

(17)
(16)

NOTES ON WEEKEND XVII WITH
K. POLANYI, OCT. 12, 1957.

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. ROBERT OWEN	1
2. THE EARLY MARX	28
3. FREEDOM AND TECHNOLOGY	42
4. ROUSSEAU PARADOX	52
5. SHAW	55
6. CAMUS	57
7. INTERDISCIPLINARY PROJECT	59

NOTES

MONEY	61
SUMNER	61
AMERICA	62
THE GREAT TRANSFORMATION	63
CANADA	63
CANADIAN POETS	64

ROBERT OWEN

The Village of Union is an intricate thing which P. has now seen. [The first Village was an utter failure and nothing happened. He was told: we don't understand it, it isn't voluntary and how do you run it without capital? Are the workers allowed to employ themselves? What would happen to their earnings? Owen never admitted that it was impracticable and doesn't work at all.]

The Poor Law was a mechanism of the Parish or Union of Parishes and was carried on by Unions of Villages. For example, Pickering can't carry unemployment insurance alone. In England there were Unions of Parishes. P. has a statistic of 584 Unions in the Northwestern counties. [The first plan turns to the parishes. He will capitalize the rates and rent or buy the land and take over the paupers and include the unemployed in it. But nothing happened.]

He had no response and then he put forward something entirely different maintaining the first plan. P. takes it that Owen reversed his position and not for the given reason that the first plan would be so marvellous.

Spade agriculture claimed the imagination of more than one person of the time. Also social engineering was a great fashion of the time. (cf. the G.T.) Owen thought he had a suitable idea but it doesn't strike P. that way. That isn't the way real money is invested in new ventures.

The 1792 depression was nothing but the first year of the outbreak of the War and after that there was a war boom.

[We haven't given any picture of Owen's selflessness, his lack of vanity, the lack of any touchiness and abundance of generosity. He had a type of pride which was peculiarly noble. He refused to accept a valuable business offer because it was one-third instead of one-half. He had unlimited patience, utter insensitivity to unjust blame, physical courage and boundless strength of mind. He had an impersonal detached faith, absence of anger or fear and was unimpressed by King or Emperor. His autobiography is that of a saint who would have been shocked to be referred to that way. No one was more tactful or reserved. These are the characteristics of the selfless person which except in some novels (e.g. Dostoevski, The Idiot) doesn't occur anywhere. He was utterly impervious to logical argument and therefore the links were missing from his discovery which wasn't a discovery, to the conclusions that didn't follow.]

We will have therefore to make much more deliberate points taking them from our need to start on Marx, but this is not difficult. It simply means that the points will be somewhere in the Owen chapter.

Owen was enormously able but his abilities were far surpassed by the peculiarities of character. These are summed up under the rare heading of selflessness and being obsessed by practical aims of selfless character. P. thinks Owen personally was irresistible and no one could speak with him without being won over, and this was due to the selflessness. He wasn't interested in his person and this is something very attractive to everybody.

P. sees the Owen story in a different light and we will also have to collect material from Marx' great admiration of Owen. He was

the only one of the utopians he thought highly off. According to Landshut Marx almost invented the proletarian - the only force to be regarded as a mover. It is not one of the postulates but what he regards as the reality. In Owen there is no idealizing of the proletariat at all and in Marx there is an infinite capacity to idealize the proletariat.

We will have to quote four lines from Owen's autobiography written at the age of 85 that the work he did will undoubtedly change the picture of the world, on this planet. He hadn't the shadow of a doubt that his work was outstandingly successful in spite of its apparent failure. ⁸¹⁵¹ Owen's autobiography should be known in a different way from Cole's presentation. I didn't take in Owen's autobiography. P. was very much taken with the autobiography this time.

His autobiography P. 144 gives the two postulates under which everything can be resolved. P. 75 - he regards his work as utterly successful. You are amazed from line to line. This comes from the modesty which doesn't really occur anywhere. P. 22 he recapitulates his belief on being a child of nature. To abandon all belief was Owen's religion to be taught to man. His real desire was to do good to the human race and he thought that religions were not only wrong but caused all the evil.

Man isn't responsible for his falling character and here he never elaborates the position. This is a kind of absurdity which goes far to explain the whole man. It is like an obsession and he discovers the thought anyone might have had, but he has only this one thought.

With Calvinism (Grace) man isn't responsible for a thing. Owen must have thought of something which he doesn't say.

In his school he must have produced a crowd of children which amazed the world: well-behaved, cheerful and loveable and this was so much a legend that Queens came to visit and the school strikes one as even surpassing a common experience of modern times.

Owen discovered capitalism through unemployment and was not prone to regard socialism as the solution. What does capitalism consist of and why does fighting unemployment lead you to a further discovery?

The answer was the trades depression. The sensation that staggered the country was that they had a victory in the war and then found themselves in a depression. This was an utterly perplexing thing and Owen described his reception when the Parliamentary committee heard him. It was the first time there was a great depression at all and the sentence indicating the discovery of capitalism was more shocking almost than America.!

Owen put forward a theory that the machine was responsible that he said that the war is over with its great source of demand and that there were no markets.

Malthus at the time didn't provide much in the way of economic theory and Ricardo was only famous on the bullion question in 1809. Laissez-faire does not have a strong representative and insofar as it has one, it is Malthus. For him poverty is one of the preventive checks.

An indication of what Owen was up against was the terrible way he was hounded and attacked and in this way learned about classes and the extent to which they make themselves felt. Why were wages low? They were low on account of the unemployment. In some sense this was a discovery of capitalism i.e., not that it is low wages but he is conscious that unemployment was a phenomenon distinct from the poor. When P. was a boy it was thought that the reason for unemployment was that they didn't try and find work. The main objection to my draft is that it isn't serious.

Owen noticed the bitter egotism of the class war and we may need this for the Marx chapter. Owen's conclusions however, were completely different from Marx.

There is no mention of Bellers whose problem must deal with the unemployed in the framework of the Poor Law.

Owen said that he wanted useful things and he called the market "artificial". His heterodoxoy is expressed in the 'artificial and useless goods'. This must be mentioned in his head-on collision with capitalism.

Owen also wanted to get rid of the Speenhamland thing. There would be no supplementation of wages but there is here a subsidy to the capitalist through cheaper labour and a promise of shorter hours. It is a grandiose measure of shorter hours although no evidence is available. That would explain the whole thing.

† The logic of the shift from the first plan is unemployment.

Owen is the only
utopian Marx thought
highly of.

Owen does not idealize
the proletariat as does
Marx.

The Village would attract the unemployed and one would have to have similar unions for those who work. In that way the idea was to prevent unemployment by immobilizing labour. Today for example, we have the five year contract. The general measure for the social welfare of the working class during a depression which was outside the depression made no sense at all. The first scheme would attract more paupers to the Parish.

The second scheme would stabilize employment in a depression. This is very near to the 18th century view, when village workers had bonded cottages.

The real difficulty is class three, as to why they should go into this. The propertyless workers would go into it if their employer did. Actually number three had no practical importance at all. They are craftsmen and artisans and these are not in danger of unemployment at all.

Under the first scheme they were subsistence farmers and it meant that they would actually grow their own food and nothing would come on the market. If they earned in spite of that, it would be for the benefit of the community. It was pretty much the same as the Bellers plan. It meant that the guardians would settle the paupers and the unemployed on the land and the rates were capitalized. It never worked because it needs capital. And also the unemployed would be stabilized permanently, but you are actually trying to get rid of them. This would institutionalize them and the poor rates would persist. He did say they would be working for the benefit of the community but you can't have that with compulsory organizations.

The first scheme therefore would increase unemployment instead of decreasing it. Owen couldn't answer the old charge of creating paradises - oases.

There was no Poor Law reform and the poor houses were nice little buildings - almshouses and there might be six or eight paupers in them. There were usually no work houses and people weren't compelled to work. Otherwise they would be overrun and the Act of Settlement etc. wouldn't be effective.

Also how would the working class grow up, This is under the Speenhamland regime and that was pretty widespread although it was not entirely general.

Note in the Cole edition of Owen: p. 151 - artificial law of supply and demand, p. 219 - goaded by mechanism etc., p. 227 - vociferators for freedom.

The main features were that these were real depression measures. It was all later done by Roosevelt e.g., O.P.W., C.C.C., W.P.A. This actually saved them from starvation and degeneration.

