

CONTENTS

FREEDOM & TECHNOLOGY - GENERAL COMMENTS
- MASS SOCIETY

p. 1
p. 9

NOTES

INTERDISCIPLINARY PROJECT

p. 18

HEGEL & MARX

p. 18

JASPERS

p. 18

NATIONALISM

p. 19

AMERICA

p. 19

GROTIUS

p. 19

p. 19

Two photocopies

MANYA HARARI,

'NOT BY BREAD ALONE' — ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF
A NEW RUSSIAN NOVEL', THE LISTENER, pp. 339-40
Feb. 28, 1957, pp. 339-40.

VICTOR ZORZA,

'SOVIET WRITERS VERSUS THE BUREAUCRACY',
THE LISTENER, April 25, 1957, pp. 669-70.

51957?7

"FREEDOM AND TECHNOLOGY" - GENERAL COMMENTS

The two articles in "The Listener" (discussing the Dudintsev book) shift the framework of our work from conformism in America, which is a speculative theory on the total origins of the phenomenon. The question now is to reconstruct the book to include the East as well. The book becomes more important and it is easier to write about, because it is not a problem that arises out of our thoughts, but it is given.

P. thought about this problem for three days. His conclusion is that we should keep to our outline but introduce into it a very different tone in such a way as to allow the scope to be broader and to speak all the time in a tone of our being conscious of this scale. We must deal with the problem as it arises in the East in an epilogue or perhaps in the concluding chapter. This must not be a surprise to the reader but an anticipation from the beginning. It doesn't mean that we can answer the questions, but we are conscious of the questions.

It takes us back to Robert Owen and at the same time establishes the technological civilization more definitely than we ever succeeded in doing. The importance of the subject grows, but not in the sense of a construction (e.g. calling conformism totalitarianism).

The American mistake is in believing that America has more Christian elements than Russia. The April 25th report in "The Listener" discusses "Not by Bread Alone" which is a Russian book and takes our subject up to the present. It causes enormous difficulties in the conclusions and we have to give a feeling of breadth from the opening while anticipating the epilogue. This will increase the importance of the book and make it unique. On the subject we discuss, there

isn't a single book (perhaps there is Berdayev, but he hasn't the same concreteness).

It also gives us a third front that we cannot ignore. P. is not for a Christian anarchism in Russia, restaging the whole delusion of the denial of the reality of society which P. is fighting.

We have much more to say than we had. Our subject was too narrow. It did smell of something antiquated. The difficulty is to make some room for socialism. Robert Owen is of enormous help. He identified the problems of society with the limitations that society puts upon us in our dealing with the problems of machine.

P. couldn't find the appropriate beginning or the frame till he hit on one that hinges on being more personal and therefore more modest. We are trying to sum up our starting point in a more personal way and with less authority. Once you get the breadth, you lose the authority, unless you act as the personal Saviour coming from the skies and landing with all the truth, and that would be premature. We will write a more modest book and it will have more appeal. However, it will not change our subject matter and that is what we want people to know about. It will not be the rassing, clanging thumps of an argument, but the scenery for the audience to understand the world - a travelogue.

As to the problem of the title, we can solve it without refering to the machine. It may have a different title now that we refer to the ferment in Russia.

P. has discussed with sociologists, the question of Parsonian sociology and was convinced that we really mean the modern sociology which

runs through Weber, Marx and Pareto. But they agree that we have rightly understood it. P. agrees with my point that we need more sociology and to have it less metaphysical and apocalyptic.

P. wasn't sure that Bledsoe would think that what he sent him is an outline, but Bledsoe knows *The Great Transformation* and so had no difficulty in understanding it.

P. gave almost a whole day to the question of how one can write such a book, and it is almost impossible. It is only by saying that it is an old man and a young man etc. and peeping on the century which has gone by and on the century to come. This gives some perspective on things that have gone and will come. What did the world look like fifty years ago when P. turned into manhood, and fifty years from now when I conclude my life? In comparing notes, the only thing we conclude together is about the generation in between. This includes the change to socialism and here one takes a milder view, but it is not the time for relaxation either. That would make it easy to give the freedom to one's tone and supply the modesty required. The very fact of age and youth are an occasion for modesty. Then we could suggest the picture to express the situation and it makes it more possible with more general appeal and more truth in it.

Concerning "The Listener" review of "Not by Bread Alone", the Russian situation is important and the general problem raises the question of the reality of society. How much importance is to be attached to the form of society and the view of resurrection in the anarchist position? However, it is not an anarchist position but a communist position.

This book is acclaimed by the mass of students and it is impossible

to treat it in a light way, and the real scope of the matter has made its appearance. We can take it that we have a general concept which can take into account the development involving Russia.

P. wrote something in the meantime, that in 200 years of technological development there were 200 years of the discovery of society and the different philosophies expressing the concern with society never ceased.

The problem of freedom never ceased to exist. How is the reality of society compatible with the spiritual interpretation of history or the spiritual nature of man? Only with Hegel and Marx was history apostrophised. (Arendt says that suddenly history came up). One can start the problem of freedom with Hobbes, Spinoza and Rousseau .

This is the human history of the machine that is being written, while the reaction to it - the social philosophy - shows how much is to be said. P. might write the history of modern sociology as part of this story.

To include the Russian developments has much less rigour, but it is true that we are in the same boat.

P. has given up putting the matter as a syllogism. The biggest job in 1957 is to view the world as a whole - the crisis in socialism. If we do that, it is an important book and no book answering the American problem alone is sufficient if it leaves out China and Russia.

Mannheim says that there is a mass democracy in every industrial society which is unlike medieval society. This individual is a literate person expected to offer a view from a position of self-determination. This is not the case in a traditional society at all. In a traditional society there would be no dilemma of freedom.

That man lives by bread alone is the economic fallacy in a socialist society.

It is a completely mistaken argument that Hitler and Mussolini came when the problem was resolved (cf. Arendt and Stolpern).

The cold war now seems to cause less danger of war but a clearer appreciation of the basic problem of our age which is peace. It is superficial to show that history solves the problems of the past. It has only the appearance of being resolved, but nothing shows ^{the} rationality of man more than that.

P.'s difficulty is to show where socialism may be an advance over capitalism. The peculiarity of Dudintsev is that there is no complaint about the lack of freedoms. It is a confusion on all kinds of things.

