

## THE REALM OF FREEDOM AND THE REALM OF NECESSITY A RECONSIDERATION

*Herbert Marcuse*

San Diego

I was very happy to hear that my friend Norman Birnbaum in his paper this morning spoke of utopian concepts and of the way in which allegedly utopian concepts were translated into reality, or were at least in the process of being translated into reality by the events of May and June in France.

I am equally happy and honored to talk to you in the presence of Ernst Bloch today, whose work *»Geist der Utopie«*, published more than forty years ago, has influenced at least my generation, and has shown how realistic utopian concepts can be, how close to action, how close to practice.

I want to follow this road here. I will not be deterred by one of the most vicious ideologies of today, namely, the ideology which derogates, denounces, and ridicules the most decisive concepts and images of a free society as merely *»utopian«* and *»only«* speculative. It may well be that precisely in those aspects of socialism which are today ridiculed as utopian, lies the decisive difference, the contrast between an authentic socialist society and the established societies, even the most advanced industrial societies. I think what we are witnessing today is a revolt against tabooed aspects and ideas of socialism, an attempt to recapture repressed aspects and images of socialism which are coming to the fore again and which are being kept alive and activated by the student movements.

I would like to take as a motto of my talk one of the inscriptions on the walls of the Sorbonne in Paris, which seems to mark the very essence of what is going on today. The inscription said: *»Soyons réalistes, demandons l'impossible!«* Let us be realistic, let us ask for the impossible. I believe that this inscription marks a turning point in the development of the established societies, and perhaps not only in the capitalist societies, and I believe that in view of this fact no re-examination of Marxian concepts today is possible without reference to the student movements.

In the first place I do not think that the students by themselves constitute a revolutionary force. I have never maintained that the students today are replacing the working class as the revolutionary force, that of course is nonsense. What the student movement represents today is not even an avant-garde behind which revolutionary masses are marching, but a leading minority, a militant minority which articulates what is still unarticulated and repressed among the vast majority of the population. And in this sense of an intellectual, and not only intellectual avant-garde, the student movement today is more than an isolated movement; it is rather a social force which is perhaps (and I hope will be) capable of articulating and developing the needs and aspirations of the exploited masses in the capitalist countries.

The student movement in these countries illuminates the gap that separates traditional ideologies, even socialist ideologies (reformist as well as radical leftist ideologies) from the reality in which we live today. The student movement has revealed the inadequacy of the traditional concepts of the transition from capitalism to socialism and the inadequacy of the traditional concept of socialism in view of the real possibilities of socialism today.

The student movement has redefined socialism, and we had better come to terms with this redefinition because it corresponds to the possibilities of constructing the socialist society at the attained level of the material, technical and cultural development. This redefinition of socialism takes into account forces and factors of the development which have not received adequate attention in Marxian theory and strategy. These factors and forces are not extraneous events, they are not surface and superficial developments but are rather tendencies inherent in and resulting from the very structure of advanced capitalism. They must be incorporated into Marxian theory if it is to continue its task of guiding radical and revolutionary action.

I would like to stress from the beginning, that this redefinition of socialism, this re-examination of Marxism is not adequately described as *»socialist humanism«*.

There is in the student movement a sharp criticism of the concept of humanism, even socialist humanism, as a bourgeois ideology, a critique which is easily misunderstood. Humanism, according to this criticism, is the term for an ideal which still smacks of repression, though of refined and sophisticated repression, of internalization, sublimation of freedom and equality. The militant young of today sense in the idea of humanism a degree of sublimation which they no longer want to tolerate, because it is no longer necessary for human progress. It is no longer necessary either for the emergence of a free society nor for the emergence of free individuals. To these young militants the term humanism is inseparable from the affirmative higher culture of bourgeois society. It is inseparable from the repressive idea of the person or personality who can *»fulfill himself«* without making excessive demands on the world, by practicing the socially required degree of resignation. To them humanism remains an

idealistic concept which minimizes the power and the weight of the brute matter, the power and the weight of the body, of the mutilated biology, of man, of his mutilated life instincts.

It goes without saying that this criticism does not apply to that socialist humanism which has become a political weapon in the struggle against oppressive modes of socialist construction. There, socialist humanism may well emerge as a material force of liberation.