The first plan meant something like the obvious - the Bellers plan to let them keep themselves on the rates. But the second is a far-reaching anti-depression measure of employment stabilization to prevent unemployment from breaking down by flooding in of the new unemployed. At that time if unemployment measures were successful it would increase the poor rates and make it more difficult to get rid of the poor. There must be very high safeguards and they would only embark on this scheme if it would be cheaper to keep the paupers.

The problem is ancient - making the poor work, sending them around to the farmers as roundmen etc. The Parish would assume the burden of the interest on the capital. These are the typical problems of social institutions and social legislation and market economy.

Owen refuses to discuss these. He says that if these are so successful the whole of society should be in it. Instead, he would have immobilized the population. (The workers would be indentured and there would be no new enterprises and that would be the greatest loss to the economy and you can't get workers if you need them (the market)).

This scheme gives stability at the cost of efficiency, productivity and change and that's why the economists were against it. It went head-on against this scheme which culminated in 1834. He said the capitalists were conspiring to do just the opposite and he says he thought it was revolting. The capitalists instead of planning for employment planned for unemployment and to force wages down and he found it revolting.

After receiving 100 or 200 pounds, it meant that the class would cease to be a proletarian class.

P. had the conception from the beginning but he didn't see that there were 3 different kinds of Unions which I pointed out, and now he sees the meaning of the whole thing. [Except for the fact that the world was moving toward a labour market system it would have made a lot of sense especially since competition for labour among the capitalists would have made wages rise (this was in a boom).]

On p. 251 he discusses labour notes and that there would be markets for everything. That's why he said that the basic institutions needn't change. This could be called liberal socialism where you have markets (Abba Lerner). This is not an end to profits, otherwise how would they pay the 100 or 200 pounds.

P. thinks I should read the autobiography carefully and the crucial passages and the works. P. feels that we have got somewhere on the Village of Union and it is sound. One-half of the chapter is sound, interesting and to the point from our angle - not from the point of view of the usual Robert Owen reader. There is a lot missing however, in the writing of things that are relevant to our approach to Owen. This might be written later. What is his relationship to the individual and society? We don't have the passages on freedom nor the meaning of his social determinism nor are we criticizing it either.

P. will have to read this again on account of the Marx then it will be quite obvious that we can't miss some of this. We might have for instance the passage where in Owen's view those who are writing on these subjects have no practical knowledge. This has much relevance to Marx.

One should not risk missing understanding to the full the Owen situation. He realized the problem if his first plan were a success. The problem of the Poor Law had insoluble contradictions. If you make it a success it breaks down and it gets flooded. Everybody knows that. It would break down under the rates. Even people with employment would prefer it. It didn't get started for this reason. You would never get rid of the poor.

Alvin Lerner +
liberal socialism

The fact that you would have to invest the money is not in contradiction with saying that it can only be done on a bigger scale. That's the answer, - they would stabilize employment of those who have it and end up like America looks today e.g. the long-range Reuther contracts.

The workers were promised enormous sums by the capitalist to stay in for five to ten years. The workers would have houses and land to keep themselves, (allotments) and this is the solution which saved Germany and Austria in the 1920's and England in 1940-43. The people survived by having land and this takes only an hour or two a day with spade gardening.

All this makes a lot of sense from the capitalist point of view - cheap labour, no strikes and no troubles. In a non-depression, this means high wages and flourishing markets e.g., America in 1957. With communal kitchens and nursery it is a liberal socialist utopia. There is stability, security no unemployment, no revolution and it's done gradually. There is no McCarthyism and the people congregate according to their sects and parties. My understanding of sects and parties is correct.

There is no contradiction that it didn't work and you need a bigger scale. Every socialist says that it would be gradualist.

What would the 100 pounds be paid out of except the profits by capitalists? This is a matter which shows in more than one way how far Owen was forced to penetrate the whole problem. [There is no but unemployment, accumulation of capital, distribution of capital gradually, stability of employment, subsistence farming which is subsidiary.]

There is no urbanization, ^{but} a return to village life, flourishing markets on the purchasing power principle. The high wages mean good markets and added to this there is no totalitarian development in civil liberties and there is complete tolerance through freedom of association. This makes it possible to have pauperism separated out and to generalize the principle of the Village of Union.

Now P. understands why Marx was so appreciative of Owen and he must have understood how many problems he was trying to solve.

[The labour notes would have replaced the gold standard but he didn't understand that setting the labour hours on commodities is insoluble. He was misled by the labour theory of value that Ricardo had been teaching.]

Owen was a man of enormous practical ability and he thought it out. He would have got around the whole obstruction of the church if e.g. the Catholics all kept together etc. They probably taunted him to find an answer to the sectarian question so he said let them have their sects. It has nothing to do with the question and was for example like female fashions.

There are few cases of humour. On the other hand having that many sects and parties is on the same level as a whimsical thing and it means you can't take it seriously or know why it was there. It was an answer to things he was bothered about on all sides. e.g., let them have left-handed and right-handed Villages of Union etc. We might say for instance that one shouldn't get confused by the whimsical things - these were an answer to the vociferators for

freedom, the freedom cryers and we don't know etc. We needn't follow this up in a conventional, trivial fashion and we are not permitted to this or that completeness. We are called upon to understand what is being suggested.

I overlooked that this is in the framework of the market. In the first plan there are no markets only exchange between Unions.

P. made the mistake of not noting that there are separate and distinct types of villages and that he would have all the classes in it. That was a very realistic objection.

The question is only what points do we make on the reality of society. He accepted the challenge that if more cannot be done man would have to accept the unavoidable without whining. He never accepted marketless planning. But with this he said there would be no basic institutional change ^{unless} if necessary.

On the spade, he was talking about it under the wrong heading. He meant England's 60 million acres.

I don't know what to do with the Village of Union because it wasn't thought through.

Even though the trade union movement and the Rochdale pioneers came very much later, he really said good-bye to socialism with this plan.

He didn't make any statements after 1821 as important as the ones between 1813 and 1821. But in his autobiography he had one statement of the world being transformed more and more. Of course, he could know nothing of Mao-Tze-Tung.

Capitalism made quite a success of it 30 years later.

It is a simple idea to include all the points (2 or 3) where he was stopped - the owners, the church, parishes and the circumstances of the Village of Union. Apart from America (which doesn't prove anything) their attack should be regarded as a consistent pattern. This needn't be said but it would give the paper a more meaningful pattern.

The writing is too smooth and one shouldn't allow the reader to skate over without taking it in. It is important for such a plan that one makes it plastic so the reader realizes the Village of Union is a planned settlement. Otherwise one imagines that in some old village people are simply more friendly.

We should use our imagination to map out what Owen meant and do it freely. Bare bones are misleading. This wasn't a bare bones affair. It is quite obvious that it is an employment stabilization matter. That is why it is impossible to persuade them. They are comfortable. There is a distribution of capital. (cf. Chesterton) and property is more widely distributed.

From the second class people would move into the third class and this is a typical distributivist idea - that everybody should end up with capital. If you take people today eg. Levittown you get a picture of the Village of Union or some enormous Kodak or Eastman plant of 2000 to 6000. There are also the Reuther contracts and education and insurance schemes. P. doesn't know where I see the importance of the book.

P. has the feeling that we should take the line that the first village plan must be corrected. The point is that the number of poor was increased by those out of work. I should get more material on the poor law questions and those were not new apart from the Bellers proposals.

No action was taken and since the depression continued unemployment continued to grow. Broader action seemed to be called for that helped to stabilize unemployment and reduce the unemployed. It was logical to enlarge the action and one should credit him with the intention of making the first plan possible by relieving the threat of further unemployment and at the same time he may have had in mind an anti-depression measure. Purchasing power would be maintained, markets created and demand increased. This grew into a measure of general scope and would have introduced an entirely new organized development and this might have served all the purposes. Nobody knew how enormous was the scope of depression. This wouldn't be in the realm of naivete, although nothing came of it.

[This was however, extremely prophetic and a number of features 140 years later (today) became features of capitalism e.g. the indenture features were carried into the long-range contract and anti-depression features of today are thought of as the dispersal of capital holdings, distributivism.]

We must say therefore, that these are some of the features of a much later development. He was right, that all this would happen without basic institutional transformation.

