third World to work for us, to do a certain number of jobs which the majority of Frenchmen no longer want to do.

[Maulnier] I think that in certain respects, moreover, what were called the "great invasions" at the end of the Roman Empire resemble the invasion of immigrant workers today more than a military invasion as such.

[Einstein] Precisely, the empire did not crumble at all as has often been said or represented under the force of the thrust of armed hordes, but precisely because it had to have ever greater and more frequent recourse to the hordes coming from the Eastern countries as mercenaries, as legionnaires, because the Romans, or the residents who had become Roman citizens, no longer wanted to work or fight. The decline of the empire had begun.

[Maulnier] We are seeing this rather clearly at the current time.

[Einstein] Yes, this is one of the most worrisome phenomena in our society, this inability to take on a certain number of problems. And it is the more serious since in the end we are still more dependent than the Romans were, because our raw materials come from the Third World countries. I do not place all of these problems on the level of an opposition between them and us. But this is a socio-cultural observation which can be made and which seems to me entirely basic.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

The problem this society must resolve is the reduction of the inequality of opportunity for individuals and the inequality of conditions. Equality, as it has been represented since the Renaissance, is indeed strictly speaking impossible, and for a very long period. I would even say that too great a search for equality could lead to increasing inequality. This is the case with education in France, for example, as it has been for the past 15 years. It is obvious that the educational system we have developed, far from decreasing inequality, has benefited the richest strata of the population. For the children of intellectuals, for example, have more opportunities to compensate for the inadequate knowledge imparted by the primary or secondary schools than do the children of workers. Thus the desire for equality which was voiced, and which was laudable in many respects, has led to its opposite. This is without a doubt one of the contradictions existing between democracy and liberalism.

[Maulnier] We are witnessing a kind of exchange, if I might put it thus, of ideas or values between the right and the left.

[Elleinstein] May I make this comment? This is precisely the same development which occurred in connection with the phenomenon of nationalism after 1880. You know that the right wing was anti-nationalist until 1880, and it was beginning then that it became nationalist, instead, while the left wing was profoundly nationalist. For example when we look at what happened in 1870-1871, the right wing favored peace over war, and was ready to abandon Alsace and Lorraine, and did so cheerfully--at least without too much difficulty, while the left wing, on the contrary, demanded Alsace and Lorraine and the war of revenge. Suddenly, beginning in 1885, the right wing became nationalist. There was an upset.

[Maulnier] There was a partial upset in another sense with the defeat in 1940, when it was a certain right-wing sector which supplied most of the contributors to collaboration, after all. And perhaps still today when the supporters of Europe are to a certain extent of the moderate right wing. The phenomenon of exchange is being renewed now, but in connection with progress and tradition: thanks to ecology or for some other reason, a certain leftist sector is looking more to the past, while thanks to economic growth and technology, the right wing is tending on the contrary to take up the idea of progress again.

[Elleinstein] To magnify technological progress. Quite right.

Should We Re-Read Maurras?

[Maulnier] Moreover, in relations between society and the individual, it is somewhat the same. The individual has tended by turns from the right to the left, from the left to the right, and society as well. The predominance of the collective over the individual has been raised as a banner first by the right wing and then by the left.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Elleinstein] Yes, when one looks at the history of France for the past century these changes of position, transition from one side to the other, are rather surprising. The case of the thinking of Maurras is interesting to note.

[Maulnier] In connection with Maurras, another subject was dear to him and currently has a leftist rather than a rightist ring: regionalism.

[Elleinstein] Naturally, I believe it would be better after all to reflect on the history of ideas in France and to re-evaluate the role of Maurras from this angle.

[Maulnier] It is interesting to hear you speak of Maurras!

[Elleinstein] No doubt. I also believe that there are unacceptable aspects to Maurras, for example anti-Semitism. Obviously too many things occurred to allow us to absolve him.

[Maulnier] Anti-Semitism has also had a certain tendency to move to the left at certain times.

[Elleinstein] At certain times. Anti-Semitism was to a certain extent a leftist phenomenon in the 19th century, for a long time. The first anti-Semitic work in the last century was published by a utopian socialist named Toussenel, and it was entitled "The Jews, Kings of the Epoch." There was a very strong tradition in a part of the socialist movement identifying Jews and capitalists.

[Maulnier] I would like to take up with you the problem of Marxism as a substitute for religion, or more generally, the religious problem in the modern world.

[Elleinstein] Marxism is often experienced in religious fashion through work and the church, i.e. the party, but it is precisely this representation of Marxism which I challenge. The thinking of Marx was criticism, as he said in response to the young women who asked him what his favorite slogan was: "De omnibus dubitandum" (one must doubt everything).

[Maulnier] Yes, but there is the spiritual void of the period, a period with man ready to cling to anything.

[Elleinstein] Resulting in the development of sects, for example, in such countries as the United States, where the basic conditions, because of the role of Protestantism and its sectarian aspect, favor the development of this type of phenomenon.

[Maulnier] Should we presume that this is a spiritual need which socialism failed or is failing to satisfy, or is it (this is also possible, and I

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

would personally be tempted to believe it) the fact that mankind as a whole has not yet reached the adult stage?

[Eilleinstein] I believe that in any case the religious spirit is a construct of the human spirit. It seems to me that, precisely in Marxist thinking, the role of ideology in general, the role of conscience and spirituality, has been underestimated.

[Maulnier] I recall a statement by Malraux: A child is run over by a bus. Although one can claim that in socialist society children are not run over by buses because the drivers have been adequately trained, this is not a social scandal, but a metaphysical one. Conversely--this was a news item day before yesterday--if a young man of 25 kills his grandmother in order to steal 30 francs from her, that is perhaps a metaphysical scandal, but it is also a social one.

[Eilleinstein] Obviously. You are entirely right!

[Maulnier] There is here a type of problem which in any case no social reform can resolve.