P.'s answer is Owen's answer; we must improve the society. The limits of society can be found only by our best endeavours. We must be prepared to accept the limits set by society so we can't stand out for a communism which is a contradiction in terms. Since such a position involves the reform of socialism, the sympathies of the world are with those who want to reform socialism.

If the second revelation stands, then Owen is right and we have to follow it and be ready to resign ourselves. (cf. The Goethe poem about "der musen").

We cannot know the limits that society sets beforehand, because it is the knowledge of the limits of man. It is always tested by trying the impossible.

Politics is usually regarded as a problem of ethics, but it hinges on what kind of people we should be like. The political and moral is identical - what

is right and wrong. Aristotle in politics discusses what should a community be like. The polity is an ethical discipline which the community wants to achieve. This is an ethical thing. In the economy it boils down to self-sufficiency and reciprocity. He says if you get egotism you won't get a community and if you get the wrong prices the community will burst. If you get the right prices the community will continue. Economics is the way a community can continue. P. thought the just price was ridiculous..(?) England was always Aristotelian.

Things will have to change if the situation remains the same without a spectacular collapse in order to provide an adequate solution which can last.

The Industrial Revolution is at the root of a split between the East and West and the problems common to both are basic to the Industrial Revolution.

The economic fallacy is primarily a Western one and later it becomes an Eastern one. Earlier it meant absolutizing but now it involves not only the market economy but something else.

P. said that in the first phase of the Industrial Revolution the organization was economic - how to use machinery for production. It involved risk-bearing etc. Today there are a different set of concerns related to national unrest and the conditions of industrialization.

Unless you have a metaphysical dilemma you have nothing. The various determinisms, statistical, biological and psychological are all elements of the reality of society. There are inescapable alternatives. There is a double relatedness of man to power, he creates power and is a victim of it. There is no contracting out and we cannot choose the roles which don't exist. These are based on mutual role expectations.

The French Revolution took over the absolute state power of the ancien

regime. There was no idea of society.

The Middle Ages and its corporative work disintegrates. People were anxious about society before Hobbes and Rousseau but not in the same way. E.g. if we go into Francis Bacon, Rober Bacon, science etc. The genetics don't usually add to the explanation of anything. The machine began to grow into peoples' lives.

Jaspers has the idea of the masses. What kind of mass? If you go near it, it disappears - there are committee members, trade union members, and they listen on T.V. to discussions of the mass and they read the paperbacks from Aristotle to Jaspers. Mannheim says that modern society is democratic in an operational sense.

In the sense that each individual was separated by original sin, anarchistic Christianity is the same as atomistic individualism. In Christianity it is not the fate of mankind but the fate of each individual which is the concern. The essence of it is that society is individuals, and this is one of the interpretations of Christianity. This brought Calvin to decide on grace as predestined. Calvin said that this was determined at the time of creation and follows from the deterministic premise of science that everything must have a cause. Robert Owen is not far from this.

In Medieval times, the individual was not activated and now he is (see Mannheim above).

For us the machine is a "deus ex machina" and we talk of 200 years only in a modest sense. We never go beyond the authority that Robert Owen claimed.

If we sum up the term inner life, we are really talking about freedom (a mixture of hope and fear) and this is a definition of freedom. But it allows

you to say that at the very bottom of all our troubles is an increasing consciousness of the loss of freedom. This can be discussed educationally, statistically and in terms of the organization of industry. But this has never been said.

Society didn't exist before the machine, in our sense. It was the consciousness of central power and getting the same information all the time and of its compelling character. It was simultaneous and the same information. When we refer to power we might mean e.g. the declaration of war, the rise in prices etc.

A totalitarian government which refrains from giving information becomes a shortcut to freedom. (?)

You can't make yourself responsible before your conscience for your life. There is a lack of moral integration and you cannot take your responsibilities. There is a disintegration of our responsibility for the total effects of our action. (Power and value come up). We are both the source and victims of power and are unable to make ourselves responsible for a part in this.

The first point is the one raised by Owen and Quetelet; there is a sense in which the individual is not responsible and this comes under the heading of determinism.

There are fleeting borders between the individual person and society, because we just can't say when we are acting on our own and when we are acting as a member of society. There is an increasing recognition that the individual cannot separate himself off. Our function in creating power (coercion) is active and passive.

Mass Society

Myself: Perhaps what is meant by the term "mass society" is the reality of society.

P.: It is loose thinking which serves the purpose of keeping a person from an act of moral courage.

P. doesn't believe in elites. These are the same who howl at all kinds of putrid nonsense about absolutes that they are after.

The mobilization of the individuals in the mass is not the danger. The danger is collective. Medieval society broke down releasing the individual (the Mannheim formula). In the material democracy of today the individuals in the mass are knowledgeable and thinking. This is the opposite of the mass. If you go looking you only find people. The mass is only the unemployed before the gates of the factory seen from the director's office.

Where do we get the term "the mass"? It was first mixed up with the mob (Le Bon). We (you and I) behave utterly differently. The mass of people sit home and look at T.V. - people who see the same thing at the same time. It just means that there are many. "Mass Media" isn't the mass versus the individual.

Averagism doesn't make the mass different from the aggregate of individuals.

Mr. Jaspers isn't different from other individuals. If his shoes don't fit he reacts the same as anyone else. He is in an elite situation, but another fellow in his position behaves in the same way. There may be rare personal qualities among humble people in their own surroundings (this is not education).

P. doesn't believe in the elite and it is a lack of education and coarseness to believe in such a thing.

P. thinks there is a growing tension in the mobilization of individuals against the mass media and the mass weapons of destruction.

The matter of conformity is different. We have all the same fear and are ready to accept power to protect us. We are in the same danger and allow unlimited power to arise instantly. This has dangerous centrifugal tendencies. This happened the first time when the market made its appearance in the 17th century. There was a cry for order as the citizen's first duty. If you have a stock exchange and if there is a panic the whole system may collapse. In medieval society there were no panics; the cows continued to graze. In our society with a stock exchange, slumps, factories closed etc. the cows don't continue to graze. In P.'s time any sign of social disorder was considered a panic. At the time of Henry the VIII they didn't see any danger in a riot - they knew then that there was a scarcity of something.

In some sense we unconsciously realize we are threatened e.g. emergency powers are given and agreed to immediately and without limitation.

