

Thursday July 27

10³⁰
AM

Lecture -
Gajo Petrovic

Editor - PRAXIS

- on the history of this
radical Yugoslav philosophical
review

Discussion -

Igor Hajek - Editor
of Czechoslovak journal,
Literarni Noviny

3

Stajo Petrovic & Igor Hajek - 27th July 1967

Petrovic

As you know, I am going to talk about the journal Praxis. It may really seem a little unusual or even inadmissible for someone to come to a Congress on Dialectics of Liberation and, instead of talking either on dialectics or on liberation, talking on the journal which he is editing. So in order to explain that, I must tell you that I really came to the conference with a paper in written form which I intended to read, but I decided not to read the paper but to talk informally to you about Praxis for two reasons: one is that David Cooper advised me to do so, and the second is that I found his advice wise. And I hope David won't be angry with me if I tell you how it happened. Really it happened so that David, after he read my paper told me "Oh, it's great, it's great." And after a pause he repeated a third time "Oh, it's really great." So when he three times repeated it was great, it was clear to me that he didn't regard the paper suitable for the purpose but he didn't know how to tell me that. So in order to help him I told him "No, it's really not great, it's a fool paper". And then he told me "It is great indeed, but I would, if I may make a suggestion, I would suggest you talk on Praxis." I accepted his suggestion because I think in this Congress a number of people from various - intellectuals from various fields are gathered, it is really better to talk informally, and I think Praxis is a good topic for such a talk. I think it's a good topic because Praxis is not only a journal, although it is a journal. It is also not only a literary concept, Praxis is ~~also~~ really a way, or a mode, or a form of being: namely, it is that form of being which is characteristic of man, it is really what makes men men. So I think it is quite appropriate for such a Congress on the Dialectics of Liberation.

There are different possibilities for talking about the journal. I really, in these introductory words, do not intend to speak in the way of

Petrovic - 2.

information. I don't intend now to talk to you, when did it start, how can you subscribe or etc., but I will be glad to answer such questions in the course of the discussion.

Now I would really like to talk something about the, what one could call basic or guiding ideas of Praxis. I would like to talk really a little about the motives which led us to found the journal. We really decided to found the journal because, not simply because we wanted to have the trouble of editing a journal - which is really ^{in a way} a trouble and ^{through} losing much time - but because we didn't find a single journal ~~in~~ which we could express our basic intentions and wishes. So I would like to tell you something about these basic ideas. I would only like to mention that when I am talking about our guiding or basic ideas, this doesn't imply or mean that all editors or members of the editorial board - because we have seven members of the editorial board - or even members of the advisory board, which is a group of 40 or 50 people, or even all contributors to the journal have some common ideas which they simply share. Really we differ ~~very~~ very much among themselves, even the editorial board, but nevertheless we have certain similar views. So what I am going really to do is to talk about some of my own views, with a remark that some of my colleagues who take part with me in this journal, have rather similar views on these points. I'm really going to talk about four views, or four points, or four conceptions: a specific conception of philosophy, a specific conception, or concept of socialism, a definite concept of Marxism and a concept of internationalism. If I am mentioning now four problems or four concepts about which I am going to speak, this doesn't mean that there must be four; I could reduce them or summarise them into three or two points, or even one, or I can expand it into ten. I am doing this simply because of the necessity to give a structure to my talk which as Lucien Goldmann yesterday reminded us, is very important always in human activity, although structures are something which is historical and which is, of course, made by man himself.

the journal
First, we started ~~izvjestak~~ to promote a certain concept of philosophy. As we all know, contemporary philosophy is in a curious state. In a way it is, if you regard numbers, in a state of flourishing because, as I was recently told by the organisers of the next Philosophical Congress in Vienna, more than two thousand philosophers come to the Congress from the U.S. and more than two thousand from Russia. But despite such a great number of philosophers, you know that philosophy is really leading a poor existence in the sense that we are mainly - what we mainly find under the name of philosophy is a thought which is separated from other kinds of intellectual activities, such as art, literature, science etc., and which is separated from the basic problems of man's life and of the contemporary world. Philosophy has become one among special fields, which is further subdivided into more special fields, into philosophical branches or disciplines such as logic, ethics, aesthetics etc. etc., and which has really no touch with what is going on in the world, and which is satisfied by contemplating certain aspects or part of the world, helping the existing world to function or leaving it as it is.

Our conception of philosophy is a conception of an alive thought which has something to say about basic problems of man's life and the contemporary world; and which ~~doesn't~~ not only wants to say something about that/^{which} doesn't want simply to get a theoretical knowledge of it, but which wants to change it, which doesn't want to leave the existing as it is. So in the editorial to the first number of Praxis, we express such a viewpoint that we/^{want} philosophy as a sort of ^{thought} revolution. And we further specified it by saying that we would like to have a philosophy which will be the pitiless criticism of everything existing, and the humanist vision of a better human future, and an inspiring force of revolutionary action. Such a statement, and the viewpoint which we expressed, has however met with many misunderstandings. Some have thought that, by insisting that we must take over the problems of ~~man~~^{men} and the world etc., that we are really advocating the abolition of philosophy, that it is a kind of even politicistic programme. However, our idea was not to push philosophy aside

Petrovic - 4.

and then go to a kind of an action, because we believe that really no action leading to a really human society is possible without philosophy as a critical thought of man, of himself and of the world in which he lives.