[Eilleinstein] One can resolve a number of problems from the economic, social and political point of view, but I agree with you on this point. In other words, to the extent that the religious spirit--in the sense of the divine--is a structure, a need of the human spirit, neither scientific progress--and the example of the great scholar-believers shows this clearly--nor social progress, nor the improvement of living conditions will resolve the problem. I believe that, from this point of view, there will continue for hundreds of years to be millions of people who have a faith, and that nothing can do away with this.

5157
CSO: 3100

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

COUNTRY SECTION

FRANCE

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE DISSIDENT INTELLECTUAL

'Intellectual': Toward New Definitions

Paris LE COMMUNISTE in French Jan 79 p 4

[Article by Paul Jourdan: "The 'Intellectual' or Communist Organizer"]

[Text] One can discuss the concept of the "intellectual" endlessly. One can speculate without end on where to put the line between "intellectual workers" and "manual workers." In reality, the very concept of an intellectual is mystifying, because it is par excellence a bourgeois concept.

Historically speaking, the very "intellectual" type is the philosopher, flanked by the university professor, the writer and the journalist who have always sought this label. This state of affairs is no accident, but corresponds to a very precise function in capitalist society: the creation and perpetuation of the ideologies of submission to the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, a function distinct from the organization of that hegemony (cadres) or the reproduction and development of capitalist exploitation (researcher, scientist, technical engineer).

The fact that opportunists group the philosopher and the technician under the same term, intellectual--delicately excluding the office employee--bears witness to their inability to understand the actual reality of capitalist society.

In fact, what do the men who are the typical agents of the bourgeoisie--the vast mass of the "great" philosophers, the "great" men of letters, the "great" journalists, on the one hand, and the production technicians who make up the top level of the workers' class have in common? In fact, this expanded concept of the intellectual includes within its greater mass the new middle urban strata, those affiliated with the greater modern capitalist production or results of it (teachers, scientists, engineers, cadres, technicians). Thus it includes strata of people having a double characteristic, being wage-earners indeed but also enjoying privileges--more or less according to the level and type of knowledge they have and their social level, being privileged on the level of wages, the level of prestige, and that of

57

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

authority. Thus contrary to what Georges Marchais said at the gathering of "intellectuals" in Vitry on 9 and 10 December last it is not a question of taking the so-called "intellectuals as they are." Particularly since these individuals more than others have been more or less forced to undergo training in a clearly determined culture, the bourgeois culture, which they accept the better because it provides their privileges. This is even more true when the training involved is philosophical, literary, economic or legal, and conversely, less true when it is more scientific or technical. This holds true more for those who benefit from the greater privileges, such as the engineers, than those who benefit less, such as the technicians.

The party of the workers' class could exert more influence on the middle classes if it were to rely basically on their characteristics as wage-earners subjected to the hazards of this situation, basically demystifying their social functions in the service of capitalism and the privileges attached thereto. It would increase its prestige with them the more were it to forcefully assert its calling as the bearer of a new culture based on the workers' culture--in reality embryonic and stifled--and its resolutely internationalist calling.

This would presume that the party is fully a vanguard party, a party made up of militants, i.e. organizers, capable of closely linking theory and practice, organizers of the workers' class and its battle, organizers of mass groups for anti-capitalist class action. This would thus presume that the party is a great school seeking to train its militants ever more and better not for some "ideological struggle" but rather the science of the revolution and its implementation, and the selection of leaders on this basis and this basis alone. In other words just as the party should aid its worker members to acquire an ever more and better capacity for conceptualizing and theorizing about reality, it should nonetheless urgently help its members coming from the middle strata to rid themselves entirely of the bourgeois culture and to become men of action.

It must be noted that the approach which prevailed at the Vitry meeting is the opposite of this correct concept. The opportunists recognized rights greater than for others for those members exercising a profession placing them in the middle strata. This was according to the explanation of Marchais because of their "specific character" as "producers of ideas." This is indeed a wretched result of the line of the 22nd congress which recognized for the so-called "intellectual" members, in fact members coming from the petit and middle bourgeoisie, the privileged status of "producers of ideas." The opportunists are introducing into the party the same hierarchy as exists in capitalist society, which they have already been practicing for years in the allocation to the "specialists' commissions" alone of the power to draft decisions such as, for example, for the strike force.

How is it surprising that in this context, the members who are "typical intellectuals" or second-zone "intellectuals," the recognized producers or reproducers of bourgeois ideas, try to advance their status, as the statements

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

by the majority of the speakers at Vitry--"dear professors," etc--reveal. How is it surprising that the likes of Georges Labica, a philosopher by profession, complains of the fact that according to him too many "intellectuals" are engaged in "militant effort, propaganda" instead of "drafting policy." Here we see the conduct of the petit bourgeois of the left believing himself to be the "salt of the earth," solely capable of "objective" reflection, entrusted with a mission to pursue and seeing at the very most in the workers' class a maneuvering mass for a social movement rather than the conscious intelligent and leading protagonists in the revolution. It is this attitude which is revealed by L'HUMANITE DIMANCHE by its publication of a letter saying "I am first secretary of my section (Malakoff), and thus I have responsibilities. But I tell you, if it comes to drudgery I am unwilling. I do not want to stand guard or keep order either." In other words, "I am a thinker and leader, and it is for the others to do the work."

All of this emphasizes the penetration of bourgeois ideas and the supporting band of petit bourgeois elements in the party thanks to the breach opened by the 22nd congress. Recognition of the bourgeois "intellectual" status in society and then in the party works to the detriment of the concept of a communist organizer linking in a single person the theoretician, the leader and the man of action. This means endorsement of a political line no longer oriented toward radical and communist change in society, and in fact no longer oriented toward destroying the old social division between the "leaders" and the "led," and forging the new man, that is to say a specialized organizer of the collective.