For workers who are at present working and who are in danger

of being dismissed, why not help them to be partly self-subsistent on land and then have them commit themselves to remaining there and if they promise to stay they would receive a bounty. In this way purchasing power is upheld, unemployment is not increased and at the same time life is continued and people are not unemployed and social hygienism proved.

The Owen will give us a basis for the Marx, and because it was utopian it doesn't mean that there was no interest.

P.'s Speenhamland discussion was vitiated by the fact that there were patches above the Speenhamland scale. There was a Speenhamland law but it applied only if the judges of the county decided for it. Under the Elizabethan Poor Law there was no subsidy to wages. This was contrary to the Elizabethan Poor Law. You were poor only if you decided to go on the rates. It is not like today where everybody goes to claim the pension or payment.

It worked only while employment was on the increase and English trade was on the increase for centuries. They also couldn't have national insurance. Speenhamland worked only because not everybody went on the rates. If they had, wages would have fallen to zero. Even the employers didn't want the workers to work for nothing. In that case they wouldn't work.

Today by comparison there is General Motors and Ford Corp. and Eastman-Kodak and the A.F.L. and C.I.O. etc. There were no trade unions behind Owen's plan. Such considerations are entirely permissible if one knows the matter well enough. It was his optimism which was the substitute for General Motors and it would have worked if the institutions had rationalized them.

P. is not as rigid in his views of Owen as in the earlier remarks above. It is less clear than he thought what the writings of Owen really say about the relationship of these two Villages of Union. There is no doubt that in the second scheme the first remains intact as the Poor Law. But when he came out with the first, it is not clear the extent to which he had the second in mind.

In an 1813 paper to his workmen he said that he would come back to this subject (1816). Already there was a depression and this is important.

In reading his first report of the Village of Union although he had the unemployment in mind he developed the subject of the machines and the new crisis of mankind which consists of two things. That is the whole early capitalism condition and the generally wretched condition and this merges as the problem of the unemployed. It was neither the depression alone nor the unemployed alone. In spite of the fact that his first Village of Union was a Poor Law Village the unemployment is there. He says "the poor and unemployed", "the unemployed poor adults", or "the unemployed poor".

Why is this important? It gives you a handle to a much more serious treatment of Owen's outlook. We have said that he discovered the machine and its productivity but we do not say that the machine was threatening the whole of society.

He said that the condition of the working class is much worse and this is catastrophic. Here the criticism of society is made explicit in two places: what would happen if the machine goes on producing boundlessly and that it should go on producing boundlessly.

We should give this precisely otherwise we haven't developed the problem. The fact that he gave quite wrong answers must be played down but not left out. The great misery caused by the machine is because labour has become worthless. However he linked this with a different matter, that only work on the land will help. He says it must be on the land and that means subsistence. A Village of Union does mean subsistence. In the 1920's in Vienna and in the 1940's in England there was a tremendous allotment movement. Everyone went working over the weekends and evenings and everyone had food. People had enough food because there was so much waste. (The allotment problem is in The Great Transformation. The squires were against allotments in Speenhamland).

Four or five things are now important. One can't leave out Christianity and he said he wasn't a Christian but in charity and morality he was a Christian (or perhaps he might have been a Hindu with the charity).

P.'s assumption is that nothing happened between the first and second report i.e. March to September. The New Lanark Report must be regarded as an elaboration of the September report. There is no proof that he didn't have the whole plan in mind in March. Our problem however is not exactly what happened because the scheme of the villages did not depend upon the motivation no matter how strong.

Already the first plan had been put forward in answer to the general problem of the machine without institutional change, and the plan is stronger with the second plan. It was formulated in order to get the capitalists in and he couldn't say that they would be slowly extinguished, and so there was no financial harm to anyone. (Viz. his

total mentality).

His answer on religion is illogical. Mankind has always had a society and people are generally impatient intolerant, irritable and wretched. One understands this but how was this error incorporated in all the religions? How is this the cause of man's misfortune? P. doesn't understand it.

[We must be explicit in presenting Owen's essential contribution to the problem of the machine in society and in our paper there are only vague references but the thing is left out.]

"The new era begins" is another connotation - a pessimistic one. If the machine goes on it will become even worse - there will be a cataclysmic revolution. This is very important with regard to Marx. He prophesied that this is only the beginning of what we called mechanism.

The condition of the workers was quite independent of the unemployment, cf. the G. T. which showed how it was a problem of unemployment at all. This was in the dislocation which occurred with more people being brought in and more sent back and becoming uprooted at home.

[Suddenly unemployment came up as a Poor Law question (see also the passage where he says that the Poor Law never could work) and he was answering Malthus (p. 198?) He said that the problem was not on account of Malthus discovery but was on account of the social dislocation. That settled Malthus, and everyone would grow his own food. That is why he tells them half a dozen times that the land is the only solution. The Village of Union is not a new settlement but it is the land.]

(no page 19)

The effect of mechanism is the lowering of standards all the way. He says to the manufacturers however, that we can't drop the machine.

The social catastrophe caused by the machine needs an answer. He says that it is in low wages and the worker cannot be restored except on the land. (We don't play up his economics but just understand it).

Unemployment was growing and the first type of Village had to be protected against the avalanche and anti-depression ~~on~~ measures had to be instituted. He may have had no response to his first Village of Union plan.

We don't know if the second plan means a great concession and a change of mind. There is nothing to go upon. He was secretive and was a very great man. He could go ten years without saying a word about the subject. This obstacle with Christianity he saw for 17 years and he knew he would have to come out with it one day.

Although the plan for sect and party was whimsical, it was essential to the generalization of the plan because one couldn't disregard an important feature of the situation. In the first plan voluntariness didn't arise and in the second plan it stood in the forefront. The Parishes would do it for the first group but no one would for the second. That is why "voluntary" comes in. For the paupers you could interpret it as compulsion because he gets no food, but you can't move beyond that for the worker who is threatened by unemployment. He had to build on economic classes as organic to the whole plan and he really hid the stark fact in this way that classes

were basic to the whole thing. He thought that apart from the question of classes people would combine in the Villages. The function of the classes is very different from sect and party. He was diabolically clever (cf. p. 227) because he avoided discussion of a fact. Nothing comes up in the first Village of Union plan of forcing people together. However, on the broader scheme...

We leave out the moral implication of this matter. It didn't turn on sect and party but on class. He never had any other concept.

The idea that he now had to make his peace with reality is a mistaken idea. Not even a single step can be taken and he must have seen it when he had the earlier concept. It is essential to the plan. Owen planned for production while he referred to those economists who don't. P. tends to the thought that the important matters were there, while many important matters were left undecided.

The Village of Union is used in contrast to the term "individualized" which turns out to mean the cottage. The basic feature that Owen suggested is that people should live together in communities, in Villages, not in cottages.

There is nowhere any sign that Owen noticed the ambiguity and two-sidedness of his use of the term "individualized".

They might have abundance in the future but in the meantime at least they wouldn't starve.

The whole problem of transition is contained in his attitude to gradualism when he says that even the best measures unless gradually applied are worse than the worst conditions, e.g. The Cotha Program.

The very fact that these ideas go back to Owen is startling but for educated people it is interesting. They ought to know about it.

The Owen chapter will be much improved by his not being treated so much as an odd figure. His was a superb lack of vanity and wonderful good taste.

At Gotha there was the Union of the Lasallians and the Eisenachians. It is the basic law of what the Russians regard as the program for the future.

Owen doctrines which the Trade Union movement took up included the very different forms of self-help and productive associations to produce a Village of Union.

On the machine, he said that a new age was beginning and that it cannot be dropped on account of the national interest. There was a necessity of allowing for this being an infinite development and there was the need of doing something actively. He said it would take the heavy work from all. He didn't say that the machine would produce any amount of anything but there would be an abundance of all the necessities, which was possible. This was in terms of markets. Each of the above can be substantiated by a famous passage.

One must bring out the hard tough character of the thought. There was the certainty of a new age and a new epoch with inconceivable things happening. As to society that is our difficulty.