So that our viewpoint is not to abolish philosophy, our viewpoint is to develop philosophy, really to negate that, if you like, self-alienated form which contemporary philosophy mainly has; to renew great traditions of philosophy which, when it was really flourishing, was concerned with great problems of man's life; and to go further, to in a way go to the realisation of philosophy - which doesn't mean that philosophy will be realised at any point of history, because this would mean the end of man, of history and of society - but it means that philosophy cannot be separated from life and has to participate in the creation of a new life.

Another misunderstanding was that we are perhaps interested only in some parts of philosophy; that we are perhaps interested only in political and social philosophy, or perhaps also in a kind of philosophical anthropology. This is also not a right impression or interpretation, because we really believe that not only social philosophy and political philosophy, but in a way all so-called traditional branches of philosophy, including metaphysics or epistemology, were concerned with real problems. And what is our viewpoint, it is ^{not} that philosophy has to be reduced to some of its branches. We on the contrary think that it is wrong to divide philosophy into branches. It is possible to divide philosophy into disciplines for purposes of teaching it in schools. But when somebody gets interested mainly in ^{divisions}, or in some special field, he is really not a philosopher any more. Those who specialise, let us say, in ethics or aesthetics or in some other field, they really cannot say anything important even in that field, because all questions of philosophy are so closely connected. It is impossible to discuss a question which would be regarded as a question of social or political

Petrovic - 5.

philosophy - for example a question of a better society for which one should engage - if one doesn't have a concept of men in mind; and it is impossible to discuss a concept, or the problem of men without discussing questions which have bearing on it, as typical questions of metaphysics, as the question of the meaning of being; because to explain what man is one should explain his specific mode of being, and in order to do that one has to discuss the problem of - about the meaning of being in general, one has to discuss the problem of the time, one really has to destroy the traditional conception of time as something which is determined from the past, and elaborate a new concept of time which starts from the future; one has to discuss the problem about the relationship between the possibility and actuality; and one has to discuss a number of other so-called general philosophical questions.

So what is our intention, it is not to metaphysics or some other field. We really believe that questions of social, so-called social, and political philosophy are connected with problems of philosophical anthropology, epistemology, ontology etc. On the other hand we let us also think it is impossible to discuss problems of, ~~and~~ say, ontology apart from the problems of anthropology or, if you like, social philosophy. Because if one wants to answer the question about being in general, one cannot disregard the problem about the being of man, which is a specific and, in a way, if you like, the highest mode of being. (So our view is that philosophy as a whole should develop), that no great questions of philosophy should be ignored or eliminated.

A third misunderstanding and criticism was directed to this part of our programme and those of our sayings where we said that we would like to develop philosophy as a pitiless criticism of everything existing - which, as you know, is one of the sayings of the young Marx. Some people objected to that, saying that really this means that we are a kind of group which wants to criticise everything, which is destructive, which is not constructive; and that such a destructive criticism as we practise cannot help anybody, and is even socially,

theoretically fruitless and socially harmful. This criticism is also without foundation because really, you saw when I mentioned how we defined our task we were talking not only about criticism, but we talked about the humanistic vision and the inspiring force etc. But on the other hand even if one takes this critical part of it, we believe that every criticism is both constructive and destructive, and it is a naive way of dividing criticism into constructive and destructive. In answering the criticism that we are destructive, a friend of mine recently wrote that we are neither constructive nor destructive, we are simply subversive, in the sense that every real thought is subversive because it wants to subvert the existing order. Either it is subversive or else it is not a thought at all.

So really what we have in mind is not simply criticising in the sense of saying No, which is really a vulgar conception or concept of criticism: because you know criticism derives from krinein, which means "to judge", and this means really to analyse a situation and come to its core, to its essence, to discover both its limitation and the possibilities for its further development.

In addition to such misunderstandings and criticism which assumed that we are really doing less than we were intending to do, there have been also such criticisms which wanted to attribute to us much more than was our intention. So, without disputing that we are doing a kind of philosophy, some have thought that we also want to become a kind of political movement or a political party. And this again was not our intention. We are really a philosophical journal which, among other problems, discusses of course problems of political philosophy. And we discuss them very frankly and openly, and our discussion of those political problems certainly has also an influence upon the political life in our country. But we don't want to form a political party, for the simple reason that we don't believe that it is - that the future of mankind should be organised in such a way that you have political parties as the basic tool or form which will enable to make decisions about life. We

Petrovic - 7.

really think that one can discuss whether a one-party system or two-party system or three-party system etc. is better for this country or that country, at the present moment. But we think that in all cases the goal to which one has to strive is not either to increase or to diminish the number of parties, but to go to a no-party system. And this is the direction in which we tend to go and in which we intend to support the development.