We don't maintain civic liberties but we fear them. Conformism raises the question of civic liberties. To oppose conformism is to stand for the rights of minorities.

Power is ambiguous. Hume showed that it was based on opinion. It is the active way of creating power and also the object of it. There is a mutual mirroring and oscillation.

The origin of fear is quite different. We are dependent in a vital

sense on technology, e.g. if the power station closes up we would all be helpless.

The individual is dependent on the average for his shape in the environment. He cannot develop beyond a definite level unless he has air, light and moral example. Moral and vital statistics are dependent on the environment.

In a human society you have a need for regulation. If you have a certain number of cars, you increase the speed possible on the road by the use of lights. There is the infringement of freedom, but we accept it. The right to drive on either the right or the left side of the road wherever you please, is limited. Regulation itself should not fall under freedom. Certain regulation is present even in the most primitive society e.g. sex.

Now there is a definite increase in fear due to the increase in power and the excessive nature of it. One shouldn't quite forget that regulations are needed to protect humans from the machines around them. Regulations such as the regulation of working hours are of a protective character. Otherwise we would have children age 5 and women working in the mines.

The distinction between government and opinion doesn't exist in a democratic community.

There is a tension between the increasing mobilization of the individual and mass regimentation which occurs with the media and the armaments.

Technological civilization has to protect and regulate life and you don't get into the problem of democracy. We only proceed to the technicality of interdependence and uncertainty as to consequences. In the market you are always irresponsible and anonymous. Our readiness to accept compulsion is

infinitely greater because we think it is right and necessary. There is an enormous concentration of power and there is something on the point of endangering us and making us slaves. Government comes up only as the shadow of an opinion making for a totalitarian trend. We shouldn't go beyond this on the question of freedom. If you point to the present, then the danger to freedom from technological sources is the patent thing. This runs from the beginning of the machine world.

P. started 30 years ago with the idea that the social effects of the individual's life were untraceable. We must formulate this in terms of freedom. We should not be compelled to accept lower standards than the ones we cherish (Dudintsev) if this is what we mean by freedom. It is unacceptable that society should compel us not to live up to what we know to be the best (Dudintsev). P. wants communism to be such a society. But there is no justification because not everyone wants it. (It is peculiar that this is close to the Nietzsche idea). Everybody must bear his share for law, order and security. He can't contract out and benefit.

This is the argument for us. The trouble is in relinquishing our freedom. There is a double realism insofar as we really have to bear such a burden and secondly, for some it's a terrible burden because they are higher (different). We are really trying to make room for people who want to give instead of taking. The point is that this possibility shouldn't be closed.

This is the objection to the death penalty. If the state does it, such a society cannot rise beyond a definite level. Similarly in beating children. You may not do any harm to the children but it doesn't do any good for those who beat them.

We are not saying that without machinery this problem couldn't have

arisen, but who could say that with machinery it hasn't?

There is in existentialism a common element with P.'s position in the realization of the unsatisfactory matters.

In 1957 it is not the mass danger, it is something different. It is an entirely rational fear of technology arousing irrational emotions. There is nothing contradictory in the fear being rational and the effect being irrational.

"Masses" is the situation you yourself are in. It is the people in the next room, while the person who carries on the conversation and the other person whom he is speaking to are exempt. The audience is meant as against the speaker discussing it. P. doesn't say that there aren't people with average views, but in other situations they take up the position far ahead of us all.

The loss of freedom is there from the beginning in a complex society. The self protection of society e.g. against the labour market, limits the freedom of the market but this is never linked with the totalitarian tendency of a technological civilization. P. deduces the totalitarianism only from the fear generated from rational causes. In Russia there are vast experiments with terrific efforts needed to carry them into effect. These were the root of its problems.

By using such popular and general terms the freedom problem we get into is one which would readily imply that this totalitarian tendency which was present in any technological civilization would have to be counteracted by establishing freedoms.

Socialism does away with the utter helplessness of not being able to join or congregate for joint action. Yet the enormous amount of compulsion and restraint is already too much. How much of the reality of society and compulsion

must we accept? Enough to make the socialist society possible without any avoidable constraints. It doesn't mean for example, there are no markets or money. Markets however, only indicate the intensity of the demand.

Some would see no absolute need for man to be master of his destiny. But it is an absolute requirement of Western man to act according to his conscience. He cannot cut loose and contract out. The alternatives are given and inevitable.

The totalitarian development cannot be stopped unless we relinquish the absolutes and go out for civic liberties. This totalitarian tendency has the possibility of locating and accumulating power over everything. The totalitarian power may be public opinion but this may even be more ruthless and it might shatter a man's life right away.

We can use the Commentary article to introduce the economic fallacy. The changeover from the economic or the obsolete market mentality to the moral, transcends the market but not the technological civilization. Beyond capitalism and socialism there is the technological civilization. Justice and humaneness are the problems raised. The technological civilization seems to be crazy because science itself is under the suspicion of being insane. Owen hadn't even seen the market but he saw that abysmal questions would be raised. This is a man who, at the first knock of the machine took in the problem of the ages.

The Commentary article made it clear that the market should be regarded as a phase of an industrial civilization. Our difficulty is that the market problems are still there to be resolved. We shouldn't get into a position where the criticism of the economy has lost its topical interest. We don't imply that the economy is solved.

There is an emphatic brushing aside of the West and East and nothing could prove the relevance of our position more than this. This is beginning to be argued in Russia. The point is not that they are arguing to go back to capitalism but they are arguing something different.

My question on participation in power:

One cannot escape participation in power on account of the reality of society. Society doesn't permit the freedom of not creating power, just how much and what for. One is faced with inevitable alternatives and there is no contracting out or evasion (cf. the Hindu case, Bhagavad Ghita) of the inevitability of choices.

For the Christian, power appears as evil because its essence is compulsion. This is because they think that only the government compels. Under the market economy the problem doesn't seem to arise.

In a technological environment there is a point outside the system from which we create situations that have laws of their own e.g. a bar of iron is a level or weight. It's the technological environment which decides how to use it. The commitment to technology accepts all these implications. But then you can only choose roles and careers which exist for you, e.g. you can go to a lunatic asylum as a patient, but not as a doctor. The sociological point gives concreteness.

Deciding not to choose is still a choice. In the name of a person uttering a position and maintaining ^{you} it _^ may point to it.