Marxism, Humanism and Individualism

Paris FRANCE NOUVELLE in French 7 Jan 79 pp 29-33

[Discussion by Gilbert Wasserman, Jean-Pierre Cotten and Bernard Michaux, philosophy professors: "From Humanism to Pluralism"]

[Text] [Wasserman] The communists have often questioned their concept of man, of the individual. These are major questions raised with ever-greater insistence. They are not however new. When I joined the Communist Party around 1965, a great debate was in progress on the subject of humanism. The fact is that today a large number of communists are familiar neither with the elements nor what is at stake in this discussion. Couldn't we begin by reviewing this as briefly as possible?

[Cotten] You are right to recall that the problem of humanism has already been raised, to the point of being, in my view, in large part resolved. It seems to me important to go over the history of this discussion in order to understand how it can be continued today. There is considerable at stake on the national and international levels. The discussion has been pursued in the French party, but elsewhere as well. The point of departure was the 20th Congress of the CPSU and its denunciation of the crimes of the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

so-called Stalinist era. From then on, a whole complex of communists have thought that what was lacking in Marxism was a supplement of soul, a human, humanist dimension, which thus needed to be added to it. On the other hand, certain positions adopted denied the problem of humanism any significance. This was in fact a discussion in no way abstract, but rather on the contrary pursued with great determination, for the problem raised was beginning to understand what had happened. It was under these conditions that the discussion on theoretical humanism and anti-humanism developed in France and was made specific at a Central Committee meeting held in Argenteuil in 1966, where the positions were developed. Conclusions which I do not regard as a compromise were reached, and roughly speaking they were the following: First of all, to regard Marxist humanism as too closely related to the classic humanisms merits criticism. On the other hand, to seek to radically cut the bonds between Marxism and humanism is equally reprehensible. Thus one comes to the concept of a humanism termed "scientific," which takes as its basis that the essence of man is in the end social relations as a whole. Finally, what separates our humanism from the others is that there is no human nature removed from history.

[Michaux] To add to this historic review, it also seems to me necessary, at least for France, to relate it to a certain humanistic concept in current ideology, but in university ideology as well. Earlier I looked in the "Petit Robert" to see what the definition given for humanism was. It is the following: "Any theory the goal of which is the human individual and his flowering." It goes on to say that in the 18th century this term was synonymous with philanthropy. In current thinking, humanism is, in the final analysis, any concept which invests man, the individual regarded as the representative of humankind as a whole, with a value to be respected. Consequently, the problem of humanism must be related to historical action. One can consider, for example, that all historical action is a priori based on an ethic, and in such a case all violence is anti-humanistic, as is any form of constraint as well. On the other hand, one can consider that humanism is but a kind of mask, a cover for historical actions designed in reality only to serve certain interests, a view which leads to an anti-humanism I would call vulgar, a kind of historical pessimism involving saying that there is nothing in history whatsoever in which respect for the human individual is possible. To this must be added the fact that the modern human sciences, influenced by the structuralist trend, have tried to isolate social and historical structures in which the question of man as an individual, properly speaking, or as a value, is not posed, since he is regarded only as the agent of social relations.

Put differently, when we speak of Marxism as humanism, it seems to me necessary to set aside first of all an ethical concept. Marxism is not humanism in the sense that it would make the dignity of man the goal or an absolute value established at the outset. Moreover, it is equally necessary to understand that Marxism does not regard individuals as mere agents of social relations. It is between these two reefs that Marxism has been led

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

to steer its course. It was necessary to win something through the reading of Marxism, the place of individuals in history. It was in the double interplay of ethical humanism on the one hand and theoretical anti-humanism on the other that this study developed in France. From this point of view, dates are in fact very important, the period around 1965 coming after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, it is true, but it was also the time when structuralism flourished in France.

[Cotten] One could also, in order better to understand the elements under discussion, go back for example to the era of the Popular Front. Faced with the rise of fascism, Marxism had to redefine itself in relation to a certain number of themes which emerged during the Lumieres epoch, in particular the concepts of man in terms of reason and freedom, of advancing humanity, etc. Marxism did not define itself against this thought, but bypassed it. If it refused to view man as the final goal of nature, it took its place in another concept of man with such equally essential concepts as freedom, responsibility, dignity. I mean by that that if it was essential for Marxism to differentiate itself from a classic concept, the period of struggle against fascism, which made it necessary to re-evaluate the role of democracy, also made us better able to put forward what therein relates us, and the positive aspects of the trend which emerged from the Lumieres period.

What is at stake in such a view of matters is very great today. At a time when the new philosophers are taking up the most hackneyed themes of pessimism again, and criticism of "progressive utopias," the Marxists must prevent themselves as the critical heirs of this true liberation movement which was that humanism one cannot simply call bourgeois.

[Wasserman] Perhaps before continuing it might be necessary to review some of the concepts most often brought into the discussions on humanism: speculative humanism, theoretical anti-humanism, scientific humanism, particularly since these definitions themselves have been and are subjects of discussion.

[Cotten] Indeed. I think that where speculative humanism is concerned, it can be defined as a concept of man according to which his nature or his essence is removed from history.