At the present time the Owen chapter is divided as follows: there is the introduction of two pages, then Owen the Man, four and a half pages. Here add the simplicity, modesty and selflessness of

his character. His mind was a wealth of paradoxy. Then there is the New Lanark section, seven pages, and then the Philosophy. At this point we give the machine and discovery of society. With the machine give the episode with Colquhoun and then that he felt responsible for the machine. Its consequences had proved disastrous but its possibilities were infinite for the good. At this point add five or so things on the machine to the material. (This is not gestures - write quietly). The reader doesn't believe that someone saw the machine for the first time and recognized it for what it was. Don't present this as a confusing picture. He knew it had infinite possibilities and terrible evils but it could be dealt with. He said that unless government action would be taken, "permanent evils will come about". He wasn't a Tolstoyan one day, and a Technocrat the next. He had a steady view. What makes him so utterly amazing is that peculiar obsession. He was full of "society" but if one makes this a function of his obsession you get something unsound.

Then there is society. He discovered all the things individually that operationally make up society. Start with New Lanark and give the other things afterwards.

When Owen wrote "something would have to be done" he wrote the brief of his itinerary through life. He knew the machine had to be counteracted. There is the idea in The Great Transformation that unless something is done it will destroy society. That was the market.

Don't distinguish between the discovery of capitalism and society. Society was capitalist and capitalism and unemployment come here.

In the end society is gradually, patiently and completely trans-

formed and we don't know if we solve all of man's complaints. Only someone who deals with reality in this fashion can conceive that there are limits. He is faced with this all the time. Add as well Owen's social pacifism. At the end give his philosophy, a conscious and deliberate formulation.

Our conclusion is that his position was expressed through his life and not his writing. We needn't trouble that his philosophy isn't convincing because the known story of his life bears out our conclusion. But there is a limit to what society would permit.

A naturalistic idea was abroad at the time. In Malthus the population presses on the means of subsistence or the law of diminishing returns of the soil are both naturalistic not humanistic. An economist called Anderson pointed to this. Only with Ricardo's rent theory did it become known and accepted as valid and there you have a price theory that accounts for rent.

Owen entirely and completely rejected the point of view of the religions, although he gave as his grounds something irrelevant. No church was as intolerant as he, yet he thought he could determine right ideas. His ideas of man's duties were dogmatically Christian to the point of rejecting any kind of punishment which is as far as Christ went and he wasn't responsible for New Lanark.

The socialistic influence in legislation and the social determinism was supported by statistics. In Quetelet's work there was the idea that crime, divorce, prostitution, were determined by social changes. This was prophetic although how and why this would make him

an exponent of the reality of society became of decisive importance for his ethical orientation (and anthropology). Owen says that what he is teaching could never have been done before (p. 111). Like Marx he wanted to unite all the separate principles which is a highly Marxist idea.

The point which wasn't in Owen was that the Gotha Program had a distinction from each according to his ability. The Gotha Program was made by the Eisenachians (Liebknecht and Lebel, and the others were Lasalle etc.) The critique by Marx makes the distinction between socialism and communism. Later on Erfurt retained this distinction. From Owen comes the idea that there will be an intermediate stage and human beings will be educated. He anticipates the Gotha Program.

This will be an authentic view. Neither Cole nor the Russians nor Marx refer to it. We have acquired the wretched habits of the old system. The natural death of the old system will not be lingering (p. 274).

We must get some of the pedestrian starting points of the latest Marxist position into Owen. Perhaps we will bring in the trade union movement, Chartism.

I could mention Chartism and mention that Owen was absolutely anti-political. The idea is that he had a twist of mind which is not at all usual. This is not an economic twist of mind: to produce goods because part of it won't do it.

It was only in 1891 that the text of the Gotha Program was

published because that was when the critique was published although it happened in 1875. In my text the word "combined" with the fourth class is a bad word and I should use precise words to describe social organization of economic character. Owen's was a gripping imaginative conception.

On "the spade" it comes in in quite a diletantic way and the impression is that it isn't serious.

The economies from the house and communal arrangements should not be put together with abundance because this is impermissible. We must take the matter seriously from our own angle and judge it. To call the thing an economy of abundance frightens P. because it has a definite meaning. Then the task of the writer is to make it clear.

The sentence: profits are not reduced, is curious. It is not a description of the Village of Union. This falls under grave criticism. It should be in the general section.

The reference to gradualism belongs where we develop this concept earlier. The passage on "the machine would be his backer and ally" should be put in with the machine. Here it is destructive, and loose. It should all be built as a monument.

He was regarded as the founder of the labour movement even though he became the leader against his will.

The labour time was a work of utter genius. He thought that everyone would hand it all the goods that they produced but these goods deteriorate and only the pick of them is saleable. In a market

where there is competition individuals take the losses. Here they can't take the losses and the organizations go bankrupt. There might for example be produced 240 lamp-shades but no lamps. Things therefore become dirty and stale and out of fashion. In some places in London the notes were accepted without difficulty. Proudhon tried the same thing and he imitated Owen.

Note rational: p. 146 abundance for all at all times.

(See also The Early Marx for points in common, and Freedom and Technology.)

THE EARLY MARX

There is a new edition of the early writings of Marx. The original edition was issued in 1932 edited by Landshut and Mayer. It contained "political economy and philosophy" in 1932. The work of the Christian left in England was in 1938 and no one in England knew about it. P. was greatly influenced and thought it threw a flood of light.

In the introduction Landshut takes up the subject of the world of thought of Marx in the light of the 1932 publication and shows his thought in an entirely new light. It was written as a sample of an outline of an all-round view of philosophy with political economy as a sample. It is the first time we have an indication of the things that Marx thought of up to 1844.

There has been a playing down of these writings by the Russians and others.

When Marx grew up and attended University from 1817 to 1822 religion and philosophy were the only subjects around which thought revolved. He joined in the admiration of Hegel but he did not say in his criticism that this or that particular thing was wrong but reacted to the philosophy as a whole. This meant that he accepted the Hegelian philosophy as "philosophy" but he felt it strongly contrasted with things as they are and he was looking for some general position which would comprise the position of philosophy as Hegel developed it. Instead of the criticism of religion and the State as was the fashion with the young Hegelians he would set up the picture of the actual world which would be capable of being unified with "philosophy as

work of Christen Lefor
was - 1938 & no one
- Eng. knew about it.
Early Marx

philosophy" (i.e., as understood by the philosopher in the narrow sense).

At that time the first signs of technology made their appearance especially in the business field (joint stock companies, banks etc.) and also in transportation. There were new developments of a significant sort. Things seemed to be pregnant with great consequences. Marx' hunch was that the key to the development of the real actual world which was so different from the Hegelian idealization was to be sought here.

Landshut then discusses the main stages of Marx philosophical development - his criticism of Hegel and Bauer and especially his joining enthusiastically with Feuerbach and P.'s great achievement in setting up a humanistic interpretation of religion as a reflection of man and man's universe.

In the course of this he already met Engels who was already writing on political economy and whose experiences were those of Manchester and the textile industry (the condition of the working classes etc.). They became close collaborators and the thesis on Feuerbach in 1845 is the presentation of the philosophical position. He wrote the political economy piece as an introduction to a general philosophy comprising other branches namely law, state etc.

Marx general criticism of Hegel as a philosopher of the State wasn't understood but P. understood it clearly. Marx had reached the point where he thought the statements of Hegel ought to be reversed and then they are the key to the human world.

Feuerbach

& Marx's humanistic
interp. of religion as a
reflection of man &
man's universe.

He said that in philosophy the things which are predicates are made into subjects for example, if you said that the manifestation of the idea of society is the family (i.e. biological) the family is the only thing you can talk about. It exists but society doesn't. Now if instead you said the family makes up society partly, then family is a subject and you have said something about it as regards society.

Hegel had made ideas and modalities etc. the whole of the human world. Therefore it was what you said about man and society. But human beings, classes etc. are the real subject and the other is the predicate to make up the concept of society or history. Marx had a sentence in his doctor's thesis that all philosophy makes predicates out of subjects. It was ambiguous and he may not have meant subject as the acting individual or group but he did mean it when he wrote to Hegel.

Marx' philosophy of the state is only part of the philosophy and Law. It was meant only to justify the Prussian State and tells nothing about the real world. Everything was derived from theology etc.

Reversing the form of the Hegelian statements is an example of Marx' logical method. It was a first class achievement of Marx to examine the whole thing and why it leaves out the real world.

Hegel wrote a book on the phenomenology of the spirit which makes lovely reading. Most of Hegel is unreadable containing words that he made up himself. (Phenomenology means the general treatment of the elements which come up in it).

