KW! NOTES ON THE EAST HUROPEAN ARTICLES ON MARKIST HUMANISM BogdanzGuchodolski in his article"Remaissance Humanism and Margian Euganism" traces the philesophy from Bucon as the first attempt into the mechanics of human activities (vs. human creativity. But he most serious article is by Winelle Markovic "Humanism and Dialection" It is he who not only speaks seriously of the dialectic but is not a fraid of saying that it applies also to a humanist" antology" as well as the humanist" Epistemology": "Marxiet dislectic is inseparable from its humanism. Marx noted that Hegel's dislectic is essentially a criticism of society, albeit 'concealed, unclear and mystifying criticismin. (ps. 79) Markovic then traces the "alienated, ideblegical life of the Marxist dislectic" just as soon as the labor movement became a vast organization,) how ther Bernstein rejected "the dislectical scaffolding". (pg. 81), and finally because the first revolution - - Rissian-was in a backward country. technology and industrialization) took priority over the human development: timo be sure, it has been customary to talk of dialectic as a guide to action But this has meant little more than a subsequent rationalization of various past pplitical conceptions and decisions. This is why Stalinism did not reject dislectic as a wholelin the way it rejected its key principle - the negation of negation.) The use of dislectical phraseology created an illusion of continuity in method. Furthermore: such a formalized and degenerated dislectic was needed to prove that whatever existed in socialism was necessarily such as it was, i.e., that it was rational." He also manages to criticse Paul Sartre's entreme) on freedom as an essential "ontological structure or as a condition of authentic existence which might make sense as postry but could easily concessed forms of slavery. since freedom can mean something definite only under a certain set of con-

13009

ditions.

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

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

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

July by man Find

and following the int

led to shilosophy to shilosophy

The really important one because it relates directly to Shilosophy and Revolution is the one by Danis Polovic "On the Power and Impotence of Philosophy": "This seek "Philosophy and Revolution" is only another way of expressing Marx's well-wern catch phrase about the 'realization of phisophy' beginning as a revolution in philosophy in order to end as a revolutionary philosophy in the ferr of the philosophy of the revolution." (pg. 181)

The author also establishes that as far back as his doctaral dissertation Marx considered Prometheus the greatest in the entire philosophical roster."

The movement from this historic mission of philosophy to lead to the liberation of the world to its transformation into bourgeois economic about the production of goods is, for Marx, "the same process of the perversion of philosophy from an idea of liberation into the science of exploitation and enslavement."

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