To the militants of the New Left the content of socialism is preserved, — *aufgehoben*, in a more radical, a more »utopian« and at the same time more realistic concept of a free society, a vision of socialism which may perhaps be best characterized by a new relationship between the realm of freedom and the realm of necessity, which differs from the classical conception of this relationship in Marx's *Capital*.

I recall to you briefly the classical Marxian conception. Human freedom in a true sense is possible only beyond the realm of necessity. The realm of necessity itself forever remains a realm of unfreedom, and the optimum that can be achieved there is a significant reduction of the working day, and a high degree of rationality and rationalization. Now this conception epitomizes the division of the human existence into labor time and free time, the division between reason, rationality on the one hand, and pleasure, joy, fulfillment on the other hand, the division between alienated and non-alienated labor.

According to this classical Marxian concept, the realm of necessity would remain a realm of alienation, no matter how much the working day is being reduced. Moreover this conception seems to imply that free human activity is essentially different, and must remain essentially different from socially necessary work. Nor does the earlier Marxian notion of the all-round individual who can do one thing today and another tomorrow seem applicable to a highly developed industrial society. For there would be hundreds and thousands of people who would want to go fishing at the same time, or go hunting at the same time, who would want to write poems or who would want to criticize at the same time. These conditions do not exactly convey the image of freedom.

I am aware of the fact that there is still another Marxian concept of the relation between freedom and necessity in the famous and often quoted passage from the *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Oekonomie*. This concept envisages conditions of full automation, where the immediate producer is indeed »dissociated« from the material process of production and becomes a free »Subject« in the sense that he can play with, experiment with the technical material, with the possibilities of the machine and of the things produced and transformed by the machines. But as far as I know this most advanced vision of a free society was apparently dropped by Marx himself and no longer appears in the *Capital* and in the later writings.

The classical conception in *Capital* is part of the basic Marxian notion according to which the unfettered development of the productive forces is a precondition and token of socialism. This assump-

tion subordinates freedom to productivity, to constantly rising productivity: freedom, the attainable degree, extent and level of freedom would depend on the attained degree of productivity, the attained level of the development of the productive forces. But what kind, what mode, what direction of the development of the productive forces? This is no problem, at least does not seem to be a problem as long as scarcity and poverty prevail: their abolition is the primary goal. But then, the achievements of technical progress open another aspect.

In the so-called affluent societies, the technically developed capitalist societies, we see a twofold development. On the one hand, capitalist progress constantly augments the quantity of necessary commodities available on the market for the available purchasing power. This means in these countries an increasing rate of production of so-called luxuries, including the so-called defense industry, and an increasing production of waste and gadgets while retaining large sectors of poverty and of misery even within the borders of the society.

It means furthermore the extension of the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. Ever more gadgets, ever more so-called luxuries, ever more leisure commodities and services have to be bought in order to attain that level of existence where you have the privilege, by virtue of your purchasing power, of at least a modicum of freedom within the framework of capitalist society. In this sense, we can say that, in advanced capitalism, development of the productive forces is equal to the development of voluntary servitude, voluntary of course in an ironical sense. The new automobile you have to acquire every second year, the new television set you have to buy in order to be able to keep up with your neighbours and peers, all these instruments and commodities increase and intensify your dependence on the ever vaster apparatus of production and distribution, controlled by the ruling powers.

But there is yet another aspect of this development. The growing productivity of labour tends to transform the work process into a technical process in which the human agent of production plays increasingly the role of a supervisor, inventor and experimenter. This trend is inherent in, and is the very expression of the rising productivity of labour. It is the extension of the realm of freedom, or rather the realm of possible freedom to the realm of necessity. The work process itself, the socially necessary work, becomes, in its rationality, subject to the free play of the mind, of imagination, the free play with the pleasurable possibilities of things and nature.