I would then define theoretical anti-humanism, not to be confused with practical anti-humanism (this confusion did not exist moreover in the 1960s) as the concept according to which men can indeed be moved by various feelings and passions but wherein the concept of man is not a functional concept for understanding the movement of society. I would adhere to this strict definition. Finally, scientific humanism. If one means thereby that our concept of historical materialism takes into account what men are, one can in my view speak of scientific humanism. If on the other hand one would mean by that that we possess the truth about man, that would not be very scientific and would likely be rather dangerous.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Michaux] I would like to add a word about speculative humanism. This philosophical concept, having been formulated before the science of history or the human sciences existed, was based on a confusion between the individual and mankind. To speak the truth about man came down to looking for non-historical, eternal, fixed qualities in the individual viewed in isolation, and those qualities which could be found in the analysis of an isolated individual. On that basis, speculative humanism is linked with the concept held then about psychology, involving finding the constant factors in human nature on the basis of an individual taken separately. Conversely, what could be called scientific humanism today, and I agree with what has just been said, is the idea according to which nothing in the individual is unrelated to history. The only human nature we can recognize in historical materialism is social relations as a whole. The human fact is the whole of the social relations established and based essentially on production relations. One can then analyze individual processes, introducing therein all the necessary articulation, such as the effects of the social relations, even if the participation of the individual in history then has an impact on the historical processes. Put otherwise, a theoretical reversal is effected here by materialism between the individual and society or the individual and the human species. In speculative humanism, the point of departure involves the presumption that the individual is the whole man, while in historical materialism, we reach the concept that it is social relations as a whole which create the human fact, the individual being a part of a phenomenon which itself is social, i.e. the product of social relations. Without this it would not be possible to understand the place of individuals in history. Now we have not yet finished, to say the very least possible, waging a battle from the materialistic point of view against the concept according to which history is made up of internal ideas, feelings or passions which individuals embody. Nor have we finished the battle against the idea according to which it is great men who make history, in other words distinguished individuals who alone can fashion historical movements. I do not hesitate to go back to the statement by Politzer who said in July of 1929 that the secret of the human phenomenon is not psychological in nature. To make this assertion inevitably alters the very method of theoretical approach to the question of humanism.

[Cotten] We will now have to make a certain number of other concepts clear. I would begin with the statement by Marx in the postscript to "Das Kapital" in which he spoke of the capitalist as the personification of social relations. Marx did not mean thereby that this or that individual represented such a personification. What he meant was that on the analytical basis according to which there is no essence unrelated to the movement of history, an infinitely complex problem is posed, and that is what the historical forms of individuality are and what individuals are. This leads us to a very important question, the concept which we Marxists may develop--and it is not yet complete--of specific individuals. I think that in the final analysis, individuals are differentiated on the basis of the development of social relations. For us Marxists, the problem does

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

not lie in the conflict between the individual and society, which does not mean that there are no problems posed by the concept of individuality in terms of the role of the individual as well as a scientific problem, in which the biological and the social are intermingled. But we do not have the individual on the one hand and the society on the other. For example Marx showed that individualism as it was conceived beginning in the 18th century only emerged as of the time there was a market, and a free worker selling his labor. Representation of the "robinsonnade" type could not have existed in feudal society, while men were enclosed therein in very narrow relations with no concept of being free of them.

[Wasserman] To this approach to the concrete individual one must add such concepts as those of heritage, transmission, the social inheritance.

[Michaux] I am just getting to that. The social heritage is what differentiates the human from the animal phenomenon. The animal phenomenon develops according to the laws of nature, the laws of the evolution of the species, which in the final analysis are accumulated by genetic processes in each individual, such that the individuals of an animal species develop at the rate of the changes in their species. Now in the case of the social phenomenon, the individual finds his social and historical heritage outside himself at birth. What he finds outside him are objects, tools, etc, which will in the course of his development impose upon him an adaptation in the forms of problems to resolve. The development of the individual is made up of these problems to resolve within a complex of social relations in which the individual is placed as of his birth, and to which he must adapt in the form of schemes of activity, the types of social opportunities open to him, institutions of which he will become a part. We can thus obtain a notion of the diversity of specific individuals depending on the way in which the heritage was accepted and interiorized, but also the quantity of that social heritage acquired. There is also a diversity in the social strata. When we say that the workers' class is that most excluded from cultural opportunities in our day, we are noting a phenomenon here which is of enormous importance for the future of the country and all of mankind. It is a question of acting in such a way that this class which produces social goods can assimilate and develop the cultural heritage. At the same time, within a social class itself, there is diversity from one specific individual to the next in the sense that the biographies of individuals differ and thus in terms of the fact that they assimilate the social heritage in different ways.

And so it is that the contribution of the social heritage to each individual is of a sort one can unhesitatingly term original, not at all of course because the source of the originality is the inherent nature of the individual, but because the personality socially established by a unique biography cannot be equated with any other.

Thus one can say that the diversity of which there is abundant discussion in the texts of the Communist Party is not at all a concession to a somewhat

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

weak ideology which is reduced to "it takes all kinds to make a world," but on the contrary the awareness of a social phenomenon which will be particularized down to the individual. The social heritage is unequally distributed. Therefore when we speak of diversity, there is at the base the question of scientific humanism, of which we spoke a short time ago, and also the utilization of the dialectics of the universal and the particular. In fact, we cannot think of diversity as the simple existence side by side of a certain number of individual realities, but as the expression, in the different classes, social groups and individuals, of a process which has reached its ultimate phase, the process of alienation. In fact, the end of capitalism also corresponds to the end of the great historical period of class struggle, i.e. the moment when the question of the development of the individual arises as a condition for social advance as a whole and thus access to the highest possible degree of culture at a given moment. It can clearly be seen that one cannot separate the questions of humanism from those of specific individuals, from that of diversity, and those of the dialectics of the universal and the particular. It is essential to take all of this into account at the same time.

[Cotten] I would add that heritage means legacy, but this term also refers to the father. Heritage also includes that of language and family institutions. The individual is a member of a family. In addition, one cannot understand the adaptation of the heritage without raising the infinitely complex problem of the social adaptation of language as a function of social relations and in families, elements in these social relations. The title of a well-known work of Engels is "The Origins of Property, the Family and the State." Thus one must think about the individual as a function of the dialectics of social development and types of institutions such as the family. It is no accident that the effects of the differentiation of society into classes can so readily be detected in inadequacies in the adaptation of language. This is indeed one of the ways in which the massive effects of exploitation are revealed among the sons and daughters of the workers' class. I am thinking of some of the characters presented to us in the Karlin and Laine broadcast "The Reason of the Most Insane." Here we see that if they did not succeed in adapting the social heritage, it was because of their class origins and their consequences in the background. At the same time, it is also impossible to adapt to the symbolic aspects going back to their personal and family history. I believe that there is here a problem which is still partially unresolved, and that is the relation between the development of the individual and the family institutions taken together, the relations to language and society as a whole.