An atheist upholds this as well. Having convictions is the inner life. A person maintains them and is true to himself. This is not belief, this is

knowledge, not like the thermometer but from internal evidence. This is a knowledge of the universal character of human experience. (There may be a time when you didn't know it).

We insist on there being a meaning to things. "Logos" means that you can deduce meaning. This is the only grain of truth in Platonism. For the rest Platonism is a mystification.

The sociological framework confirms this and if you go to society you find it to be true. Society consists of action patterns. You can't start from atomistic individualism. It is better to start with meanings or values which if you internalize them you have a personality type. The same meanings determine roles. He swallows those meanings and breathes through them and everybody has definite values. And this structures his personality in a certain way. This is the starting point of modern sociology. It is not behavioristic or symbolistic or normative. It starts from values and meanings which are irreducible.

Some religions insist upon certain things that stand out. The communism position is a Christian heresy. Christianity is a very vague matter and a number of values swing around in it. The Hindus base their case on nothing - they say so. They feel safer that way, and they think it's funny that we think of anything being certain. Christian anarchism pretends that there is no restriction to live on purely altruistic motives.

The reality of society is a tissue of situations which creates inevitable alternatives. It is not a subjective phenomenon and it is there for everybody. We can wish that it wasn't there. It is manifested in moral statistics and laws of the market. There is no contracting out of participation in power and you are a victim whether you want to or not. The Christians object more to

participating than to being victims.

We can't answer the question of how the machine affects the tissue of interpersonal relationships. It reveals that through the above manifestations.

How does it create this situation? It may be through the division of labour, since this is inherent in the interdependence of movements in the economic process and their recurrence - the unity and the stability of the economy. But there is a lot in the tissue of society and the motivations of individuals which derive from non-economic situations. Here you have the embeddedness of the economy. The unity and stability come from both economic and non-economic situations. There is interdependence and recurrence.

NOTES

The Interdisciplinary Project

When the interdisciplinary project started in 1953 the first lecture was on equivalencies. This lecture was a failure because those present said there were no such ^h things and P. didn't succeed in producing anything in ancient history or anthropology which resembled equivalencies.

One year later however, Connie Arensberg brought in an article from "The American Anthropologist" on the savages from Nigeria. It was on the Tiv markets and concerned some observations on exchange by Paul Bohanan. It included elite circulation, hierarchies, and higher and lower money. If a person couldn't perform a transaction on his own level then he must make one on a level higher up. Another might make one lower down. These are elite circulation and equivalencies. Later P. found that Bohanan had given a lecture at Columbia but he missed it.

Hegel and Marx

Hegel's term the "burgerliche gesellschaft" (civil society) is what we mean by the market economy. It took P. years to find out what Hegel meant. He was the first to use the term society in Gesellschaft und Staat. Marx probably took the term "politische economie" from Hegel. Marx meant a category like art, law, religion etc.

Hegel contrasted the economy and society (he meant the market) while Marx consciously included the ideologies of the market system in the term political economy.

Jaspers

P. thinks that by the awakening, Jaspers really means society. The modern world begins with the breakup of the medieval world. To talk about changes of consciousness is not empty of content. To say it was alchemy and science etc. is true but there is a more topical subject.

People were getting wealthy and the church stopped giving alms when their domains were being secularised. In 1536 England passed a law depriving the church of its possessions.

Jaspers is strong in taking up the lines of general consciousness and comes close to us at one or two points e.g. where Marx dropped the dialectic.

Nationalism

The nationalism in Asia and Africa exists to keep control of the industrialization: to what point it should go and to cause a minimum of disruption internally.

America

Adjusting the child to the environment here, is like giving a person a map of how to lose his way - a kind of pocket compass of no return.

Grotius

Grotius said to ignore religious differences.

'Not by Bread Alone'

MANYA HARARI on the implications of a new Russian novel

NOT BY BREAD ALONE is the title of a first novel by the Soviet writer Dudintsev, who has suddenly sprung to fame. We enter Dudintsev's world with Nadia. She is a beautiful and idealistic school teacher in a small Siberian town, who has recently married Drosdov, a middle-aged Napoleon of industry with a jolly sense of humour and a steely eye to the main chance. While keeping her school job, Nadia has become the first lady of the town. The Drosdovs live in a well-appointed private house and have a car, a maid, and a chauffeur. When they give a party and Nadia wants to ask her friends amongst her colleagues, her husband says 'Better not'. They would identify her with the luxury in which she lives and she would become even more isolated from them than she is already by her position.

Temperamental V.I.P.s

When Nadia falls ill and is taken to hospital, she finds that all the patients from her ward have been moved out into the corridor to leave her by herself. She orders them to be brought back. Doctors and nurses hurriedly obey, muttering: 'You never know what these V.I.P.s will ask for next'. Her husband laughingly approves her gesture but tells her that she cannot hope to change the system.

The system suits Drosdov down to the ground. He reinterprets Marx for Nadia. 'The greatest spiritual asset of our time is the capacity to make material things'. This he has, and for this he is rewarded with a lavish share of the good things of life, which he enjoys thoroughly—they are life. And why shouldn't he look after himself, he asks Nadia gaily. Or would she prefer him to be a Christian?

One day Nadia visits one of her pupils, the daughter of Syanov, a mechanic at Drosdov's factory. The Syanovs, with their five children and a lodger, live in one dark room partitioned into two, and Nadia shares their dinner of potatoes and salt eaten off a newspaper. The lodger is a penniless inventor, Lopatkin, the hero of the story. Gradually, Nadia learns the facts. Lopatkin has invented a machine. His invention competes with that of the academician Avdiev, an established authority and the head of a powerful scientific group. The relevant Ministry backs Avdiev and has ordered Drosdov's factory to work on his model, diverting to it the funds originally allocated to Lopatkin's. It soon appears that Lopatkin's method was the better of the two, but by then the money has been spent and the Ministry, the Institute, and the factory must save their faces.

For seven years Lopatkin fights these giant vested interests who claim to represent the state and use its power. He works and starves, he is slandered, threatened, offered bribes, robbed of his invention, tricked, imprisoned, and condemned to ten years in a concentration camp. He is unaided except by Nadia, who comes to love him, and a few other isolated 'individualists' like himself. Thanks to them he is at last released and his machine is made and proved to be successful. But his victory makes hardly a dent in the armour of the giants. Although this is after Stalin's death, the commission of inquiry puts the blame on some defenceless stooges, and Drosdov is even promoted.