Now these two trends, the one extending the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom, the other the possible extension of the realm of freedom, to the realm of necessity, express the basic contradictions of capitalism at the stage of competitive technical progress: the conflict between the increasing standard of living by extending the commodity form of men and things, the American model of progress on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the increasing potential of freedom within the realm of necessity, namely, the possible transformation of the

realm of necessity by men and women determining their own necessities, determining their own values, determining their own aspirations. In other words, not only reduction of the working day, but transformation of work itself, and not only by the basic production relations and institutions of socialism (which remain the prerequisite for any free society), but also by the emergence and education of a new type of man free from the aggressive and repressive needs and aspirations and attitudes of class society, human beings creating, in solidarity and on their own initiative, their own environment, their own *Lebenswelt*, their own »property«.

Near the end of the first volume of Marx's *Capital*, socialism is defined as the restoration of individual property on the basis of the socialized means of production and the soil. I think we should understand this strange and today rather neglected re-introduction of the concept of individual property into the very definition of socialism as a vision of one of the most essential features of socialism – the vision of a new mode of life.

The Subject of a socialist society must be the Subject of a new sensibility. There is such a thing as an instinctual root of freedom in the individual itself, and if this instinctual root cannot grow, the new society will not be free, no matter what institutions it will provide. This instinctual root of freedom in the individual, for example, would generate a biological need for silence, solitude, peace; a need for the beautiful and the pleasant – not as passing moments of relaxation, but as qualities of life, to be incorporated into the mental and physical space of the society. This, and only this would be the »definite negation«, the rupture with the entire universe of domination and exploitation and with the repressive development of the productive forces. The socialist society as a *qualitatively* different society would be the achievement of men and women who have liberated themselves from the material and intellectual culture of class society, and who are free to develop a language, art, and science responding to and projecting a free society.

Let us not forget that domination and exploitation perpetuate themselves not only in the institutions of class society, but also in the instincts and drives and aspirations shaped by class society, also in that which the people, that is to say the managed and administered people, love, hate, strive for, find beautiful, pleasurable and so on. Class society is not only in the material production, it is not only in the cultural production and reproduction, it is also in the mind and body of the subjects and objects of the system.

We all know this truism, but only the student of rebellion has articulated it in theory and practice, has »incorporated« the idea that the revolution, from the beginning, must build a qualitatively and not only quantitatively different society. The student movement has articulated what, in an abstract way, has been known to all of us, namely, that socialism is first of all a new form of human existence. I said from the beginning, but can we really dare to say »from the beginning?« To be sure, the abolition of scarcity, the elimination of inequalities, the raising of the standard of living remain and must

remain the primary goals of every and any socialist society, but I think that the effort to attain these goals would not be encumbered by the weight, the dead weight of the American model of industrialization and modernization, the American model of raising the standard of living. Industrialization and modernization can be kept *à la mesure de l'homme*, that is to say can avoid the massive, noisy, ugly, joyless, competitive features of capitalist production and consumption, and can construct an environment in which the human sensibility, the human body, the life instincts of man can finally find that universe which the attained and the attainable level of technical progress makes possible today.

In conclusion, I would like to offer two remarks which refer to the discussion that has already taken place here and, which I hope, will continue. I have spoken of self-determination as the qualitative difference of a socialist society; I would like to emphasize: self-determination is not adequately described as »*Selbstverwaltung*«, »*autogestion*«. These terms designate a different form of administration; they do not articulate the content and goals of administration. A mere change in the form of administration is not yet the qualitative difference. Even if the change in administration replaces one class by another, or rather by certain groups of another class, it is not yet a qualitative change, as long as the new class perpetuates the aspirations, and values of the established society, as long as capitalist progress remains the more or less hidden model of progress. Decisive, at the first stage, is not so much the form of administration as what is going to be produced, for what kind of life it is going to be produced, and what priorities are set and translated into reality. Only if production itself is guided by men and women with new goals and new values, only then can we speak of the emergence of a qualitatively different society.

Secondly, the question must be asked whether the destructive competitive co-existence between socialism and capitalism which marks the content of our period is not an insurmountable obstacle to the emergence of socialism as a qualitatively different society. Does not this competitive co-existence impose upon the socialist societies ways and modes of production, ways and modes of administration which militate against the transition to a free society, moved by new goals and new aspirations?

This competitive co-existence is the basic factor of our period. It cannot be minimized, it cannot be neglected, it cannot be left out of any consideration of socialist strategy and socialist theory. But then we have to ask whether this destructive competition, aggravated by the terrible head start of the developed capitalist societies, cannot somehow be broken. And I would suggest that the possibility lies in the different vision of socialism and in a praxis which strives to translate this vision into reality. And I believe indeed that the events we have witnessed during the last months have shown that this hope is not entirely utopian.