[Wasserman] This is a vast and fascinating field of study, but it is necessary to take into account the work and achievements in the various human sciences, which we are probably not able to do here. I would hope however that we can come back to the question of humanism to the extent that it is not just a theoretical discussion but involves numerous specific things at stake, political among others.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Michaux] To proceed in this direction I would go back to the question of man and culture. This is a great historical and specific question confronting us. It can in fact be presumed that there will be no more truly innovative developments in the productive forces in a social system which cannot take into account the development of personality, the forms of individuality, within a system which does not regard the question of the adaptation of the social heritage by a whole nation as the central problem. The development of productive forces today requires that they be put in movement by conscious, highly qualified individuals, with a profound knowledge of the problems confronting society. There will be no creative development of labor without this national adaptation of the social heritage. We spoke at the beginning of the continuation of the historical conditions of the discussion on humanism in the 1960s. If during one period this question had a basically theoretical aspect, one can say on the other hand that today the question of humanism, even if it is not posed in these terms, is truly a mass problem. Following labor, let us take the example of the schools. There is a political stake in the conception of it simply as an apparatus for the reproduction of the dominant ideology in a system for the reproduction of social relations, or else as the training of the labor force of tomorrow, which must thus be on the highest possible cultural level at a given moment. This is indeed a great mass question.

[Cotten] I would also proceed in this direction, specifying that the question of humanism is for us above all the question of the place of men in the production process. Here one can moreover speak of anti-humanism, the negation of the human aspect of the capitalist production process to the extent that there is a negation of living labor. It is important to understand clearly what the place of men in production relations is, a role experience in terms of the lack of dignity, alienation, debasement. Indeed our concept of humanism is not limited to that. Man is not only what he is in the production process, but we must begin with this to understand in what sense there has been mutilation and in what sense, to the extent that there is contradictory development, capitalism is creating the conditions for going beyond that mutilation. It is also this which allows us to understand what another specific place for men in the production process might mean. Obviously, the question of humanism is directly linked with that of the revolution.

[Wasserman] If Marxism, as both of you stress, gives us numerous means for analyzing and understanding the present social fabric and its crisis, this does not however mean that it provides us with all the keys to the future of man and individuals.

[Michaux] It is certainly necessary to state forcefully and calmly that we do not conclude from our scientific, or if you prefer materialistic humanism, what forms mankind and the individual will take in subsequent societies, even those within socialism of a French hue. Our theory does not predict all the possible advances in social relations. In other words, we do not need to represent ourselves as knowing what the potential for the human

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

future might be tomorrow. What we have mastered as of the present is a certain number of the conditions for the development of men in societies which have put an end to the class struggle, and this is not a prophetic vision of the future of the social fabric. We do not enclose man in a pre-established historical direction, in which the forms of development would be inscribed in a kind of movement finalized in advance, for this would be in contradiction with Marxism. This also shows that the Communist Party is in no way the single historical agent which alone will determine each advance. It can also be said, on this basis, that Marxism in no way has a monopoly on the proper answers, any more than it has a monopoly on the proper questions. There are proper questions asked outside Marxism and even against it, which Marxism must assimilate. In fact it is the social fabric which is advancing, rather than Marxist theory advancing ahead of the social fabric.

[Cotten] There is a false representation of our theory being diffused by the dominant ideology, according to which it is a complex of formulae making it possible to know and predict everything a priori. In reality, it is theory which makes it possible to adapt reality gradually to thought. But this mastery is never total, it is only approximated and at least in principle, should never serve as an obstacle to later correction. It is necessary to eliminate the idea of a sort of absolute subject of history, a concept with which Marxism has made a sharp break. Thus where the role of the communist party is concerned, it has basic responsibilities, but it is not the absolute subject of history. Problems may develop in the movement of society of which it does not immediately take charge. Basically it is the question of pluralism, and what we are asked is whether we do not intend to impose a practice in the name of a doctrine. Now our concept of theory excludes that, at least in principle. I will take an example, that of the transition to socialism in our country. One may have a theory of transition, but one cannot have a theory of what the transition in France will be specifically. One cannot say that things will happen just so at a given moment. I do not say this in order to laud pragmatism, but our theory is never inconsistent.

[Wasserman] It is characteristic that we have moved from humanism to the individual and then to pluralism. The fact is one cannot separate these questions. Do we not have confirmation here, moreover, of the fact that contrary to the often-promulgated image of a forced and obligatory rallying of communists to pluralism, it is on the basis of their materialistic conception of the world that they have come to their assertion of the need for pluralism?

[Michaux] I think it is necessary first of all to make a distinction between pluralism and plurality. They are not the same thing. In our country there is in fact a plurality of social strata, of aspirations, practices, cultures, etc. But the fact that the French social body is characterized by plurality is not due to Marxism. Those who question us often and in good faith fear that our concept of history and man may lead

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

us to deny that plurality. If we did that we would be paving the way for our failure, for plurality exists and it is not within the power of anyone to make it disappear. But the key word along with pluralism is democracy, for the people whom we want to have power are a differentiated people. There is a current attitude toward the people as a crowd, in a way. Perhaps more-over the term "mass" which we use is often understood outside the party as an undifferentiated and to a certain extent terrorizing crowd. Democracy imposes plurality. If one wants to pursue to the end the concept that it is because we are materialists that we rely on pluralism, this must be linked with the definition we give to democracy, both as a means and a goal. In reality, the French social body is not so pluralistic, since today the existing social relations and the regime are reducing that plurality and preventing its expression.