The second point which I mentioned is a certain concept of socialism. We are, in the _____ of Praxis, socialist, but we have a certain concept of socialism which we would like to promote. As you all know, there are many different concepts of socialism, and in this meeting it has become also obvious that there are many many concepts and interpretations of socialism. Nevertheless I think that the predominant concept of socialism is still the one which was developed inside Marxism and inside the Third International, and which is still more or less accepted in Russia and in most socialist countries. This is the concept which regards socialism as a political system - a social system - a social system which is very clearly and simply defined, because it is regarded as the so-called _____ phase of Communism. It is a view that all the future history of mankind will pass through those two phases: the phase of socialism and the phase of ripe communism. And it is also a conception that between capitalism and socialism there is a transitional period: the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. So that in a way there is a scheme of development, there is an idea that we have first capitalism, then a transitory period - period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, - then socialism, and finally communism. So that we know in advance what is going to happen.

Socialism and communism in general are defined by the fact that private property has been abolished and that you have a common and really mainly State ownership of the means of production. And then a difference between socialism and communism is drawn, on the basis of a certain principle of distribution which will be prevailing for the society.

Socialism is defined as a society where we have the distribution according to work; and communism as a society where we have distribution according to needs. This is the prevailing concept of socialism, at least in the socialist countries and in the communist workers' movement. And this is a concept which we in Praxis have been criticising, because we find that it is not adequate. We think that it is really even not Marxist although it may have some of its roots in Marxism, but it is mainly a Stalinistic concept.

First we think it is rather a dangerous conception to talk of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transitional period between capitalism and socialism, which is neither capitalism nor socialism. Because the idea of such a transitional period which is something special leaves too much freedom for determining what is such a period going to be. So that, for example, although you will have a developed democracy in socialism, and although you have a kind of democracy - with many defects but nevertheless in some countries a form of democracy you have in capitalism, you can say that a transition period need not be similar in this respect either to capitalism or to socialism, it can be a period of violence, a period in which inhuman means are used for achieving human purposes. And this is what has sometimes really happened, and this is what sometimes compromised the idea of socialism.

Then, if you come to the idea about socialism and communism as something where ~~you have~~ the basic thing is to have private property abolished, and the difference is in the way in which the distribution is made, it is again a dangerous conception because you regard socialism and communism, and it is the implication that these are good or ~~the~~ best social orders for which you have to fight. You regard them as something which can be defined in terms of an economic system, and then you are able to require all men to make whatever he can for that social system which ~~is~~ now becomes a criterion for human behaviour, for judging it as human or un-human. I think it is a wrong conception because really, what is characteristic of contemporary man? It is ~~his~~ that he is really

Petrovic - 9.

not a man, that he is self-alienated; that means that he has become divided or split into different spheres; that his life is divided into economic activity, political activity etc. etc.; that he is not a whole being. And this conception of socialism and communism accepts the fact that man will be divided and that there will be a special economic sphere of his life dominating the whole of his life, and serving as a criterion for the social progress.

So in rejecting and criticising such a view, we insist on the fact that socialism and communism should be defined as a human society.

once wrote that socialism really is a cult of personality - but not in that sense in which it was used to denounce Stalinism, because the phrase "cult of personality" was in that place used really to mean the cult of impersonality. But in the sense that communism is a social order in which the human personality must have the possibility to develop its human possibilities. So that really we take such a viewpoint of socialism and communism as humanism, and we ~~it~~ regard this division of all future development of humanistic society into two phases as quite unjustified, because we are not able to decide ^{prescribe} for the future how it is going to develop.

I think really that it is interesting that it can be shown, and I have shown that in some of my writings, that for example Marx used the words socialism and communism, in several places he used the word socialism as denoting a higher phase in relation to communism. So it has sometimes been understood that we want to have first communism and then socialism; but this was not the idea, the idea was to show that such divisions are untenable and that what is most important is to conceive socialism as a human and humanistic society, and to take its humaneness as the criterion of its development. If you regard it in this way, then it is impossible to argue that in a certain way inhuman means are helping developing a socialist society in the future. Because ^ahuman society cannot be made using inhuman means.

So I come to my third point, which is Marxism. Marxism is not very popular nowadays and sometimes our friends in Yugoslavia and elsewhere tell us that we are really perhaps the last ^(gap at end of tape. Only a few words) and it might be possible. Nevertheless we are Marxists, but not Marxists in that sense which is now still current, and this is a sense in which Marxism is identified with Stalinism. We believe that Stalinism is really not Marxism, or if you like we think that Stalinism is a kind of a self-alienated Marxism. If I say that Stalinism is a kind of self-alienated Marxism, I want to say really that it is not something which has nothing to do with Marxism; because if it had nothing to do with Marxism, it would be easy to throw it away and not pay any attention to it any more. But Stalinism really takes some conceptions or views from Marxism, only it develops it in a wrong way. It is not, I think, something which could be regarded as a weak point of Marx that something like Stalinism ^{could} have been developed from it; because it is really a mark of a great thought, or a great philosopher, or a great thinker, that his thought always leaves different possibilities ^{open} ~~only~~. Only narrow-minded people have such views that they cannot be misinterpreted or misunderstood, or interpreted in different ways. So I think that Stalinism is a possibility of Marxist thought, but it is the worst possibility. There are many other possibilities which could be explored and developed.