## DISKUSSION MIT HERBERT MARCUSE

*Ernst Bloch*

Tübingen

Ich glaube, liebe Freunde, wir alle waren sehr beeindruckt, zum Teil bewegt, und zum größeren Teil, wie ich annehme, belehrt, durch die ebenso feurigen wie präzisen Ausführungen Herbert Marcuses. Er ist wirklich rechtzeitig gekommen. Diese Zeit der Studentenunruhen brachte Formulierungen und brachte etwas, woran man sich halten kann. Und, daß dieser Halt, wenn er ein stabiler, kein statischer ist, wie es alle die sein müssen, die die Establishments uns anbieten, oder angeboten haben, und hoffentlich nicht mehr zu lange anbieten werden. Studentenunruhen, sind eine Revolte gegen Autorität, ohne vordringliche ökonomische Ursachen allein. Hier brach also das durch, was man aufrechten Gang nennen kann, und Willen zum aufrechten Gang. Ein Anliegen das im klassischen Naturrecht eine sehr große Rolle spielte und poetisch bei Alfieri und Schiller Ausdruck fand. Das Anliegen des Naturrechts ist nicht untergegangen, sondern sucht neue Formulierungen. Etwas von diesem Willen zum aufrechten Gang ist in der Studentenbewegung der ganzen Welt höchst lebendig, ein Wille, der im Marxismus nicht genügend kultiviert und vor allem nicht reflektiert wurde. Es gibt Mühselige und Beladene, das sind die Ausgebeuteten. Es gibt Erniedrigte und Beleidigte, das sind die Unterdrückten und sich selbst Entfremdeten, wobei die Ausgebeutete auch erniedrigt und beleidigt sind. Ein neues Motiv, das dringend seinen Namen und seinen Begriff verlangt, und das im Marxismus, vor allem in Stalinismus, kaum mehr gehört wurde. Wodurch eben der Stalinismus in theoretischer wie moralischer Beziehung wenig Widerstand fand. Auf diese Weise hat sich eine neue Knechtschaft unter einem neuen Namen etabliert. Und Marcuse gebührt unser Dank, daß er als einer der klarsten Streiter für antiautoritären Sozialismus eingetreten ist. Was eine kritische Frage an ihn nicht ausschließt.

Marcuse ließ harte Worte gegen die Kategorie Humanismus fallen. Die historische Wirksamkeit des Humanismus ist dabei nicht ganz, wie mir scheint, zu ihrem Recht gekommen. Denn Humanismus gilt in

jeder stalinistischen Verapparatchung als eine Strafsache. Es genügt zum Schluß der Stalinzeit das Wort »menschlicher Sozialismus« auch nur einmal ausgesprochen zu haben, um schon mit einem Fuß im Zuchthaus zu stehen. Kann also eine Kategorie so ganz unwert sein, die von der Unterdrückung oder von der Verschlechterung oder nicht Erfüllung des Sozialismus als so gefährlich betrachtet wird? Fällt sie wirklich nur zusammen mit der »O Mensch-Phrase« aus der Werfel Zeit? Gewiß, in der »O Mensch-Phrase« steckt noch, was Marx mit so großem Recht, in den »Elf Thesen«, am Feuerbach kritisierte: daß hier das Gattungswesen Mensch verabsolutiert ist, ein »Schwüler Libestau«, wie Marx sagt, sich ergießt, mit ewigen Mensch – Mensch – Mensch-sein bis zur verdächtigen Entspannung zur k. und k. Toleranz, »Menschen san mer alle!« Womit alle Gegensätze, und vor allem alle Fronten verwischt worden sind; Marx setzte darum mit so viel Recht statt des leer sentimentalisierten Gattungswesen Mensch den konkreten Begriff des Ensembles gesellschaftlicher Verhältnisse. Das was nötig gewesen, mag auch heute noch streckenweise nötig sein. Ein anderes aber ist die ebenso generelle Abwertung einer so bedeutenden Kategorie wie Humanismus, mit so großer revolutionärer Vergangenheit und mit gebliebenen Sprengkraft gegen alle Verapparatchung, mit besonderer Sprengkraft im Kampf gegen Selbstentfremdung. Was ist denn das Selbst von dem man sich entfremden? Das ist der unbekannte Mensch, der homo ignotus in uns, der immer wieder die Flügel regt, der revolutionär gegen Unterdrückung aufsteht, von Spartakus an. Er ist nicht nur homo oeconomicus, sondern ein Mensch mit aufrechtem Gang, an dem und zu dem hin die soziale Orthopädie, sich vollzieht und die am wenigsten abgeolten ist. An dieser Stelle stehen Individuum und Individualität. Selbstverständlich das überall befreite Individuum mit einer dadurch erst vollendbaren sozialen Solidarität, die einzig gültige konkrete Erscheinung dessen, was unter dem abstrakten Genus Mensch gedacht worden ist. Alle »Springquellen des gesellschaftlichen Reichtums sollen fließen« (Marx), damit das Individuum befreit wird. Es gibt das Geheimnis dessen, das in dem Wort Menschensohn steckt, also nicht der Sohn des großen Herrn, nicht Gottessohn, menschlicher Sozialismus, dies Wort allein aber sagt schon so viel, daß alle Zuchthäuser und Katorgas des stalinschen Russland damit denunziert waren, und die Katorgadirektoren haben das wohl gespürt. Deshalb die Strafsache, »menschlicher Sozialismus«.