[Cotten] What is striking is that one comes back to the point of departure. In order better to frame our concept of humanism, we have used the term democracy and we come back to it again for pluralism. Our concept of humanism implies a refinement of our concept of democracy. We have come today to the concept of a democracy on all levels, in all sectors, in the analysis of the specific problems posed by the implementation of self-administration. But I think we must further refine this idea of democracy carried to its end.

[Wasserman] We have spoken here of the political implications of material-istic humanism in the relations of communists with the social struggle. Could we not say a few words about what that involves for the relations among communists themselves?

[Michaux] I wanted to get to that, for it is important to see that our humanism is not only the confrontation between the party of the workers' class and society, but also has implications in the organization of the party, its forms of work, its strengthening, its way of integrating the diversity of the members which come to it. When the communist party becomes a mass party, when it seeks a million members, it becomes the recipient of a number of members with singularly rich personal histories. Today one comes to the party by extremely varied routes, and so how can one think that membership melts all of these various individualities into a single mold? This makes it clear that a mass and vanguard communist party cannot be a monolithic party. It must on the contrary take into account this whole wealth of personal reflections in order to integrate them in a single reflection and political action. I think that there is a dialectical unity-diversity, unity on political strategy and diversity in aspirations, in the invention of forms of struggle, in the invention of language. If this is not taken into account there is a risk that membership will be transformed into frustration.

[Cotten] I too believe that these humanism-individual-plurality problems also exist in terms of understanding of the internal life of the communist party. Not that one can confuse party and society, but one cannot be

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

satisfied with avoiding this confusion. To pose the problem of democracy pursued to its end is also to pose the problem of the forms which should develop, which will allow the party better to carry out its tasks, and it also means seeking methods which will allow each party member to express himself best in order to act and to contribute so that the party can better assume its functions, having a better grasp of the movement of society.

Kehayans: The Soviet Experience

Paris LE POINT in French 22 Jan 79 p 41

[Article by Michele Cotta: "Communists: The Kehayans in Quarantine"]

[Text] A few days before the celebration planned by the local communist newspaper LA MARSEILLAISE, the Kehayans received a telephone call. A voice issued an unmistakable warning: "If you come to the celebration, it will be your last, the same for your wife."

There are things about which one does not joke in Marseilles, customs there being what they are. And that is why Nina and Jean Kehayan, 33 and 35 years of age respectively, did not go to the LA MARSEILLAISE party this year. And that is why their book, "The Street of the Red Proletarian" (one of the year's best sellers--150,000 copies in two months) was not sold there. In fact, the story of the Kehayans and the reaction of the party to which, against winds and tides, they continue to belong--the PCS--is an interesting one.

It began with two young communists, not wealthy, with two little children, who decided to spend two years in the USSR. The wife, Nina, joined the party in 1969. With a degree in the Russian language, she had been to the USSR, serving as a guide, interpreter, secretary, several times. Her husband, Jean Kehayan, was as his name indicates of Armenian origin. Born in Marseilles, he had been a party member, with an interruption when he was about 20, since 1960. Nina and Jean met on vacation in Moscow, and decided to return there for two years. He would work with the Novosti press agency as a journalist, and she would perfect her Russian.

Then came the departure formalities: the man in charge of organizing the travel of the French couple to Moscow at the Central Committee in Paris was dubious: "You have a 90 percent chance of coming back anti-communist!" he said. A pessimistic view, but not far from the truth. In fact, the life the Kehayans found in Moscow seemed to them a hundred, a thousand times removed from the Soviet paradise, the hoped-for garden of Eden. On the contrary they found a society with profound inequalities, in which the party card opens all doors. They found incompetent public services, a housing crisis, lines in the large stores, profound skepticism, sometimes, when they dared to talk, Soviet citizens who were heartsick. The two French citizens were first astounded, then scandalized. They asked to return to France at the end of a year, but the PCF refused them. They stayed until 1974, then returning to Marseilles where they chose to keep silence until 1978.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

It was the attitude of the communist leaders at election time which caused them to break their silence. After the failure in March, the Kehayans joined the comrades who signed the "opposition" appeal refusing to put all the responsibility for the failure on the PS. One fine morning in July 1978, the day the Soviet dissidents Shcharanskiy and Ginzberg were convicted in Moscow--Jean Kehayan, vacationing in Brittany, wrote the preface to the book all in one session. In August, Jean and Nina divided the task and began to write. The book was completed in September, and came out in November.

The story of "The Street of the Red Proletarian" would remain a personal tale if it did not spotlight the way in which the PCF hierarchy still today deals with those of its members who raise the question of the nature of socialism in the USSR.

For the "trial" of the Kehayans began as soon as the book came out, in the Bouches-du-Rhone federation, one of the most closed federations in the French Communist Party, and also in the intellectual circles in Paris. While the authors of the official book "The USSR and Us," Claude Frioux, Francis Cohen and company, categorically condemned the book they did not write, the federation issued a statement denouncing "the attitude of two of its members." Overnight, the party comrades, or at least the majority of them, turned their backs on the authors, crossing the street or lowering their eyes when they approached. All of this then culminated in the LA MARSEILLAISE celebration.

In fact, for what is the hierarchy reproaching Nina and Jean Kehayan? For denouncing the Soviet paradise? But the leaders spend their time trying to show how little they are concerned with it today! For failing entirely to ask the agreement of the leadership first? Or was it instead for joining the 300 challengers in signing the appeal condemning the USSR?

In any case this trial reveals two new manifestations by the PCF: first of all, the challenge is the greater among the communists when the federation in which it occurs is more rigid. And the corollary is that the "harder" Georges Marchais becomes, as at the European Press Club last week, the less effect it has. And finally, the challengers are far from having thrown in the sponge. There are a number who, like the Kehayans, are getting ready to participate in the discussions preparatory to the 23rd congress. With the common and perhaps illusory goal of changing the party from within.