The Truth as the Students See It

Needless to say, such a novel would have been unthinkable under Stalin. But since then many books have attacked bureaucratism. Yet when Dudintsev's novel was discussed at Moscow University a thousand students came, and some of them shouted that the whole of Soviet fiction was a lie with the exception of this one book. What is the truth they see in it? It is less, I think, the startlingly recognisable facts than that Dudintsev gets under the double-talk which makes them possible. In Dudintsev's novel all the current terms are passed under review.

Lopatkin's enemies label him an individualist—traditionally the equivalent of the cold bourgeois egotist—while they stand for the collective, the team, the warm dynamic community of selfless work and friendship, welcoming to talent and devoted to the people: he is the

enemy of the people and of communism. But who are the people and what is Lopatkin? For Dudintsev it all depends on what you mean by communism. In another, less recent, novel, one schoolboy asks another what it will be like when communism is established, and is told that there will be plenty of everything and everyone will be able to help himself to anything he wants. To Lopatkin this is 'bourgeois communism'. Going back to the early formula—'From each according to his capacity, to each according to his need'—he says that his own material needs are almost satisfied even now, in his dire poverty; not that he would reject material comfort but it is not enough for him and he can do without it. In reality he does reject it, for he has inherited much of the traditional Russian's love of poverty as well as the attraction towards tests of courage and endurance of the early revolutionary.

'For people who are attached to things', Lopatkin says, 'communism is the feeding trough. But a real man does not live by bread alone'. Communism, as he conceives it, is a moral force which exists in people and has existed 'for a very long time'. He knows that it is in him because his needs are different from those of the bourgeois: his chief need is to give. He wishes that a communist society existed already because for him it is a world which would not hinder him from giving. Not that anyone can break his spirit. 'Once a man has learnt to think', he says, 'nobody can stop him. There are freedoms of which it is impossible to be deprived'. Even from the concentration camp he comes back with new ideas for his invention; but he would like to hand it over physically to the people. For him the time for distribution is now and the people are not an abstract conception but those living men whom he has seen sweating in unnecessary labour. Because he is an idealist, as his friends call him (not in the pejorative Marxist sense, but in the older meaning which has survived), just because he does not live by bread alone, he wants to give his neighbours bread. But between him and the living community there stands the 'bureaucratic ring' of the Drosdovs.

The Means to Wealth and Power

Drosdov is delighted that a society does not exist in which the principle 'To each according to his need' is practised, and that the slogan has become: 'To each according to his work'. He works for the 'material basis', as he calls it. Human relationships will come later. In his epoch the end is wealth, power, and it justifies his means—his ruthlessness, his lies, his grabbing. He laughs at Nadia's egalitarianism: wealth is for the people, but for the present it is limited and his superior share in it is his incentive and his just reward.

Unfortunately for Lopatkin it is Drosdov who claims to speak officially for the state and to decide who is an individualist and what is a collective. 'I don't like these lofty natures', he says of Lopatkin. 'They're conceited individualists. Genius is always thumbing its nose at the common man'. At this Nadia protests that the common people are not necessarily mediocre. They think and they even throw up genius; what Drosdov has in mind is something different—dark, dangerous, sub-human: it is the mass conceived in terms of mediocrity which must inevitably strangle the genius and the hero. Certainly it cannot digest Lopatkin. 'If I were a writer', Drosdov tells him, 'I would write a book about you. Because you really are a tragic figure—a figure from an age which is irrevocably past. You are the isolated hero'. Lopatkin makes the relevant protest: 'Isolated I may be, but I am not out for myself'. But Drosdov sweeps on. 'You are a genius but you are alone, and we are building ants, you see'. In his eyes there flashes 'a cold, monstrous animosity'—the animosity of the ant heap:

We don't need either you or your idea, however good it is. There are no capitalists to buy it, and the people can do without it and without your elemental ardour—all it does is to upset the economic system. The collective has more genius than any genius, but it works at its own pace.

It maddens Lopatkin that this pace is not even the pace of efficient materialism. It is *his* invention that will add to the 'material basis'

after millions have been squandered on Avdiev's. But he is powerless: the ant-heap works only for established authority.

And here is Drosdov's chief, Shutikov, describing the collective of established scientists:

When I was put in charge of this business, I realised at once that there were vested interests involved in it and people clinging to them for dear life. They've built a walled city, you see, and they live in it according to Malthus. And how are we to know that your idea is good? If you were one of them, of course we'd believe you. You can't see the city but it's there all right. If you like, it's a submerged iceberg, and believe me, it has sunk more than one Titanic.

The collective of the Shutikovs is the pressure group, the monopoly, the ant-heap of those who help each other to help themselves and to keep others out. It is intensely conservative and unwilling to take risks, because, unlike the poor, it has everything to lose. It is united only by the feeding trough. In reality *these* are the individualists. 'You just get inside Avdiev's Institute', say Lopatkin's friends. 'That's where you feel the desert wind of isolation'.

Honesty with Courage

And what of all the teams that go from top to bottom of the social scale? Occasionally Lopatkin wonders if there is not really something wrong with him that he is outside them. He glances round him at the audience in the gallery of a concert hall. How jolly they all look: teams from factories and colleges—easy, open, intimate among themselves. He tries to join them but when they turn to him, the alien, their eyes are discouragingly blank, and once again he feels the stirring of the desert wind. These people are not all Drosdovs, of course; but it seems that team life, with its easy, extrovert relationships, does not of itself give life, only bourgeois cosiness to those inside it. There are many honest men among them, but honesty is not enough—without understanding, heart, and heroic courage—to keep the wolves from getting to the top and the people's collective from turning into the monstrous structure of monopolies and double-talk. And what then is the state? We are, say Shutikov and his friends, deciding to take over Lopatkin's invention after he has vanished into a concentration camp.

There are no monopolies in our country. Everything belongs to the State. And who is the State? We are—the Institute, the Ministry, the Factory. Why shouldn't we take what belongs to us?

And who are the people? 'We are', says a broken-down inventor whom Lopatkin meets. 'You and I and the rest'. 'Who are you?', Lopatkin asks him. 'I am a broken man. I have learnt to sit quietly in my corner, keeping my eyes open and my mouth shut'.