Marcuse erwähnt die Kategorie Möglichkeit. Das ist das Unentdeckte im Menschen, nicht nur unsere äußere Wirklichkeit, auch unsere inwendige und menschlich-gesellschaftliche; alle Vorhandenheit ist von einem viel größeren Meer objektiv-realer Möglichkeit umgeben. Und Realismus ist das, was sich gerade ins objektiv-real Mögliche begibt, das Gute darin befördert, das Schlechte darin verriegelt. Mögliches ist das partiell Bedingte. Es ist nicht voll bedingt, sonst wäre es wirklich, und wenn es ganz voll bedingt ist sogar notwendig. Wenn es partiell bedingt ist, dann ist es möglich, und damit es wirklich wird, fehlt noch ein Bedingungsfaktor, und dieser ist der subjektive Faktor der Tat, des Übergangs von der Theorie zur

Praxis. Alle diese marxistischen Kategorien haben ersichtlich als Hintergrund die lange noch nicht genügend erforschte Kategorie Möglichkeit, als objektiv-reale Möglichkeit, die gleiche worin eben auch Mensch und Menschlichkeit, Homo und Humanismus stehen und gelten. Das ist das unentdeckte, ja ungewordene Land in das wir fahren, und das Mittel dazu ist die sozialistische Gesellschaft.

Solches mit Eindringlichkeit am Schluß betont zu haben ist auch ein bedeutender Zug in Marcuses Rede, um endlich, fern allem Sektierertum, etwas zu schaffen, was mit der bisherigen Welt nichts gemein hat, nur in ihren besten und edelsten Träumen antizipiert worden war. Dies aus dem Zustand des Wischiwaschi, des bloßen Spintisierens herauszuführen, es zu verbinden mit der objektiv-realen Möglichkeit, mit der Tendenz und Latenz im Gesellschaftsprozess, ja, sogar im Weltprozeß: das ist die Aufgabe die ohne Kompromiß mit der veralteten Welt, veraltetem Wohlstand, entnsetzlicher Entmenschlichung durchzuführen ist. Ohne deren Ablenkung von dem Einen, was uns wirklich not tut, das ist das, wozu der Sozialismus doch angetreten ist. Es wäre noch sehr vieles dazu zu sagen, das mit dem Humanismus lag mir überwältigend am Herzen. Es steckt ja implizite im Pathos des Individuums, es steckt mehr als implizite in unserem Selbst. Mit diesem Blickpunkt, Schritt für Schritt, doch stets immanentem Fernziel, muß gearbeitet werden, damit die Zeit der Mißerfolge, der Entsagung, der Deteriorierung der Mittel, und die Zeit der Haltlosigkeit überwunden wird. Wir wollen also das haben, woran wir uns halten können, auf dem Weg der konkreten Utopie, wir wollen mit dem Sextanten arbeiten, damit wir den richtigen Kurs einschlagen und wir wollen in Umrissen wenigstens genau ahnen, damit wir nicht durch falsche Erfüllung betrogen werden können, Korrigieren und berichtigen, das Geradeaus aus enttäuschten Hoffnung zu finden, lernend aus der Enttäuschung sich berichtigen, aus der Enttäuschung sogar wider die Hoffnung hoffen zu können, das ist unser Amt und das Amt, das in die Hände der intelligenten Jugend gegeben ist.