Survival Value of Individualism

Paris MAINTENANT in French 26 Mar 79 p 33

[Interview with Peter Schneider by Gerard Belloin: "Individualism Becomes a Survival Value"]

[Text] Peter Schneider is the author of the scenario and dialog for the Reinhard Hauff film "A Knife in the Head" which has just come out in France. We talked to him during his stay in Paris.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Hauffmann, the main character in this film, a biogeneticist respected by his colleagues, and without known political involvement, is wounded in the head by a bullet in the course of a raid on a young peoples' club to which he had gone to pick up his wife. He loses his memory and the power of speech entirely. The police accuse him of attacking a policeman, who fired in the course of the incident, with a knife. Extreme leftist militants tell another story: they are trying to make a martyr for their cause of Hauffmann.

Slowly Hauffmann emerges from his nightmare and little by little regains the use of his faculties. He feels manipulated by all, rejects that manipulation and tries to regain his identity.

[Question] What is the political intent of your film? Isn't it likely to give the impression that you want nothing to do with any part of mankind, and that politics is but a clash of equally false theses?

[Answer] A film, as I view it, does not come down to the illustration of a political thesis or a thesis on politics. If I had only wanted to do that I would have written an article. Moreover, I am writing one. This film is first of all the specific story of a unique individual seeking his own truth.

The fact remains that the character of Hauffmann is very German, very contemporary. The young people in the German Federal Republic are now feeling, and often very dramatically, the need to find their own identity too. They find themselves less and less in the two value systems, the existing capitalism and socialism, which divide Germany. These two systems appear to them to be imposed from abroad. They do not identify themselves truly with either one. Underlying the values officially proclaimed on both sides is a great void, a void which is also the result of the collapse of the ideals of the 1968 student movement.

[Question] There is nothing more which can be done then . . .

[Answer] Indeed, quite the contrary, there is. Hauffmann, because of his injury, is placed in a situation in which he can rely only on himself. He can only rebecome someone by dint of constantly increasing will and personal search. And he achieves this not to allow himself to be tossed about by events, but on the contrary to act as a conscious agent.

For myself, as for many German intellectuals of my generation, the search for the truth and the motivations for action have become a more personal, even more solitary quest. We have had to abandon a certain optimism. We no longer think that our personal and political identity can be found with reference to Ho Chi Minh, Mao or any other hero of the revolution. Much less following the drama currently being played out in Asia. The pre-established images of the revolution, of communism, do not enable us to comprehend the present reality and act upon it. It is necessary to invent.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Question] Yes, but it is not possible to wait. There are immediate requirements for action. In your film moreover one sees very clearly the vast danger to freedoms posed by the police state.

[Answer] No, one cannot wait. Moreover in my film, Volker, the extreme leftist militant, says precisely to Hauffmann that it is not possible to wait until he has regained his memory because the police are maneuvering to make a charge against the militants. Thus it is necessary to contradict the police version with another report immediately.

This for me is a contradiction which must remain open. I think that there must be a position like that of Volker. But I also have great sympathy for the anger of Hauffmann, who refuses to allow himself to be manipulated. His desire to think for himself, not to be told what he feels, in brief what could be called his individualism, seems to me a very positive attitude which gives rise to political optimism.

The two great world systems confronting each other in Europe, and dividing Germany and Brazil, seem to me to be closer together than they admit. Both generate a vast trend toward homogenizing society, tending to bend all individuals to the same norms. A singular individual manifesting his own personality is regarded as intolerable in and by both systems. Individualism, to the extent that it is evidence of rejection of this trend toward homogenization and standardization, becomes a survival value for men, the substructure for a positive struggle.

[Question] From this viewpoint, it is no accident that the problem of language plays such a great role in your film. Hauffmann's search for his identity inevitably involves relearning words, reviewing closely the words he uses, and cleaning them up.

[Answer] The loss of memory, which is a loss of language, is traumatic for Hauffmann. But it is also his opportunity. He is forced to challenge all words, to find a meaning for them again. In the process, he is also led to challenge all the ready-made statements and phrases which lead too easily to belief in concepts which seem obvious. I greatly regret not having been able up to the present to rewrite the scenario as a novel, because the written word would have made a deeper approach to this question, which the film does not permit, possible for me.

In the political experience of my generation, the problem of language occupies an important place. The 1968 movement was unable to find the proper words for the ideas in which it believed and for an analysis of the situation. Too often it merely took up the ready-made formulae of the international theoreticians of communism.

We come back again to this problem of language as well when we examine such questions as Stalinism or terrorism. These phenomena are inseparable from

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

the process by which language becomes autonomous and produces one effect after the other, leading to extreme situations. It is necessary to go back to the point of origin in all of this, the point at which discussion of ideas, notions, goals, began. It was Hauffmann's good luck to be forced to return to this point of departure.

A "Free Writer"

Peter Schneider, born in 1940, pursued literary activity simultaneous with militant activity along with Rudi Dutschke. He was hired as a worker in the Bosch factories and was surprised to find that the workers were only mildly interested in the theories of the students. He completed his studies and became a teacher. However, the victim of "professional prohibitions," he was refused the teaching post for which he applied. He appealed and won his case. Today he is a "free writer," which is to say that he lives solely by his pen.

Bibliography: "Ansprachen" (1970), "Lenz" (1973, published by Flammarion), "Atempause" (1974), "So You Are an Enemy of the Constitution" (1975, published by Flammarion), "Die wette" (1978).