So we try to develop another possibility of Marxist philosophy, and we have been doing that, always criticising Stalinistic conception of Marxist philosophy. To mention just a few points, we have been first of all criticising the Stalinistic attitude to the philosophical inheritance, especially the attitude to Marxist philosophical inheritance. As you know, there is a concept in Stalinism about ~~thoughts~~ four, three - the number is changing, ^{some say} /now ~~there~~ five - classics of Marxism. Marx, Engels, Lenin, for a time it was Stalin, and some now, Mao. But we think that it is wrong, not simply because Stalin was included, but because this concept of the classics of Marxism, this idea that there are four or five

people which are the collective possessors of the absolute truth, which know everything, which are always in agreement among themselves, and everybody with himself, is a wrong concept and cannot be maintained. We also disagree with the Stalinistic concept, or attitudes to non-Marxist philosophers, which is an attitude that someone who is not a Marxist cannot say anything important or valuable in philosophy. In our editorial we have written that we believe that intelligent opponents of Marxism can help more by their criticism the development of Marxist thought than the dogmatic and non-intelligent followers or admirers of Marxism.

Another point in which we disagree with Stalinistic interpretation of Marxism, is the viewpoint that philosophy has to be a tool in political action, especially a tool used by the Communist Party. We believe that philosophy is a greater activity, which has to be its own judge. This doesn't mean of course that philosophy should pay no attention to reality, that she lives in an ivory tower etc. But it means that she is responsible for herself. There is nobody else to tell ~~her~~ ^{the philosopher} what shall she discuss and to what conclusions should he come. A further distinction is that we do not accept the viewpoint according to which Marxist philosophy, is dialectical materialism. Because dialectical materialism as it was developed in Russia is really a conception which is a negation of some of the basic ideas of Marx. Dialectical materialism, for example, is a conception which explicitly contains no conception of man. It talks only about matter, mind, knowledge etc., But implicitly it contains a conception of man. It contains a conception of man as an economic animal. And we think that this conception, although it is widely attributed to Marx - namely the conception that the economic sphere of man's life is decisive, and even that the so-called forces of production play decisive or determining, the tools of production play a determining role in the development of all society - we think that such a conception is really not Marx conception. Marx really thought that man, in a certain period in his history - namely in the period of class-history - of his alienated

history, was mainly an economic animal. But it was not his general theory about man. It was really his criticism of the self-alienated society. He believed that man really is a free and creative being of praxis: something which he has been only to a certain extent to the alienated society, but something which he can and ought to become.

We think further that the so-called concept of materialism, the idea, the whole problem of what is primarily matter and mind, the thesis that matter is primary, which is regarded as the basic thesis of materialism, is really a conception which is based on dualistic conceptions, which is based on the misunderstanding of what human praxis really is, and which is also an evasion of basic intentions of Marxist philosophy.

We think further that what is usually regarded as Marxist theory of knowledge, the so-called theory of reflection, which has been elaborated mainly by Lenin - although he found it a little in Engels and before him - is really not the Marxist theory of knowledge. Because it is basically mechanistic, it can be a part only of a mechanistic and a vulgarly materialistic conception of the world. So that we think that this is also a Stalinistic conception.

We really even have certain doubts about the Dialectics, at least about the Dialectics as it was conceived. We think that Dialectics, if is taken as something describing such general and unchangeable laws of nature, is certainly untenable. But we have certain doubts also about the Dialectics in human history, because the question arises: how a dialectics should be made which won't contain a certain contradiction, in maintaining at the same time a change in history, and on the other hand insisting on some general structure of what is happening. So that some have even explored the possibilities of a so-called post-dialectical thinking.

These are some of the indications which show you the differences between our concept of Marxism and that concept of Marxism which has been developed in Stalinism. Of course when we develop such a conception of

Marxism, we meet with objections from all sides. We are criticised from the side of Stalinists as betraying Marxism, and we are on the other side also criticised from those who think that no form of Marxism has any importance today. I think in this audience today it will be more appropriate to say just a few words about this second objection.