Gefreut hat mich auch zu hören, daß das Verständnis oder Mißverständnis in das Marcuse eine Zeitlang geraten war, wonach er eine sektiererische Trennung zwischen Intelligenz und Proletariat vorgenommen habe, sich behoben zu haben scheint. Oder nicht nur scheint, sondern durch Berichtigung ins Lot gekommen ist. Wunderbar doch, daß die Intelligenz nicht mehr freischwebende Intelligenz heißt, wie bei Karl Mannheim. Sie ist zwar nicht frei, aber sie schwebt auch nicht, sondern sie spürt genau was sie nicht will. Sie schwebt also nicht, sondern sie kann und muß sich niederlassen, und muß in Allianz geraten, in selbstverständlich brüderliche Allianz, mit dem was überall um sie her die Ausgebeuteten, die Mühseligen und Beladenen, die Erniedrigten und Beleidigten bewegt, mit denen sie eine gemeinsame Not leiden und ein gemeinsames Ziel der Freiheit vor Augen haben.

So möchte ich Marcuse danken.

## REVOLUTIONARY SUBJECT AND SELF-GOVERNMENT

Herbert Marcuse

San Diego

I would like to offer some tentative answers to two questions raised with reference to my paper which I did not have time to answer.

I would like to point out that these questions were raised by students, and I would be very happy if students would speak in the discussion. In the United States (and that is one of the advantages there), after such a lecture, the students talk, and not my colleagues. I love my colleagues very much, but I would also very much like to hear what the students have to say, and what the students have to ask.

The first question referred to the »revolutionary subject.« How can we today, when the situation is obviously different from the time when Marx and Engels wrote, how can we today identify the revolutionary subject?

I would like to offer a very tentative definition of revolutionary subject by saying: It is that class or group which, by virtue of its function and position in society, is in vital need and is capable of risking what they have and what they can get within the established system in order to replace this system – a radical change which would indeed involve destruction, abolition of the existing system. I repeat, such a class or group must have the vital need for revolution, and it must be capable of at least initiating, if not carrying through such a revolution.

If we use this notion of the revolutionary subject, we will have to say that revolution without the industrial working class is still unimaginable. I cannot think of any technically advanced country where a revolution could be carried through without the industrial working classes. On the other hand, precisely in the most advanced countries of the capitalist world, the majority of the working classes do not have the vital need for revolution, they are not willing and, quite understandably, so they are not willing to risk what they have for an entirely different social system.

Can we reconcile these two obviously conflicting realities? We have here one of the cases where apparently highly abstract and philosophical concepts of dialectical logic manifest their very concrete con-

tent. The Marxian tradition distinguishes between the revolutionary subject *an sich*, by itself, or in itself, and the revolutionary subject *für sich*, for itself. If we apply this distinction to the situation of the working classes in the advanced industrial countries, we can say that the working classes in these countries are *an sich* the revolutionary subject as long as they are the only class which still constitutes the human base of the process of material production, and the only class which, by virtue of its function in the productive process, is capable of arresting this process, and of redirecting it.

I said that the working classes in the advanced industrial countries are *an sich*, by themselves, still the revolutionary subject *as long as* they retain the central and basic position in the process of production. I introduced this time factor (»as long as«) in view of the decisive transformations of capitalism at this stage of development: the decline of blue collar in proportion to white collar workers. As an increasing number of unqualified or less qualified workers cease to be necessary elements in the productive process, the more production tends towards automation, and the weaker the role of the old industrial working classes in this process. But we are still even in the United States far from the point where this tendency would change the basic situation.