But some among such people catch Lopatkin's fire and hope, and are joined with him in friendship such as the Drosdovs have never known. Is this perhaps the real collective? It stretches into the past and the future. Listening to Chopin and Rachmaninov, Lopatkin feels at one with those in every age who hear the call to a heroic isolation. Paradoxically, it seems that without this call and those who answer it, or at least respect it, there can be no community. His friends help him to prevail up to a point. But nobody in the book doubts that his victory is a miracle. 'Until now', they tell him, 'we would have said that in our country it is impossible. Now we say that it is very difficult'.

Not by Bread Alone was serialised in the journal, *Novi Mir*, between August and October, before the events in Hungary. The Moscow Union of Writers gave it a mild though mixed reception. *Izvestia* damned it with faint praise. Since then, the Leningrad *Pravda* has attacked it for exaggerating the evils of Soviet society, and the Kiev Writer's Union, calling it a distorted picture, has criticised *Novi Mir* for printing defective works. The book is to be published in the spring, and it is usual in such a case for the author to revise his work before publication, in the light of criticism.

Most Important Novel since the 'Thaw'

As it stands, Dudintsev's novel is the most important since the beginning of the 'thaw'. His commitment is to values which are universal and it does not damage his art. His sincerity is undeniable and his art springs from his very candour. A genuine story-teller, he deals in real people and his moral is implicit in their story, but it is also stated plainly in the title—*Not by Bread Alone*. The real struggle is between the kingdoms of this world and of the spirit—of this world in which the ends are made to justify the means and the means are substituted for the ends, and where Drosdov builds his abiding city;

and of the spirit which does not allow the end to be put off or separated from the means, and where Lopatkin finds his indestructible freedom. In this struggle politics are incidental. Yet, though nothing in the book suggests explicitly that the hero would fare better or the villain worse in another form of mass-society, Dudintsev's criticism of the world he sees goes further than that of any other published Soviet author.

That it still seems to be within the party line enhances its political significance. With increasing urgency the party, through the writers, has been calling for initiative to fight social evils in the name of a return to Leninism. Many evils have been admitted and ascribed to Stalin's deviation, which consisted in encouraging the cult of personality and resulted in the habit of passing the buck. The meaning of initiative has gradually changed—from heroic obedience under Stalin to active struggle against the bureaucrats since his death. But always it was suggested that the hero had the system, the collective of the party and its highest representatives on his side. So, whatever his perils, his ultimate safety and the downfall of the villains were assured.

Dudintsev's innovation is his full admission of the price of courage. His villains keep their jobs. The evils he describes are not merely local scandals and they are not certain to be known and righted by the highest leaders in the end. Communism as he conceives it is distinguished from the social reality as clearly as a Christian must distinguish Christian ethics from the social reality of a nominally Christian world. As for the party, it is barely mentioned. Most of the chief characters presumably belong to it, but we meet them as human beings, victims of their own and of one another's passions, and moulding the collective as much as they are moulded by it. Among them, it is seen that the Drosdovs are those who rise under a system in which the checks on power are from the top and not the bottom.

'Difficult Spring'

Inevitably, to the foreign reader, this picture brings out the contradictions inherent in the thaw. If initiative is to be effective, can it stop at co-operating with the system and not attempt to change it? But this question is never raised by Dudintsev, though it is touched on in another recent novel, *Difficult Spring*, by Ovechkin, also printed by *Novi Mir*. This concerns itself with the machinery of local government, and in it the secretary of a party regional committee reflects movingly on such simple basic problems as the relation between party and non-party organs, between leadership and democracy and between outstanding personality and collective leadership. We must devise a system, he says, in which the good administrator can do good and yet the foolish boss is kept from doing too much harm. That he has much to think out practically is suggested by an incident when he is due to stand for re-election. He takes the seemingly unprecedented step of insisting that the election should be genuine and not merely confirm his appointment. To humour him, his superiors agree to put up one other candidate, but they remind him that whichever of the two fails to get in will be permanently branded as having been thrown out. This acts as a sufficient deterrent.

However, it is not Ovechkin's but Dudintsev's book which was acclaimed by the young people at the Soviet universities. Such has been its impact on them that it is said that the names Lopatkin and Drosdov have already passed into the language as common nouns. That Dudintsev is able both to remain orthodox and to reflect the spirit of these angry young men is to the credit of the present policy. Difficult but no longer quite impossible, within the framework of the system, to fight monopoly and double talk: no doubt this message of Dudintsev's gives them greater hope than did those books which claimed that it was easy. For Dudintsev's own achievement seems to show that it is possible to speak openly the plain truth.

Clearly, neither Dudintsev and Ovechkin nor their followers regard themselves as anything but Communists. They judge Soviet society not for being Communist but for being bourgeois. But they judge it by values which are common to humanity. These values they identify with Leninism, and if to us this seems an illusion, it enables them to witness to their conscience in the name of an indigenous tradition on which it is assumed that the regime is based.—*Third Programme*

Roman Archaeology in Wales, a lecture by Sir Mortimer Wheeler broadcast in the Welsh Home Service on January 30, 1957, as a tribute to V. E. Nash-Williams, has been published by the B.B.C., price 1s. It may be obtained through newsagents and booksellers or post free from Broadcasting House, Cardiff, or B.B.C. Publications, 35 Marylebone High Street, London, W.1.

Moscow is not merely the name of a collection of stories and articles; it must now be regarded as the name of a new Soviet literary school which stands in opposition to the official Soviet school of writing. The *Pravda* review makes it clear that its objection to *Literary Moscow* is the same as its objection to Dudintsev. Just as *Not by Bread Alone*, so some of the short stories in the new volume represent Soviet life as it really is; they show that the party's self-proclaimed honourable guiding role is merely a fiction for the bureaucratic and heartless management of the country's affairs and people; and, most important and most dangerous, they contain an unspoken call to the people of the Soviet Union to rise up in anger against the mismanagement of their country. There is no call for opposition to the party, and none is intended. There is an implied call to the readers, to the people, to work and to fight for the very improvements which the party itself says are long overdue. But the party is afraid that if this call from the writers is acted upon, if popular anger is allowed to rise, the party itself may be swept away in the process.