I really find it sometimes rather naive when I hear the objection that it is impossible to talk of a creative or non-dogmatic Marxism, because every Ism is already a dogma and is something uncreative. Really we always live in a historical situation and we always have behind us, behind our back, we have a historical development not only of the world but of philosophy, and at no point we cannot ignore the results of that development. Somebody who tried to develop a philosophy or a viewpoint starting from no premises, could really only fall below what has already been long ago achieved. I had such an experience ten years ago. I had an opportunity to talk to Bertrand Russell, who made this objection, who asked me about what kind of philosophy one finds in Jugoslavia. I told him that there are different kinds but that Marxism is the prevailing kind. "Creative Marxism" he told me, "it's impossible." So I reminded him that he, in his own books, says that he is using the theory of knowledge mainly taken over from Hume; and his views in political philosophy have been taken over from Mill. And this is no obstacle for him to have his own, if you like, creative views. So that I think that really, when we talk of Marxism, we are entitled to think of a creative Marxism if ~~we~~ by that we mean really not repeating what was said by Marx, but if we mean by that that we are inspired by some of the basic thoughts of Marx; that we are ready, not only to develop it - because it was a Stalinistic conception that everything which was said by Marx is true, however you may add something to it, some more concrete explorations, more concrete theses - we think that not only you can add some concrete experiences and knowledge, but you can deny certain ~~theses~~ ^{theses} ~~theses~~

or you can find that they are not tenable. In this sense I think it is possible to talk about a creative Marxism.

Finally, my fourth point was internationalism. We are a journalism which is published in Yugoslavia, and more specifically in Croatia, in Zagreb; but we don't think that either philosophy or socialism or Marxism can be something purely national or nationalistic. We believe that both philosophy and socialism and Marxism are international phenomena. However we are not quite satisfied with the concept of internationalism, which is sometimes offered as a kind of final truth. Because the concept of internationalism is a concept which starts from nationalism. It is a concept that people from different nations could cooperate. And we are of course in favour of such international cooperation. I have no objections to anybody either for loving his own country or for cooperating with other countries. But I think what is more important, it is to go further, to add to internationalism, transnationalism. Namely, to add the viewpoint that we have to cooperate not only as representatives of different countries, but as human individuals, as persons or personalities. So that what is basic for us, it is this if you like transnational, or cosmopolitan, or humanistic, human perspective. It is something which I think is very important, and it is something which has also brought us certain misunderstandings and objections. For example, we have formed an international advisory board of about 40 or 50 persons from different countries. But of course when we indicate those names we don't indicate their countries, because we do not regard them as the representatives of the different countries but as individuals who have certain common views with us and with whom we want to cooperate. So we have met sometimes objections, why have we taken so many people from this country, and not from this country. And this question is out of place because we didn't want to make representation from all countries, because we are not simply internationalists, we are, as I was all the time repeating, transnationalists and humanists.

Thank you.

Date: 27. 7. 67.

P
PG 5/32

PETROVIC

.....if one doesn't have a concept of man in mind; and it is impossible to discuss a concept, or the problem of man without discussing questions which have bearing on it, as typical questions of metaphysics, as the question of the meaning of being; because to explain what man is one should explain his specific mode of being, and in order to do that one has to discuss the problem of the meaning of being in general, one has to discuss the problem of the time, one really has to destroy the traditional conception of time as something which is determined from the past, and elaborate a new concept of time which starts from the future: one has to discuss the problem about the relationship between the possibility and actuality; and one has to discuss a number of other so-called general philosophical questions.

PG 6

....But on the other hand even if one takes this critical part of it, [we believe that every criticism is both constructive and destructive, and it is a naive way of dividing criticism into constructive and destructive. In answering the criticisms that we are destructive, a friend of mine recently wrote that we are neither constructive nor destructive, we are simply subversive, in the sense that every real thought is subversive because it wants to subvert the existing order. Either it is subversive or else it is not a thought at all.]

PG 9

.....If you regard it in this way, the [it is impossible to argue that in a certain way inhuman means are helping developing a socialist society in the future. Because a human society cannot be made using inhuman means.]

PG 10

.... [As you know, there is a concept in Stalinism about four, three - the number is changing, some now say five - classics of Marxism. Marx, Engels, Lenin, for a time it was Stalin,

because Stalin was included, but because this concept of the classics of Marxism, this idea that there are four or five people which are the collective possessors of the absolute truth, which know everything, which are always in agreement among themselves, and everybody with himself, is a wrong concept and cannot be maintained.] We also disagree with the Stalinistic concept, or attitudes to non-Marxist philosophers, which is an attitude that someone who is not a Marxist cannot say anything important or valuable in philosophy. In our editorial we have written that we believe that intelligent opponents of Marxism can help more by their criticisms the development of Marxist thought than the dogmatic and non-intelligent followers or admirers of Marxism.

pg 11

.... [A further distinction is that we do not accept the view point according to which Marxist philosophy, is dialectic materialism. Because dialectical materialism as it was developed in Russia is really a conception which is a negation of some of the basic ideas of Marx. Dialectical materialism, for example, is a conception which explicitly contains no conception of man. Marx really thought that man, in a certain period in his history - namely, in the period of class-history - of his alienated history - was mainly an economic animal. But it was not his general theory about man. It was really his criticism of the self-alienated society. He believed that man really is a free and creative being of praxis: something which he has been only to a certain extent to the alienated society, but something which he can and ought to become.