But while the industrial working classes are *an sich* still the revolutionary subject, they are not revolutionary subject *für sich*: they do not have the political and class consciousness which remains a decisive force in the revolutionary process. And they do not have this political and class consciousness because they are to a large extent integrated into the capitalist system, integrated not only by virtue of the dynamism of the working process itself, but also because they share, to a great extent, the needs and goals of the capitalist system.

I think it would be inexcusable for anyone who still takes Marxian theory not as a dogma but as a critical theory to overlook and minimize the fact that today, to a large extent the working classes in the advanced industrial countries are not only a class in the capitalist system, but also of the capitalist system. They repress or they are forced to repress their own situation, their own real needs, their own real interests; and, in this sense, they think and feel and act in terms of the system of domination and repression.

Now what are the possibilities of accentuating the objective, revolutionary potential of the industrial working classes? A revolutionary working class could counteract this integration; a revolutionary party could develop the consciousness, the awareness of the fact that the working classes in the advanced capitalist countries, in spite of their standard of living, indeed live under intolerable conditions. This discussion during this Conference has emphasized several times that there are intolerable conditions other than those of impoverishment, misery, *Verelendung*.

The so-called affluent society, the so-called society of consumption is intolerable in its aggressiveness, in its waste, in its brutality, in its hypocrisy. It is intolerable in the way in which it perpetuates obsolete forms of the struggle for existence, in the way in which it perpetuates poverty and exploitation, inhuman working conditions of all kinds

of speed up and oppressive supervision, in the face of the possibilities of authentic automation. It is intolerable in the way in which it extends the commodity form of things and men to the entire society in all its dimensions.

These intolerable conditions exist, but they have not yet generated the political consciousness and the vital need for radical change. A revolutionary party which would have the function of developing this political consciousness and political praxis does not exist. On the contrary, the major communist parties have amply demonstrated their conservative (Social-Democratic) tendencies.

Under these circumstances, the task of developing radical political consciousness and practice falls upon non-integrated groups, groups whose consciousness and needs are not yet integrated into the system of domination, and who, by virtue of this fact, are capable and willing to develop a radical consciousness. They are aware of the vital need for change, not only in the institutions, not only in the production relations, but also in the revolutionary subject itself as a type of man, in his values, and aspirations.

I believe that the student intelligentsia today is such a group, not by itself a revolutionary force, but as I said before, a *détonateur*, a catalyst, a militant minority. And it is no larger a »*freischwebende Intelligenz*« or some other marginal group in the bourgeois world.

This student intelligentsia is *potentially* a revolutionary group because from this group, capitalism will recruit its future cadres in the productive process, its technicians, scientists, engineers, mathematicians, even sociologists and psychologists, and perhaps even philosophers! This group will thus assume an increasingly basic function in the productive process itself.

I would like to refer to the paper that was submitted to this conference by Ernst Fischer, and which unfortunately could not be delivered. In this paper, Ernst Fischer points out that, in the revolt of the student intelligentsia, one of the greatest productive forces, and one of the most tabooed and repressed social forces is in open rebellion against the society: the moral, the instinctual, I would even say the biological and physiological revulsion against the conditions and values of the capitalist system.

Now the question of *autogestion*. The example at the end of my presentation already indicated where my criticism would start. I believe that self-government is a stage, is a step in the very revolutionary process only if and when the new form of control is exercised by men and women who are willing and capable of re-directing the capitalist process of production towards an essentially different way of life.

It was said here before that self-government is a way of life. I agreed and asked what kind of way of life? The way of life in which people no longer satisfy the repressive, aggressive needs and aspirations of class society, and in which they no longer produce the same stuff for the same goals. In other words, self-government in the enterprises, in the factories, in the shops, can be a liberating mode of control only if a liberating change in the controlling groups themself-

ves has occurred. Otherwise the change would not break the continuum of commodity form and commodity production to another level of administration and of relationships.

In one word, self-government, to be more than a mere change in the form of administration, must develop within a political working class which has already overcome the fetters of class society. We cannot hope for the miracle that such a change would come in the process of self-government after its establishment. Once the process of self-government has started without a change in the subjective conditions, we may get the same only bigger and better. That may be already great progress, one should not minimize it, but it is certainly not the beginning of a socialist society as a qualitatively different form of life.