Marx said what a deep and brilliant idea of Hegel to think of man as a product of a process and here he hits something of universal importance to man, labour. Also man has a history as a result of his development. Then Marx said that Hegel's limitation came because he knew only the intellectual kind of effort and labour therefore he just reflects his own thinking. It was thought, making itself the object of itself. Hegel ignored other efforts - the physical efforts. Shoes for example, don't start thinking about man. But man is more alienated if he makes shoes to sell. He is more so if he never makes it. It is the effort which links the shoe to man. Man is what he is as a result of this process.

Hegel produced the concepts of alienation and identification.

Hegel does what Parsons does - he developed categories and said that men and things are distributed in these categories. We do this too in sociology. In Hegel's theory of the State and family, people are distributed according to the manifestations of the spirit. But Marx started from human beings and we don't need the mystification. In Parsonian sociology you have an element of the Hegelian.

P. had been right in taking up freedom and technology but not only in Owen is the machine and society the two poles but also Marx. Society is the subject of Hegel's philosophy but as far as the machine is concerned there is no technology to speak of in Germany and he wasn't interested in the economy. He was neither a socialist nor an economist but a philosopher.

P. is enormously supported by the Landshut thesis and accepts it completely. While P. had separate reasons to bring in the early

Marx he did see that it links with the Owen.

In P.'s pamphlet "The Early Writings of Karl Marx" the appendix on Marx' life was done by Kenneth Muir.

Landshut says that the central problem is one of anthropology, the nature of man and ethics: in what sense is man free, P. accepts that the basic trend of his problem must concern itself with society and the machine.

In the total philosophy of Marx, society gained a reality which made it a possible starting point of the economic development and he never returned to philosophy again. It is proof that the effect of machinery caused social criticism and socialism even though it was 30 years after Owen. This makes Marx the most important thinker closer to our line of argument.

The main idea is to present it as simply as possible even though it is one of the most difficult subjects. P.'s idea of presentation is something very original, otherwise you fall into the old ruts. Even if you run the other way, you won't get out of them. P. thinks we should fix some points of Owen's which were characteristic and prophetic of Marx and also where they differ sharply. It would allow an entry into Marxism not locked by a host of prejudices.

According to Landshut the way to socialism was simple. Since Hegel regarded the human mind as the form of the spirit in history, Marx applied this to the real world and its institutions and economics. He would then get socialism as the rational way of dealing with production. This is also what Owen meant: the rational and not the

religious way of dealing with things. When he criticizes the economist and the statesmen he says what are the conditions of maximum production. Marx means the same as Owen by irrational.

We should find three or four points characteristic in Owen's thinking that we need later on.

First there was his insistence that he differed from the economist and he knew the practice and they didn't. He says this three or four times. In Marx it is the actual means of production and not the theoretical interpretation of the situation.

Secondly, Owen turns head-on on religion. Marx does the same. The church is the ally of the owning classes. In Marx it is the ally of feudalism and aristocracy against the republic and democracy. Thirdly Owen was absolutely convinced that he possessed the science of society and that everything falls into place. This shows a certain naivete and one cannot believe it. Marx believed that the study of society is required and will make us masters.

In Marx what he calls the human is distinctly personal: the relationship of individuals to individuals. But he is far from regarding social characteristics as correct or admirable. He was full of fashionable prejudices on this score e.g., anti-semitism in 1840 when the Jewish bankers came up. But there is not one left. Do I know of a Jewish banker of any importance?

The idea that he did his life's work in conditions of humiliating destitution is absurd. Every biography of the last 30 years shows that they lived on the full bourgeois level and spent terrific

amounts of money and didn't earn any. They lived in Hampstead in a villa 3 times too large for them. His wife couldn't deal with money and Marx refused to earn any. Wilson says that Engels left 7,000 pounds to Marx's daughter. They lived on it and killed themselves when it was gone. All the Marx perished in terrible ways. But the Marx had servants and who has servants? They should have lived in the countryside and hadn't the faintest idea of what to do with money.

Engels wrote those articles for America in Marx name and Marx was impatient if they weren't ready. He had no human qualities but he was a devoted servant of the proletarian revolution and never made any concessions in this regard ever. Otherwise he was ferocious, unjust, insensitive, tactless and never took any notice of the woman with whom Engels lived for 30 years and didn't shake hands with her because she was from the working class. This was especially true of his wife who was otherwise a wonderful person, beautiful, courageous, outstanding brave. All the bourgeois were thus in their instincts.

The Marx work would restore decency, sanity and integrity to European thought. The Russians would hate it but one needn't appease the Russians.

The opposite is 1934. That is a shameful event and we must restore some unity. The kind of Marxism which the Russians fancy is what the world regards as poor. That's no practicable foundation.

Our interpretation follows Landshut to a point: Marx was primarily a philosopher and his passion was a philosophical one.

In his famous letter to his father at age 17, there is nothing about justice or improvement of society. It is an intellectual passion and as regards anti-semitism it is superficial and time-bound. As far as his personal development it is of the greatest importance.

There is his attachment to Westphalen and when he knew old Westpahalen he showed the peculiar Jewish attitude coming from being a foreign people, nourishing a basic cynicism in regard to ideal values. It is part of the foreigner's role and tactics to regard these values as fraud and hypocrisy. It is the opposite of the idealistic role. When he saw these values were internalized and the role was valid he learned that idealism was a truth and reality.

P. thinks that the meaning of his anti-semitism was that he resented the implication of his childhood that much of the uplift was hypocrisy and he discovered that he was thoroughly misled about this. P. is quite clear about this. P. mentioned this matter to someone and it was instantly regarded as being of the greatest importance and interest.

If Owen was pressed to become a socialist because of the children and the unemployed, Marx didn't see the unemployed or a factory and he was pushed to socialism when he wanted to produce a unified body of thought. He had to measure the distance between the speculative ideal and reality. But there you need the picture of the nature of man that is called "anthropology" in theology. It is a philosophical discipline. What does one assume man to be? On this

anthropological interest he developed a new concept of man. That is as distant from the zoological or the materialistic as anything can be - that man must eat and drink to live is not more pessimistic than that he is born out of original sin.

Adams points out that Marx calls money exteriorization (alienation) whereby the human being becomes enslaved.

Adams didn't even suspect that Marx' problem was the reality of society. This was derived from the technological factors and the means of production and the chief subject was the proletariat. Marx took society as real: as real as the individual. The only point is that P. has to aim at simplicity and lucidity. Either we have to start from our subject and go to Marx or start from Marx and go to our subject. We also have to put the results down in simple sentences so that one can work up to those sentences.

P. once saw an announcement in a Hungarian paper that was evidence that Marx never saw the anti-Duhring before publication (just the utopian part), because they found the envelope in which it was returned to Engels. But this sentence in the newspaper was never repeated and perhaps it may be found in the Hungarian museum in Budapest. P. read this in 1919 in the Red Gazette before he left Hungary and it ought to exist in the museum and it might be in Moscow. The regime in 1919 lasted from the 21st of March to the 8th of August and it would be possible to go through the 150 issues or so. P. can still visualize it on the left page in the right column just below the middle. It consists of only 6 or 8 lines. It can only be got hold of in Hungary.

P. know beforehand that Marx would never have thought anything of such nonsense (dialectical materialism) and Engels knew no philosophy although he was a brilliant historian. He made Marx conscious of the technological civilization. Marx on the other hand, was a brilliant philosopher and would never have done this dialectical materialism.

The Adams chapter is a remarkable achievement of great importance for our work. He succeeds in summing up in clear and simple sentences and that is essential in that difficult paper.

P. may take up the phrase he found in Marx of "Reform of consciousness" and give as its content the acceptance of the reality of society.

My question: What did Marx mean by it?

He tried to be less confused and he was e.g., "reason has always existed but not always in a rational form".

This book shows that Marx during the Paris exile - the end of 1843, he was turning to socialism. Up to that time there was no socialism present in his thought and that's when he despaired of Germany and turns towards France.

The Landshut is thoroughly Hegelian and any attempt to get more than a feeling of understanding is hopeless. 14 pages shows that Marx hadn't been a socialist to 1843.

My question: What is the role of the economy in Marx?

With Marx it is an exploitation theorem - class war. With P. it is a market theorem - not a class war. In the G.T. he carried it to a philosophical point of freedom in a complex society. He can continue where he left off in 1943.