We think further that the so-called concept of materialism the idea, the whole problem of what is primarily matter and mind, the thesis that matter is primary, which is regarded as the basic thesis of materialism, is really a conception which is based on dualistic conceptions, which is based on the misunderstanding of what human praxis really is, and which is also an

pg 13 I really find it sometimes rather naive when I hear the objection that it is impossible to talk of a creative or non-dogmatic Marxism, because every I am is already a dogma and is something uncreative. Really we always live in a historical situation, and we always have behind us, behind our back, we have a historical development not only of the world but of philosophy, and at no point we cannot ignore the results of that development. Somebody who tried to develop a philosophy or a viewpoint starting from no premises, could really only fall below what has already been long ago achieved. I had such an experience ten years ago. I had an opportunity to talk to Bertrand Russell, who had this objection, who asked me about what kind of philosophy one finds in Yugoslavia. I told him that there are different kinds but that Marxism is the prevailing kind; "Creative Marxism", he told me, "it's impossible" So I reminded him that he, in his own books, says that he is using the theory of knowledge mainly taken over from Hume; and his views in political philosophy have been taken over from Mill. And this is no obstacle for him to have his own, if you like, creative views. So that I think that really, when we talk of Marxism, we are entitled to think of a creative Marxism if by that we mean really not repeating what was said by Marx, but if we mean by that that we are inspired by some of the basic thoughts of Marx, that we are ready, not only to develop it - because it was a Stalinistic conception that everything which was said by Marx is true, however you may add something to it, some more concrete explorations, more concrete theses - we think that not only can you add some concrete experiences and knowledge, but you can deny certain theses, or you can find that they are not tenable. In this sense, I think it is possible to talk about a creative Marxism.

Finally, my fourth point was internationalism. We are a journal which is published in Yugoslavia, and more specifically in Croatia, in Zagreb; but we don't think that either philosophy

nationalistic. We believe that both philosophy and socialism and Marxism are international phenomena. However, we are not quite satisfied with the concept of internationalism. Which is sometimes offered as a kind of final truth. Because the concept of internationalism is a concept which starts from nationalism. It is a concept that people from different nations could cooperate. And we are, of course, in favour of such international cooperation. I have no objection to anybody either for loving his own country or for co-operating with other countries. But I think what is more important, it is to go further, to add to internationalism, transnationalism. Namely, to add the viewpoint that we have to cooperate not only as representatives of different countries, but as human individuals, as persons or personalities. So that what is basic for us is this if you like transnational, or cosmopolitan, or humanistic, human perspective. It is something which I think is very important, and it is something which has also brought us certain misunderstandings and objections. For example, we have formed an international advisory board of about 40 or 50 persons from different countries. But, of course, when we indicate these names we don't indicate their countries, because we do not regard them as the representatives of the different countries but as individuals who have certain common views with us and with whom we want to cooperate.

HAIJEK
PG 16 Well, the process that is now going on is often termed, in the west, liberalisation. I think that this term might be a little misleading because it is simplifying^{ly} although I myself of course simplify- but it is simplifying beyond comprehension, I always like to think of an article by an American journalist I read which was describing the economic changes taking place in Hungary, where he said that in Hungary they have done away with Communism, that only one small thing remained and that was the public ownership of the means of production.

various sides and points of view - but I think that mainly it is a continuous discussion, dispute, clash of views, a movement, oscillation; in some direction (which I think Gajo Petrovic defined very well in his speech. And even in spite, I feel that it's going somewhere even ins pite of ~~xugxuzx~~ retrogressive movement, the possibility of which we cannot exclude. Much of what has been said here is relevant to it. Basically, the main thing is nowadays the relation between society and the individual. And the aim of all this - I again will recall the words of Lucien Goldman - is, quote "The creation of a social system which require s the minium of sacrifice ffrom the individual". I think this Spinozian thought is very important and very relevant for what is going on.

Now, I am speaking about intellectuals, but not only about them because very many people are actively taking part in all this. There are many many discussions about these sacrifices: waht sacrifices are necessary, whic are not necessary, in a stablised society of the socialist type. Even the very word "stablised" is often being discussed.

There are several spheres in which this process is taking place, but they are linked together of course. The first one is, I think, the economic. As you hearhaps very well know, in most socialist countries now - and I think especially in Czechoslovakia nowadays - we are trying to get rid of the rigid planning system, which might have been necessary, a necessary sacrifice - might have been - during the Cold War perhaps at some stage of development; but it is being replaced now by self-regulating new economic patterns and structures - I think Paul Sweezy would be much better qualified to speak about this. This is creating a new situation. It has a great influence of course on the human condition and situation: not only on decision making, but also on participation in decision making for instance.