5157
CSO: 3100

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

COUNTRY SECTION

FRANCE

CHRONOLOGICAL SOURCE MATERIAL, BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Paris LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE in French Apr 79 p 34

Marx

[Text] Besides the texts reproduced here, one will consult with interest what Marx wrote in "German Ideology" (Editions sociales 1968) on the repercussions of the social division of work on artistic activities (pp 432-433 and 434). Generally speaking, when one consults the subject index of one of Marx' works, one should refer to the concept of (intellectual) work. This remark is also true for Engels' works.

Lenin

One must refer in the subject index of the complete works of Lenin to the notion of "intelligentsia" insofar as it designates intellectuals who produce ideas. For him the ideological characteristics of the intelligentsia characterize intellectuals as a particular group. See volume 7, p 280. ("One Step Forward, Two Steps Back"). From this comes the classification of subjects in the subject index: intelligentsia, bourgeoisie and petite-bourgeoise in the West, bourgeoisie and petite-bourgeoise in Russia, before and during the 1905 revolution, in the 1907-1910 period of reaction, in the new revolutionary upswing period, during the 1914-1917 imperialist war, and during the preparation for and the unfolding of the October socialist revolution.

Gramsci

It is with Gramsci that the notion of an intellectual begins to cover, from a Marxist viewpoint, the social area it covers today in France (Gramsci dans le texte, Editions sociales 1975, pp 320-322; intellectuals as an independent category, pp 349-351).

PCF

One will follow with interest the elaboration and the development of a concept of specifically French intellectuals through the history of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

relations of the French labor movement and the intellectuals, on the one hand, and, on the other, through the Editions sociales publications and various PCF magazines.

1. Some Chronological References

1936. Villeurbanne Congress. Maurice Thorez in his report distinguishes men of culture among the categories he calls on to enter the struggle against fascism, for bread and for freedom. He makes culture one of the relatively autonomous dimensions of the national reality.

1938. Jacques Duclos delivers a lecture on the Rights of Intelligence at the invitation of the Federation of Houses of Culture (the text is to be found in volume 2 of Jacques Duclos' Memoirs).

1947-1953. The Central Committee creates a work section of "intellectuals and culture" supported by work committees by specialty. Then the federations create, in their turn, federal committees of intellectuals and sometimes specialized committees.

Birth of the PCF magazines directed by intellectuals: La NOUVELLE CRITIQUE (1948), L'ECOLE DE LA NATION (1952). In 1972 ITC [expansion unknown] will have a brief life.

1957. "Status of the Intellectual" and "Socialism and Culture" by Jean Kanapa. The ITC are for the first time considered a social class.

1966. Central Committee meeting in Argentueil, the first entirely devoted to party activity among the intellectuals and cultural policy.

1970. First enterprise sections composed of a majority of intellectual workers (Orsay University, la Halle-aux-Vins Campus)

1972. Present Culture by Roland Leroy.

1973. Speech by Georges Marchais and Roland Leroy on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE (See LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE January 1974).

1977. Speech by Georges Marchais at the Sheraton Hotel: "Social Justice is Henceforth a Decisive Progress of the Progress of Culture." "No Economic Progress and no National and Human Progress without Greater Development of Culture."

1978. The committee for "work with the ITC" is attached to the Central Committee's work section called "enterprises." In Vitry, Georges Marchais announces that, when the time comes, "another Argentueil" will be held.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1979. The draft resolution of the 23rd congress lists intellectual categories and analyzes for each one specific reasons for alliance with the working class. "This important question calls for careful work on our part, tied to fresh reflection on their situations and their aspirations."

II. Some Bibliographical References

Besides the works and articles cited in the chronology above:

Sur la Litterature et l'Art, selected texts from Marx and Engels, preceded by an introduction by Maurice Thorez and a study by Jean Freville (1954).

Sur la Litterature et l'Art, selected texts by Lenin; study by Jean Freville (1957)

Situation de l'Intellectual by Jean Kanapa. Collection "Essays of LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE," (1957)

The French Communist Party, Culture and Intellectuals,

- Texts by Maurice Thorez, Waldeck Rochet, Jacques Duclos, Roger Garaudy, Aragon, Georges Cogniot.

- Statements by great intellectuals

- Presentation of Leo Figueres

Marxism and the Roads to the Future by Waldeck Rochet, with appended resolution of the Argenteuil Central Committee, the first part of which is entitled "The Communist Party, Intellectuals and Culture" (1966)

The May-June 1966 "Cahiers du Communisme" publish together the speeches delivered at the 1966 Argenteuil Central Committee meeting.

Intellectuals and the Class Struggles, by Antoine Casanova, Joe Metzger and Claude Prevost, republication of studies published by LA NOUVELLE CRITIQUE (1970).

Present Culture, collection of speeches delivered by Roland Leroy, several of which deal with the problems of intellectuals between 1967 and 1972 (1972).

For Science, by Joe Metzger (ES 1973).

Social Classes and Union of the People of France, by Claude Quin (ES, February 1976)

In Cahiers d'Histoire de l'Institut Maurice Thorez,

- Bernard Chambaz, "PCF Cultural Policy," training and national realities (no 12-13).

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

"Intellectuals and the French Communist Party; their alliance in history"
(first trimester 1976 no. 15)

In La Nouvelle Critique,

- C. Prevost, "Toward Argenteuil, Some Milestones on the Road" (February 1976)

In the Cahiers du Communisme

- F. Hincker, "Increasingly Broad Bases for the Alliance of the Working
Class and the Intellectuals" (March 1974).

- Jean Girard "ITC, Bases of the Alliance," (December 1975)

- Gabriel Page "Middle management wage-earners" (May 1977)

In Economie et Politique

- Jean Girard, "ITC, What is its Future?" (November 1976)

The Cadres, too, by Bernard Di Crescenzo Jean Giard (ES 1977)

Travels with some Cadres, by Rene Le Guen (ES 1977)

COPYRIGHT: 1979, Les Editions de la Nouvelle Critique

8339

CSO: 3100

END