This is all pre-sputnikian idyllies. Positively, the question is where does it come up in a necessary way. In what sense is socialism a reality and in what sense is it a problem?

This one must now leave to the clarification of the whole problem raised by Marx. Not that we have to now make up our minds, but the book becomes a serious proposition on how far Marx philosophy takes us in the reality of society in this light. One shouldn't try to anticipate that as if the question of writing down the obvious or that it's just out of one's mind. One makes the unwarranted assumption that one knows. While writing the Great Transformation P. gave 3 revelations and then it was unsatisfactory and he rewrote the chapter and had to work it out.

The new context in which Marx now stands may yield much more. This will be a different criticism than all the ones brought up which were pre-sputnik. This was produced by socialist society and the question as to whether socialism is a problem of technological barbarianism is out of date. Also there is Khrushchev's speech on freedom. We shouldn't minimize it by the problems of the 1890's or the 1940's. The rest is underrating the problems with a kind of silent complacency which is provincial - that in Toronto and Montreal people know. P. doesn't think they know in London or even Paris.

This is a conversation with a Sputnik on equal terms. The

best thing is to keep ten or fifteen lines in the preface that we haven't met the problem before. One meets it only in the form that Owen is stopped in the fight against unemployment and assistance to the unemployed in the first Village of Union. In the second Village it is a fight against the unemployment in general. One shouldn't shy off here - the realistic and correct coming to grips with things and if we shy off it loses interest. This book assumes every reader knows capitalism, the trade cycle, unemployment etc.

The Hegelian jargon is the more remarkable because Hegel invented the words and Marx uses them. It is like Parsons except Hegel's words are all philosophical not sociological. Some of it is extremely modern and is used by copy-writers for advertisements e.g. alienation (entfremdung).

To the existentialists and the communists this interpretation of Marx is an absurdity and is a complete ignoring of the philosophies of Marx. We don't propagate it because it was inadequate, but it was a step toward the acceptance of the reality of society.

What Marx did, the mistake one sees, was that he accepted the reality of society as primarily expressed in history -- we have history to serve. That's not true. We can't know history and there is no science of society to know future history. If we served it we become functions of history, the person would cease to exist. The individual is unimportant.

It is the person, and personality exists only as the contact between human beings. That would be atomism which is meaningless and P. accepts the Christian position of the person. As an individual

you can't exist in isolation. This is Marx which he has derived from Christianity.

After all, the Hobbesian individual is like the wild ass crying in the wilderness, I, I, I. Hobbes said it wasn't freedom of the wild ass, but it is the freedom of the wild ass.

Religious and philosophical questions dominated the period through the activities of Kant, Schiller, Goethe, Hegel, Schelling. Engels in his old age described Marxist theory as the product of German idealism and what he meant was the concept of the autonomy of the free man, the free self-determination of man being the criterion of morality. This is one of the problems. Reason related to faith and religion with the philosophical understanding of the true destiny of man. Everyone had been brought up under the sway of these thoughts. Everyone took part in general intellectual life in which Marx had grown up. Also another force however began to show itself. It was a power that few suspected for demonic strength it would release later on. Yet in its first manifestations one could already feel its presence such as the first railway, steam boats, credit banks and removal of customs barriers - a change in the whole economic structure of life of the past. It was a decisive change of the whole historical fate of man which was in the air.

In Marx the idea came to fruition that these two opposite worlds ought to be spanned. This was so that the self-determination of man would be brought to inner connection with the industrial development and produce a common denominator to unite the contradictions of the age. The whole power of his mind, passion and emotional

You can't exist
in isolation =
what Mary took from
Christianity

life was directed to this one world historical task starting from religious and philosophical questions which dominated the period through Kant, Schiller etc. (Above translated from Landshut p. 2.)

Marx had the famous remarks in the first volume of Capital that they were themselves coquetting with a Hegelian way of expression. It was however, the Hegelian method (not the expression) that linked him with Hegel. In our time Hegel was treated as a dead dog and we didn't agree.

William James says that Hegel reminds him of a circus performance with trap-doors where things change into one another. This is the character of pure thought which moves in negations.

P. thinks we should say that the whole treatment of Marx is based on a misunderstanding.

P.'s calculation is that the Russians will fall back on a philosophical contemplation and therefore on the Early Marx.

Owen discovered society but he didn't think it was a problem of human freedom in any sense. Marx however, was concerned with the emancipation of the human race and he thought that the emancipation of the proletariat was the emancipation of the human race.

(See also Freedom and Technology).

Many - Early
will come to
Russia

FREEDOM AND TECHNOLOGY

The content to the answer is the freedoms, but this answer doesn't stand on its own feet. How do you become the person for which this is the answer? That is the same thing as the answer.

When P. was a boy the working class was in misery, destitute with uncertainty, without culture and immoral. The system produced freedom, normalcy and decency only for the ruling class.

But today it is not so. The problem has shifted and the whole thing has to be looked at again. Almost all our concepts come from that period which was entirely different.

That is why it is priceless that Owen called supply and demand artificial: because it needed an elaborate, carefully constructed institutional system to produce it. But this doesn't mean that there shouldn't be artifacts. Like the Sputnik they have their advantages.

We start from freedom as the problem of our time - why we seem to have less and less freedom and complain of its loss. There is a thesis and it has something to do with a technological civilization (the machine) but what on earth does it have to do with it?

Owen discovered the machine. (This has to be shown more deliberately with greater precision). He thought there was a lot wrong with society. He didn't discover the science of society but he just put the blame for immorality on it. It is one of the greatest climatic changes in the history of human consciousness. Man had said God, devil and man, but nobody had ever said society. The word wasn't used in this fashion.

P.'s idea of the presentation is to have in the Owen chapter a few fairly inconspicuous things which turn up in Marx, and are not inconspicuous there. There is "practical business life" - they know nothing about practice. There is also the bitter out-burst against class and the conspiracy of the rich. Owen knew less economics than the economists and he was wrong all the time.

There wasn't the slightest interest at the time in the goings-on in Manchester and the city hadn't even existed before 1750. No person of repute lived in Manchester. These things don't occur in Jane Austin for instance.

P.'s idea of presentation is to begin this with a thorough anti-climax. That is to mention some of the things that Owen had remarked on but the future of which lay in Germany, and were heard of only very much later. That is the reform of Hegel.

P. thought of the importance of the practical side of factory organization, then classes and the role of classes as an immediate problem of legislation and good government because these things didn't come up again in England nor before the left wing of the Chartists was there anything of this kind mooted. The Chartists were not socialists. The socialists took no interest in the no-class movement and the no-class movement took no interest in the socialists. That is how the Owenites and the Chartists are related. The radicals in parliament were anti-socialist and that was England from 1800 to about 1860. The socialism came from Europe.

When Marx in London organized an international, the English Trade Union movement gave money and thought that the continent should

have such a movement - Appleton etc. regarded Marx and Bakunin as clever people. Not before the Fabians however, was socialism heard of again.

The chapter thus begins with a thorough anti-climax. We then show how the rediscovery of the machine and society took place leading to the Marxist proletarian working class movement. This was the outcome of a kind of humanistic and idealistic philosophical movement of the utmost intensity and the vehemence. It is only then one can start like I do saying Owen was pretty much unusual. Marx was also pretty unusual. Hess said that there was Saint-Simon, Heine, Fourier, Hegel etc. rolled into one.

In Marx this word "society" became a byword. He used it for everything from sausages to the moon. Everything was "social" from the social individual to social labour.

What are the main points here from the development of the argument of the book? P. doesn't know. He will have to get the key to Marx. How did socialism and the working class get going at all? It will lead to freedom and technology and man's destiny which he formulated as a humanistic problem of man and his technology. Otherwise how do you get to the means of production? It is not economic or materialistic - competition, price etc.

Where does it leave P.? It leaves him with an unresolved question - how and why societal production? This socialism should safeguard the autonomy of the individual in society.

Locals came ~~not~~
for England - came for
Europe

Marx missed this problem. He thought that the only limit to the humanistic ideal is private property and profit. But there is something inherent in a technological civilization which he overlooked.

My question: Was this in his realm of interest?

His problem was, how does a socialist organization fulfill the destiny of man? (the fulfillment of his human nature). He overlooked that the technological character of civilization may be the greatest obstacle.