The other sphere, closely linked to this, is political science where there is the problem - I will used the word very often,

pg 17 should he be an object of politics only? The responsibility of the society as a whole to the individual is discussed, while it used to be the other way round: the individual was responsible to the society, but the responsibility of the society to the individual was overlooked. For all this we have various terms. Some of them are: "democratisation", "humanisation". Of course, this is again closely related to the position of socialist institutions. They also have a life of their own, and they have a ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ tendency to dig in once established - which, of course, breeds alienation. It doesn't simply disappear with the establishment of a socialist society.

I think that perhaps, in the words of our philosophers and political scientists, the effort goes in the way to find a system, to define or establish a continuous development of a system which does not prevent the individual to develop fully all his potential possibilities, but rather creates conditions in this direction. One of them, and not the least important, for instance, is the legal security of the individual.

Another sphere - which again is linked to the others very closely, they all sometimes merge - is the widening of awareness. You might term it perhaps - also the term which was very often used here, was the expanding of consciousness. Yesterday in a question posed to M. Goldmann, someone used these words which I would like to quote: "Reduction of the human condition leads to reduction of consciousness, which in turn leads to reduction of creativity"; I think this is very important.

pg29 Again, in relation to some things that have been said here, I think that the issues which we face nowadays are of a much subtle nature, and need a kind of sophisticated or thoughtful approach very often. We are very afraid, I must say, of short cuts and instant solutions. I had - I talked to some people here who said to me that it was a luxury that we could devote so much attention to these abstract things and abstract ways of thinking - abstract problems they called them. I think that - I don't think so, that

this is indulging in luxury, because after all we had to pay quite dearly for this luxury in many respects. And this luxury - so-called luxury - I think is at a certain stage of society an absolute necessity.

discussion

pg 24 Petrovic: Whether you would define internationalism as cooperation between different nations, or between the working classes of different countries, it is not sufficient. I think one should go further and also take into account internationalism as a transnationalism. Namely, as a cooperation between people regardless of their own nation. I think it is a profounder concept and I think it is something which we must have in mind. Because if we insist that our position is internationalism as a position of cooperation of nations, so it will be very difficult for us to go out of nationalism. It ~~xxxxxxx~~ always presupposes - in order to have a nice internationalism you must have strong nations, because you don't have international collaboration if you don't have nations as strong units, basic units of your life. And what I was refuting was not the reality of nations, or every the importance of nations, or even the possibility of every one of us to love one's own nation - I also love Yugoslavia, etc., but for example if one is speaking about this problem, something which I am very often stating in Yugoslavia when we were discussing problems, that I found much more close to me, for example, here is our friend, the Czech philosopher Karel , I found him much closer to me, not only his philosophic views but as a human being in whom I have full confidence, more confidence than in many Yugoslavs, or Serbs, or Croats, who belong to the same nation as I do. So that is a concrete example to show you what I mean by transnationalism.

pg26 Petrovic: I personally think this is not, that it is better to go into the direction of no-party system by a kind of a

withering away of the party. Which does this mean? Well, I think once of the ways of doing this is not to abolish or destroy the party, but to develop more and more such a situation that more and more all decisions about problems will be taken by those who are involved in them.

pg 27

Petrovic:is that really bourgeois humanism wants to remain inside the limit of the existing, of the contemporary society. Whereas our humanism is revolutionary and, as I told you, even subversive. Namely, we think that it is necessary to make a fundamental change of social order. Only where we disagree with dogmatic Marxists is, dogmatic Marxists think that the whole problem could be reduced to the problem of social change, and even less, to change in the form of property. There is a conception that you have simply to abolish private property and you have really a humanistic society. This is something with which we disagree. We think it is necessary not only to abolish the private property and to put into its place the state property, because then you have a new form of alienation and exploitation. Because you have again the worker separated from those who make decisions, and they are more or less in the same position as in capitalism. So we think we must also abolish state property and make a real social property, to have a real self-management of the immediate producers. But this is a position which is generally accepted in Yugoslavia, also by Yugoslav political leadership, and now it comes something again of which we, as philosophers in Praxis..... namely we think it is not enough to introduce a system of workers' self-management or something similar; it is really, we believe, impossible to make simple certain social forms which will secure the development of socialism or humanism. We think that in addition to the change of social structure, there must be an activity of every individual. It is impossible to create a free society in such a way that we should create certain institutions, or forms of social life, which will automatically produce a free society. Because a free

society is a society of free men, and free men are really men who are active as creative and free beings. And freedom is something which cannot be given as a gift to somebody, or forced, or produced, without that. Everybody has to fight for his own freedom. It is impossible to make somebody free. Society cannot be organised in such a way that, as a kind of a product, like from a slot-machine, you will get free individuals. So that we think it is necessary both to make a fight for a social change, change of institutions and organisation, and it is also necessary to fight for individual freedom (in the sense of developing free creating or self activity of every man. I think perhaps bourgeois humanism would insist on, that individual activity by which everyone should achieve his own freedom @ it is perhaps a way of putting it a little crudely. And Marxist dogmatists will insist on social change. We think that both cannot be really separated from each.....