A Libel on the Soviet System

One of the short stories, says *Pravda*, shows a village party group assembling for a formal meeting. Before the meeting, they are real living people, but as soon as the meeting is opened they are completely changed. They make formal, dry speeches, they mouth meaningless phrases, they say the very opposite of what they had been saying a minute or two before. They are cowards, they adapt themselves to circumstances imposed from outside, they are double-faced. *Pravda*, of course, condemns both the story and its moral, but it does not say what the moral is; the *Literary Gazette*, in an earlier review, did. It drew attention to a remark made by one of the village party members before the meeting began, who said that the light in the room was poor because the lamp, too, needed air to shine more brightly. But there was no air in the village, as there was none in the room, because the conditions were not right. This, again, had happened because the ordinary peasant was not trusted by those on 'top', because those on 'top'—the word is the writer's—are heartless bureaucrats, who are completely indifferent to the peasant's life. The division of Soviet society into those 'on top' and those 'at the bottom', alleged by the writer, is, according to the party's official view, a libel on the Soviet system. Before Dudintsev no such view could even be implied. Now, after Dudintsev, it has almost become commonplace.

Another short story in the same volume makes a poor, uneducated village watchman say to a highly placed visitor from Moscow: 'You are the rulers—we are the producers'. Again the division between those on the top and those at the bottom is there for all to see. The *Literary Gazette* makes the author say that there exist two different worlds. The first is a bureaucratic, heartless and crude world. The second is an unhappy world, but honest and good at the same time.

One of the short stories in the volume—which, incidentally, runs to 800 pages—describes a vast, desolate and neglected expanse of marsh-

land not far from Moscow, where the people, who maintain themselves by hunting and fishing, live in the same primitive conditions and poverty that their forefathers lived in a century ago. Not only has Soviet rule brought few improvements to them in the forty years of its existence, but it has, on the writer's showing—again implied, not stated outright—made life more difficult, complicated, and unpleasant. The great need there is to dry the marshes, to make agriculture and the collective farm a reality instead of the sham they are at present, and in this way bring civilisation to these half-forgotten people. This is what the writer seems to imply. There would be nothing very remarkable about this story—not more remarkable, that is, than about the other stories published in *Literary Moscow*—if Mr. Khrushchev had not been asked at a large conference of collective farmers what the Government intended to do about this area of marshland. Mr. Khrushchev immediately showed himself conversant with the problem, perhaps even with the short story. It was not a bad idea, he agreed, that something should be done about it. Only, he said, the Government could not at present provide the money.

This incident really explains more about what the Soviet writers have set out to do, what they have achieved, and why the party leadership fears them, than all the articles in *Pravda*. They have set out to awaken the social conscience of the Soviet people, and to mould public opinion, to make the people press the party and the Government to make their lives more bearable. There is not one whit of evidence that these writers oppose communism as such; but they are certainly opposed, uncompromisingly, to the distortion of communism under which the nation has lived for so long—before, and after, the death of Stalin. In this particular instance a short story has caused one of the people attending an official conference to press upon the Government, in the person of Mr. Khrushchev, a course of policy advocated by the writer. For every man who can summon enough courage to press a course of action upon so powerful a personage as Mr. Khrushchev, there must be thousands of people who will be emboldened to press and worry with their suggestions and demands the lesser party officials all over the country. But the Government, as Mr. Khrushchev said in this instance, cannot fall in with the suggestions. It cannot afford the money, which is reserved for building up heavy industry, the army, the economies of China and the satellite countries. The immediate needs of the Soviet people must come last.

But the writers tell the people that their needs, spiritual as well as material, freedom as well as bread, should come first, and that under an efficient and honest Government they would come first. And the Soviet Government and Communist Party are afraid that if they are unable to satisfy these demands, the people would believe them to be both inefficient and dishonest; would freely say so now that the fear of Stalin and his terror has been removed; and would act on this belief if and when the opportunity arose. To prevent anything of this kind happening they are trying to muzzle the writers. The chances of the transformation of the Soviet system into something better than it is now will depend in large measure on whether the writers, or the bureaucrats who try to control them, win this fight.—*Third Programme*

Modern Architecture in Finland

By J. M. RICHARDS

THE visitor to Finland—especially the visitor to Finland in winter time—is soon made aware of the hard, unrelenting nature of the country, which its architecture clearly reflects. I do not mean there is any absence of beauty in the icebound coastline, or the landscape in which primeval rocks lie very near the surface, or the lakes in which the ripples caused by the wind are fixed and frozen for months at a time. These add up to a picture, coloured grey and white with muted shades of brown, that has its own subtle beauty. Those who come to know it develop a nostalgia for it that surprises them. But it is the kind of beauty that contains none of the exuberance, none of the sense of nature expending its superfluous energy, that we get in more southerly climates. In Finland nature and man must concentrate on holding their own.

This affects architecture in two ways: first, it encourages a habit of persistent enquiry into technical possibilities—a search for new

weapons with which to defeat and conquer the elements—and, secondly, living so close to the more uncomfortable aspects of nature means that the essential relationship between the building, its materials, and the landscape is not easily lost sight of. This dependence on nature is the basis of the so-called organic quality that Frank Lloyd Wright makes so much of, and mention of it brings me at once to Finland's biggest contribution to modern architecture. Writing of Alvar Aalto, Finland's leading architect—and in my view one of the great architects of our time—Siegfried Giedion, in his book *Space, Time and Architecture*, describes him as 'daring the leap from the rational-functional to the irrational-organic'. He relates Aalto's work to 'our endeavour to combine the technical with the primeval'. Giedion wrote this several years ago, but it is even truer now, if only because Aalto's work, which has itself grown in stature, is now backed up by that of other Finnish architects possessing many of the same qualities, as the exhibition in London* makes clear.

* At the Royal Institute of British Architects, 66 Portland Place, London

Soviet Writers versus the Bureaucracy

By VICTOR ZORZA

NOT many Soviet writers could withstand the tremendous moral and political pressure exerted in the past few months on Vladimir Dudintsev to make him recant his views on Soviet society and rewrite his novel, *Not by Bread Alone*.^{*} Foreign publishers of his book have received letters purporting to come from Dudintsev, asking them to hold up the publication of his book until he has had time to revise it. It is possible that he does want to make some minor changes, but to judge from his recent public statements he is unlikely to change anything that really matters. He had been accused, he said at a Moscow writers' meeting last month, of making Soviet life appear black and bleak. That, he said, was not true. But he did try to describe the bad aspects of Soviet life, because he did not want them to persist, because he wanted the horrors of the past never to be repeated again. 'And', he said, 'I have a right to want this!'