The absolute idea of Hegel fulfills itself in history, and Marx puts society in its place. This fulfills itself in history and that is why the Communist regards this as absolute - to serve the purposes of history.

Marx overlooked what the technological character of society would imply.

From our angle, Marxism leads to a maximum criticism of society while there is 100% insistence on the human side of existence. There is a maximum of optimism on human destiny and it is a foregone conclusion that human existence will change all the way.

The A.J.M. Smith poem on the atom explosion is near our motto. It was written in 1954 and we had ten years of the atom bomb.

My question: Can we say that the Nazi is also pursuing his freedom?

Kant represents the moral autonomy of the personality. The

person is responsible to norms he himself has freely accepted. If my question is whether in Kant's view all human beings possess the capacity for freedom, the answer is yes. They possess the capacity for following the commands of the laws they have themselves accepted.

In discussing the destiny and nature of man Marx wouldn't start from freedom but from anthropology that relates man to mankind, insofar as he has consciousness of the human race. (These were Feuerbach's lines of starting from man and not from God).

It depends on the content of the paper as to whether we regard this as humanistic. Marx argues that art, law and culture of man are as typical as his economy. Marx did not maintain this position however and he put the preference on the means of production on which our thoughts did differ.

Marx measures man's achievements as a human characteristic. This makes him a humanist and if I say that there is no specific insistence on freedom then this is true. However, according to the way he argues the ideal state, he makes freedom important.

Like the Greek polis which identifies the individual and the citizen and also Rousseau's *volonte de tous*, Marx isn't interested in the individual but in personality. This is the individual conscious of his humanness and his relationship to his fellows. (This is already very Marxist). This makes the individual more closely related to social relations and in Marx there is a strong insistence on social characteristics. The individual doesn't have a language or a concept and the whole of the individual's intellect is regarded as social.

In Owen there is only one way in which man's character is shaped by society. This is a strong point of contact between Owen and Marx.

P. agrees with me that the problem of freedom is not self-evident.

The idea that Marx, apart from dialectical materialism, is materialistic has no validity and is only one of the points which is explained by strong and deep-seated partiality. There is no person of any seriousness (except perhaps the Pope) who says that Marxism is materialistic. It is the materialistic interpretation of history in which Marx gives the decisive influence to the means of production.

French materialism denied the existence and validity of ethical values or an interpretation of man's personality and nature in terms of moral values. Here at the postulate of man, self-fulfillment is made in the extreme idealistic terms. Abstract value norms are dominant in the analysis. French philosophical materialism starts in the second half of the 18th century. There is Helvetius and part of the Encyclopedistes which denied specific phenomena of consciousness and regarded them all as matter.

In the term materialist interpretation of history the word in this case means economic.

Today it is easy to argue the whole position. P. doesn't agree with Marx and is not prepared to defend his position and can say he did have special views on a number of questions e.g., the organization of socialism. This would not be true of Engels who thought

that the labour theory of value should be the organizing principle of the economy. There is not much sense in that.

The troubles which developed in socialist society (Russia) may not have a connection with all this and P. wouldn't be able to say where and how the Communists developed the idea of ideological discipline. This change came very suddenly in the Russian Communist Party from free intellectual life to the opposite.

P. would write the Marx chapter and we would bring the Owen up to the mark gradually.

(On the Marx question, for the first time in 20 years Kari got excited about something that P. was doing).

P. never found the Mannheim book (Reconstruction of Society). There is a definition there of democracy and Marx had it - that human beings become activated.

Behind the complaints of the criticism of society there is the absence of freedom. If we take the complaints and investigate them the actual trouble is the loss of freedom which is not realized. That would mean that our book has a substance.

Freedom is defined in a way in which it has nothing to do with justice. The freedom question is something utterly different.

The argument then runs that after this period of the criticism of society there is an actual stopping of the criticism of society and then there is a pessimistic criticism of human existence.

It is worth considering how the criticism of existence is linked with the stopping of the criticism of society. What kind of simple link is there?

The present very vocal complaint against existence is that it is impossible because of the freedom problem. This is a continuation of the complaint against a technological civilization. It is this thesis which coming from the socialists, induced us to take up the subject of the beginnings of both the technological civilization and socialism e.g. Owen. (It is not the Communists who don't complain of the loss of freedom).

The whole thing is like an investigation and is not sufficiently clarified and is really a kind of intuition that this is so. It is also very interesting and more than striking that there is no freedom at all in a complex society. This is Owen who said that man is simply compelled to believe what he is told and has no chance of bringing forth his own views. In society, the newly born has no chance of forming a character of his own. Owen almost went mad over this and said this was determined by social conditions. Up to a point this has relevance, but how much it actually has, only the total investigation will show.

We are discovering all the time what the position really was and it seems to P. that the greater part of what we are saying is and new to us the greater part of what we are going to say about Marx is new. The introduction in the Landshut is tremendously exciting where he says two things: that for Marx the world was full of philosophic interest which originated in Germanic idealism concerning

man's autonomy, while at the same time there was a suspicion of something new. In Owen you get that something new and Marx was born practically in the year when Owen started (1815).

P. has the idea that we should have a big introductory chapter. I wrote a new introduction which isn't an introduction but a minimum show of an introduction. It may become a full and long first chapter. The first chapter cannot be written before the material is there. It would be helpful if it developed the thesis completely.

P. is clearer in how he would keep the book in hand and not go over our heads. P. would do the main passages and develop the argument and he thinks I would urgently take up the Owen.

The 1932 Landshut was a great event and now something should come of it, what with the Sputnik about and the Russians having the worst conscience in the world about their own deeds. Previous to this every word would have been wasted. They have the worst conscience in the world and enormous problems on how to educate what with Marxist indoctrination being bad while their science is excellent and philosophy childish.

With the West somewhat staggered by the dimensions of its idiotic complacency and cheap thoughts about everything it's now time. The great thing would be to write it in the most cool and measured way as if one were a pure idiot.

To what extent is it tenable that the criticism of society may have ceased because the market delivered the goods and the working class ceased to be the leader of mankind. Communism did make a

tremendous case against capitalism but now problems of socialism come up and our book will include a criticism of this kind of socialism.

ROUSSEAU PARADOX

P. has a passing idea of the resolution of the Rousseau paradox. This would be through using his brother's idea of commitment - personal commitment and social commitment and how they are defined.

That was a strange paradox of Rousseau: that man is born free and everywhere in chains. That was the top of absurdity because man was chained in bonds of living flesh to another human being and by chains he meant you found him in society.

Kant took the autonomy of the personality directly from Rousseau, that freedom consisted of being^{guided by} nothing but your own laws. If a person says I do what I want he says I must follow the law which I have laid down (Kant). German idealistic philosophy never moved from that position.

P. accepts the Kant position and the more you think about it it is the only meaning you give to freedom - you do what you think is right.

In Aristotle freedom is the right way of giving tips - the Nichomachian ethics - it is liberalism and the attitudes of a gentleman (Chapter 4?) - eleutheria means freedom. There is no other freedom. So where does it come from? Also Romans and Paul - he thought that we are released from bondage.

P. points out that no one seems to know what it's all about. He knows as much as others.

All these questions (the existential ones) were dealt with in the Marxian period - the problems of German idealism).

One seeks an empirical not a conceptual or metaphysical explanation. It is not merely a matter of interpretation. By conceptual one means that one constructs a concept then others, but you don't know how things happen then before.

In the Parsonian way (the way Ayres^{review} talks about Parsons) you get sociology with personality structure determined by values and the values are also determined by mutual role expectations. But then how are the persons selected to fill the roles and where do the people come from who are generals, painters, caretakers etc. for that's not the question of roles or personality structure.

But, this is the third question, if P. has a different form of integration (not only the market, status traders, bone traders, kinship traders) where does this come in in Hegel? The society has its roles but the roles are there whoever plays them.

Hegel said that the absolute ideal is elaborating itself and the state has developed into families, communities while the persons and houses are given from the outside. They are factual. Family is one type of organization but later there is the city and the state. Hegel said the idea has its transformation and rejuvenation. He doesn't care where you take the people. Like Parsons you get persons independent of roles and personality structure. Hegel had a concept of society that first you have the people and procreate children and the family principle is filled with parents and children.

There is a deep analogy here. If Ayres says that Parsons gets away from the atomistic and so does Hegel, he is organicistic and corporatistic.