.....but we think that we would object to bourgeois liberalism that he would regard freedom as a formal concept, or that he thinks that freedom is simply the absence of external impediments to do so. And we would insist on the point of content, namely the fact that freedom is not only something outside, of man's possibility to move freely or to do something, but freedom is developing first one's own creative potentialities, creating something new.

PETROVIC
Yugoslav: then I hear the objections that it is impossible to talk
??? because every reason is already a dogma, and ? ? ? we
always like in a historical situation, and we always have behind ourselves
historical development not only of the world, but of a whole philosophy
and at no point we cannot ignore the result of that development. Somebody
who tried to develop a philosophy or viewpoint starting from no premises would
really only fall below what has already been achieved. I had such an
experience ten years ago. I had the opportunity to talk to Bertrand
Russell, who made this objection CUT

HAJEK
Yug: repeating what was said by Marx, but if we mean by that we
are inspired by some of the basic thoughts of Marx

PETROVIC
Yug: of socialism or Marxism can be something purely national or
nationalistic. We believe that both philosophy, Socialism and Marxism
are international phenomena. However, we are not yet decided on the
concept of international, really, which is sometimes offered as a kind
of final truth. Because the concept of internationalism is something
which starts from nationalism. It is a concept that people from
different nations should co-operate. And they are of course, in favour
of such a co-operation. I have no objections to anybody either ? ? ?
his own country, or co-operating with other countries. But I think
what is more important, it is to go further, to trans-nationalism. Let
me put forward the viewpoint that we have to co-operate not only as ~~representatives~~
representatives of our own countries, but as human individuals, as
persons or personalities what is basic for us, it is trans-national,
or cosmopolitan, or humanistic, human perspective. It is something which I
think is very important, and it is something which has also brought us
certain misunderstandings and objections. To give an example, we have
formed an international advisory board of about 40 or 50 persons from
different countries. CUT

(applause)

HAJEK
Czech: I met people here at this Congress, who didn't always have
a clear picture of what is going on in Socialist countries CUT

Czech: might be a little misleading, it's simplifying, although I

like to think of an article by an American journalist I read which was describing the changes taking place in Hungary, where he said that they have done away with Communism in Hungary, that only one small thing remains, that is the public ownership of the means of production. We can view it from various sides, but I think it is a continuous discussion, often dispute, clash of views, a movement oscillation, in some direction, which I think Gaior Petrovish defines very well in his speech. And even in spite of, I think, it's going somewhere, in spite of retrogressive movements, the possibility of which we cannot exclude. Much of what has already been said here so far is relevant to it. Basically, the main thing is nowadays the relationship between society and the individual. And the aim of all this is, quote, 'the creation of a social system that requires the minimum of sacrifice from the individual'. I think this ??? thought is very important, very relevant for what is going on. Now, I'm talking about intellectuals, but not only them, because very many people are actively taking part in all this. CUT

Haseck

Cséch: in most Socialist countries now, I think especially in Czechoslovakia nowadays, we are trying to get rid of the rigid planning system, which might have been a necessary sacrifice, might have been, DURING the Cold War, perhaps, at some stage of development. This is being replaced now by self-regulating, new economic patterns and structures, I think Paul Sweezy would be more qualified to speak about this. This is creating a new situation. It has a great influence, of course, on the human condition and situation - not only on decision-making, but also on participation in decision-making, for instance. The other sphere closely linked to this is political science, where there is the problem - I will use the word very often - of collectivity and the individual. Is man an object - should he be an object of politics only? The responsibility of society as a whole to the individual, is discussed, while it used to be the other way around. The individual was responsible to society, but the responsibility of society to the individual was overlooked. For all this we have various terms, and some of them CUT

HAFELK

Czech: continuous development of a system which does not prevent the individual to develop fully all his potential possibilities, but rather creates conditions in this direction. One of them and not the least important, for instance, is legal security for the individual. Another sphere, which again is linked to the others very closely, they all sometimes merge, is the widening of awareness. You might term it ~~xxx~~ perhaps, the term that was very often used here, was expanding consciousness. Yesterday in a question posed to M. Goldman, someone used these words: 'Reduction of human condition leads to reduction of consciousness, which in turn leads to reduction of creativity.' I think this is very important. CUT

HAFELK

Czech: this Congress, for me, for instance, speaking from a very personal viewpoint, is providing a very useful background. I have the feeling that in our country any theoretical discussion is bound to have sooner or later at least some influence, on actual conditions and policy-making. And even if the response is negative, one has the feeling that someone is listening. It might not be very encouraging, but nevertheless, I think that in some respects, and this is of course our particular situation, we are a little more with the hard facts of life CUT

HAFELK

Czech: Allen Ginsberg was deported and accused of being a homosexual, - the law that has been in existence for about 10 days in this country has been in existence for about 10 years in Czechoslovakia. The whole question of the deportation of Ginsberg is much more complicated, since, his poetry has been published, and the incident has been almost forgotten by now. CUT