Appeal to Patriotism

Soviet officialdom—in the party, in the writers' union, in the press—may share Dudintsev's hatred of the horrors of the past, but it is afraid of the forces that may be let loose in Soviet society by his passionate denunciation of them. Is it permissible, asks the party periodical *Kommunist*, to echo the slanders uttered by the enemies of communism and to show our Soviet Socialist society as through a distorting mirror? For this, it says, is what the actions of some Soviet writers amount to. The appeal here is to the writer's patriotism, to his communism, to his stake, ideological and material, in the Soviet system. But the communism of Dudintsev and of those who think as he does differs greatly from the communism of Russia's ruling bureaucracy. Nor is it much use appealing to his stake in Soviet society, for he wants to change this society and, he insists, he has a right to want to change it. But the appeal to patriotism, the last refuge of a diseased ruling class throughout history, remains.

At a time like the present, the *Literary Gazette* wrote in December, 'when the slanderers from the camp of international reaction are trying to heap obloquy on our revolutionary traditions, and are juggling with facts, your place, Writer, is at a fighting post'. In other words, the Fatherland is in danger and it is the duty of the writers to wield their pens as if they were rifles and, most important of all, they must direct their fire across the frontiers, not engage in harmful sniping at home.

After the *Literary Gazette* had sounded this call the theme was developed and embroidered at writers' meetings throughout the country. Exactly one month later, reporting the main speech made at a meeting of Ukrainian writers in Kiev, the journal made an unmistakable reference to Dudintsev's condemnation of soulless bureaucrats. 'Our enemies', it said, 'are doing all they can to make it appear that any man who receives a leading post inevitably becomes a bureaucrat and separates himself from the people. Indeed, attempts to sow disorder and distrust in peoples' souls, in order to capture them, form part of the military-strategic plans of those who want to unleash a new war'. Armenian writers at a meeting in February were warned that their 'mistakes' were being exploited by the 'enemy'. Two days later the President of the Lithuanian Republic, Paletskis, was quoted as attributing, again to the 'enemy', the hope that 'Soviet literature will become the dynamite which will blow up our social system from the inside'.

At all these meetings, to judge from the official press accounts, Dudintsev's novel was vigorously condemned and hardly a voice was raised in his defence. But the few non-conformist voices that were quoted suggest that many more writers did in fact take Dudintsev's side than would appear on the surface. Their views were expressed in print by Ilya Ehrenburg, who, in a series of articles that filled about three pages of the *Literary Gazette*, managed to discuss the present problems of Soviet literature without saying one nasty word about Dudintsev. The purpose of Ehrenburg's article was to quieten the fears, at home and abroad, that the new official onslaught on the writers signified a hardening of Soviet policy, which had previously appeared to move towards a relaxation of controls. The article, no doubt, was suggested to Ehrenburg by those in charge of Soviet cultural policy. He

is too experienced a man of the world to risk official displeasure by writing what might be regarded as the political programme of the literary opposition. His article was meant to provide a vent for the writers' feelings, and to prevent a more forceful expression of them.

But Ehrenburg's is a complex personality, with a wealth of feelings that clamour for expression, as well as of experience that tells him to watch his step, and his article was in many ways a direct negation of what had been represented at some of the writers' meetings as the official line. He did not directly contradict the view that the ruthless exposure of Soviet bureaucrats by writers could be exploited by foreign ill-wishers. But he ridiculed those critics who were afraid that the reader of a novel which describes a soulless director would inevitably decide that all directors were equally soulless. There was much more in this vein in Ehrenburg's article, skating on the thin ice of official policy, leaving a mark on the ice here and there but never actually breaking through it. The article appeared in the second week of February, but it was a month before the really nonconformist—one might say 'oppositional'—writers, broke through into public print. If those in charge of the Soviet press had had their way, the writers' views would not have been published. But the circumstances were dramatic, Moscow was alive with rumours of an almost revolutionary meeting held by the capital's writers, unauthorised accounts of what had been said were circulating in printed form, and the authorities were compelled to publish their own version of what had happened.

What had in fact happened was this: The Moscow section of the writers' union had arranged to hold a conference at about the middle of last month to hear a report on recent literary developments. The writers decided to make this conference into a trial of strength. Word about this spread in Moscow, and the conference hall, already filled to capacity by the writers, was invaded by students and a large number of young intellectuals, who proceeded to punctuate the speeches by bursts of applause and cheering for the more rebellious speeches, and by disapproving noises for the more uncompromising expressions of the official line. The events had, in fact, taken a course somewhat similar to what happened in the autumn, when a meeting of Moscow writers had been convened to condemn Dudintsev's book. This time there was a garbled account of the meeting in the local Moscow newspaper, but the national press had ignored it. Thereupon the writers arranged for a full and circumstantial report to be printed in a news-sheet published by some members under the auspices of the Moscow Writers' Union. A relatively small number of copies was printed, the news-sheet was in great demand and soon disappeared from circulation.

Conflicting Accounts of a Meeting

By March 19, four days after the first account had appeared in the local Moscow newspaper, the authorities must have decided that to continue suppressing the details would only make matters worse. So, on that day the *Literary Gazette* came out with its own version of the proceedings, giving, it is true, most of the space to speeches expressing the official policy, but indicating unmistakably that there had been much—and vigorous—opposition to it at the meeting. The next day, in a review of a recent literary publication that occupied nearly half a page, *Pravda* took advantage of this opportunity to commend to the attention of its readers, with all the authority of the party leadership that this journal carries, the *Literary Gazette's* version of the meeting. At the same time it sharply condemned the version published in the writers' news-sheet. The news-sheet, it said, had made it appear that the whole meeting was 'one stream of complaints and accusations' by the writers, and, *Pravda* added, it had given only a few lines to speeches critical of Dudintsev and of other works in the Dudintsev manner.

All this takes up only a few brief paragraphs in *Pravda's* article, which reviews a recent volume of short stories, poems, and articles on cultural themes, called *Literary Moscow*. There is a direct link between the main and subsidiary themes of the *Pravda* article, for it was this volume, together with Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone*, that had provided most of the fireworks at the writers' meeting. Indeed, *Literary*

* Discussed by Manya Harari in a talk printed in THE LISTENER on February 28