Marx is against this but gets into exactly the same difficulty as Hegel. Marx was a democratic socialist and an atomist and starts from true democracy. Marx had a complete theory of fascism and it is a criticism of the Hegel theory of Fascism (Medieval and pre-capitalist). Marx has a criticism which is a criticism of democracy but it isn't based on the individual. It is a theoretical criticism found in his critique of Hegel's theory of the state. Marx's work is about 200 pages (Kritik der Hegelschen Staatsphilosophie, 1841-42). This also shows Marx very atomistically inclined. This work dates from 1846 - two years before '48. P. always thought that he should write this up and it should not die with him. There are many manuscripts he has which he didn't publish. Also he didn't like to criticise Marx and involve himself in writing a Marx critique all his life. His instinct told him it isn't this kind of criticism on which things depend.

SHAW

The third figure in addition to Owen and Marx is Shaw.

P. developed the following picture of his dealing with the world of values: particular human values - values of personal existence. He criticizes the superficial picture of fashionable conventional lies which are the surface phenomena of values in social life and asserts against this the traditional basic virtues all the way against which these are hypocritical lies. But he never asserts them in traditional form: patriotism, thrift, loyalty but goes behind and below because they are the traditionally distorted form of basic elements of existence. These are the pedestrian values, not the ones that are glorified but the basic operational reliable elements of man's being. There is for example, being accustomed to something, preferring the known to the unknown, a secret hobby which you cherish. He says there is no difference in what is part of your integrity or secret happiness. There is the ultimate safeguard of the sanity of society and traditional virtues. That is why you can't catch him with his paradox when he argues against the traditional virtues. He shows up the glamorous distortion but plays up the traditional everlasting human situations which are the foundation of recognized values although he doesn't accept them in their recognized form. e.g. patriots, good husbands, good children, parents, generals, entrepreneurs, beggars etc.

What makes this entrepreneur or that wife successful or effective is that that person is a saint. We deny this as a human

possibility but there are such people as a matter of fact and this makes them effective in unsaintly situations. He seems to establish almost anything and then contradicts himself but thats only a semblance. He is not contradicting himself at all.

CAMUS

In the book *The Fall* there is a judge. We are all judges and he is a penitent, otherwise he would be a cynic. The communist party has an answer on absolute moral condemnation. Without penitence there would be no story. He is not successful and ultimately he discovers his friends really didn't like him. He is a supreme egoist. He is dissatisfied with the outcome. He wants to explain this position but his purpose is to confuse the world and ultimately his audience is confused.

It is the uncompromising postulate of freedom which is entirely compatible with egotism with which you subscribe. As long as he insists on absolute freedom, on inner life, it is here presented as compatible with complete egotism and he tries to show a person who produces this. The penitent has so high moral standards he can only be penitent. He was judging all the time and the myth may be that he was conscious of the fact that he was successful in an inadequate world. Therefore his insistence on his absolute freedom is not a success. It is a world he condemns and there is thought to be no way out. The person is thoroughly inhuman and the author says it is the insistence on absolute freedom. This is wonderfully compatible with the existence of intellectual freedom, superiority and moral sensibility which are tremendous. But in order to produce this it is quite enough to insist on absolute freedom as his integrity and he for one will be an egotist.

To P. such a person is not possible in any sense and this the author wishes to convey. Therefore to the reader he is such a scoundrel possible or impossible.

There is a book by Sterner, Die Einzige (the only one) and his conclusion is that the only true thing is to accept no universals - no language, no thinking and therefore you cannot be.

Myself: He has not taken a decision to live.

Hamlet behaves like a cad because he refuses to take this decision to live. When P. was ill 42 years ago he remembers he knew exactly when Hamlet was saying something and when he was mumbling nonsense for example, with Polonious "more than kind and less than kind" etc. also "words, words, words", doesn't mean he's being philosophical just he's sick.

INTERDISCIPLINARY PROJECT

Sylvia Thrupp says she considers having a special issue with articles from P.'s project. It might contain 5 or 6 articles on money.

My question: Why not a book?

P.: What kind of a book would this be? It wouldn't make a book. "Trade and Market" is a book but that is the result of all kinds of circumstances including ten years of cooperation of these people.

These articles together wouldn't be a story. Each would be about 30 pages and they have sufficient content for that. In a periodical it does not get lost. P. does not think they have the strength for a book.

P. thinks that the articles are broadly on one subject by different authors. They don't support one another. P. doesn't think he will take such risks publishing a book from these articles. With "Trade and Market" P. thinks we have just missed running on a sand bank. The publisher left so much time to rewrite the papers that they rewrote all of them and so it became one subject.

There is an article by Rosemary Arnold on The Dahomey Money Material and P. could write one on all the different things that are discovered: elite circulation, monetarization. We would need another empirical paper and two theoretical ones and that would make six papers. Such a series of articles would establish the whole thing as a new influence.

We are introducing this fashion of comparative studies by giving several cases. It is the only monographic work which appears. That is what we are doing in Trade and Market (comparative) and is the opposite of a case study.

NOTES

MONEY

P. had this idea on money uses - the effects of monetarization that the next important question was the effects of using money on the society around it. These could be answered in terms of money uses - that the effects of money as a means of payment were utterly different from money as a standard which depended upon stable finance and as a means of exchange which was still different again. One use might go on for a thousand years without any other use.

Knics of the German Historical School said there were three stages, barter, money, and credit today is the highest stage. But this needn't be so and could be reversed. Credit existed with debt bondage. Today there is an increasing amount of trade done with barter. There are no stages implied in P.'s view.

Previously when economists had discovered that there were two kinds of economies, primitive economy without money and with money, nothing came of it because there was bound to be money in kind (?).

(Above section from memory).

SUMNER

Sumner nurtured the present fathers of American thought. He said that the trouble with primitive men was that he was lazy, and gave no forethought and was greedy. He had all the bad qualities of the economic premises and no good ones.

Man's original endowment is poverty - it is nature surviving in society. Therefore pauperism and the needy require no explanation. This view was valid until 25 years ago in America.

It was only Malinowski who followed up the opposite.

The New Deal was a head-on collision with Sumner of Yale. Therefore, the Great Transformation was banned from Penn. State (it was removed from the library) and a number of men were made to leave, including the head of the department. Keyes then published a reader, and put P.'s Commentary article into it. Keyes appointed two of P.'s students.

AMERICA

The humiliation of the U.S. by the launching of the Russian satellite was a cheap price. It might have taken 200 million lives to achieve such a result. The U.S. has lived in abysmal superficiality. Also when it set lower standards it should at least win...

(From memory)

The original U.S. Atom bomb policy (threatening a preventive war) forced the Russians to take over strong control of the satellites as a glacis. This was important for the several hundred miles it would allow them in case of war. This in turn forced the U.S. into spreading out its troupes in Japan and even today it retains Okinawa without any basis.

The Yalta decision setting the U.S. and Russian spheres of influence, meant the gradual liquidation of the colonial powers.

THE GREAT TRANSFORMATION

The G.T. is out in England. This raises the question of its current topical interest. Now there is no war reason and then there were dozens. Now there is a war danger not a war reason.

The G.T. attracted no attention in England but it might attract interest now because interest shifts.

My question: Why is it that it attracted no attention?

If a book produces new facts it cannot be ignored but if it produces new views it can be ignored.

That is why "Trade and Market" cannot be ignored. Some one wrote in Annals that the book appeared to be semi-Bolshevik.

P. was asked to write reviews for Commentary on Mises book on Economics and History and Bauer's book on underdeveloped countries. He thinks he will.

CANADA

Canada's history is the history of the fur trade. This is separate trade and market. In 3 years "Trade and Market" will be used in every Canadian university. It is an institutional theory of the economy which is the right theory of Canadian economic history. There will be 12 people, each a semi-genius who will say that this is Canadian economic history.

CANADIAN POETS

Of the six Montreal poets on the Folkways record Dudek himself does not so much appeal to P. It is not his own line of greatest interest. Layton is admirable, rich, powerful and beautiful. Cohen has some very fine poems especially the one with the falling sparrows. Scott shows sharpness, powerful clarity of thought and the poem on the Shield is very Canadian.

The poems are very different and so many show the Eliot influence but this doesn't mean it is secondary. It is a recreation.