

RADIO FREE EUROPE

Research

FREE WORLD

WCM
(America)

7 April 1966

FOR THE INTERIOR -- THE PCI

Professor Robert Havemann, the embattled East German scientist and Marxist theorist who seemed to have taken on single-headed the entire SED apparatus, is by no means alone. In fact he has, in support, what could be called the best team of defense lawyers within the international Communist movement -- the Italian CP (PCI).

As Immanuel Himmelfarb indicated in his 23 March speech,¹ the attitudes of some Western Communist parties (and here the PCI must head the list) are a source of deep concern to the ruling parties of the Soviet bloc. It is one thing for anti-democratic practices to be attacked or liberals defended by the Western non-Communist press; the apparatchiki can explain this away in terms of the class struggle. But when Western Communist parties assume a role relegated in the past to non-Communists, it is a far more serious matter. The PCI especially has for some years maintained a lively and highly critical interest in Soviet bloc cultural and political affairs. Throughout the bloc, it has taken the side of the liberals against the dogmatists. The PCI's actions have been both appreciated and attacked, but they are never ignored. The Czechoslovak writer, Jiri Najek, recently emphasized the extent and importance of the PCI's influence:

Liberalization is merely an attempt to equalize the rights of the opposition and the permission of the most varied opinions, the turning of the non-intervention principle into the basic aspect of the Party's cultural policy. Democratization of the Party management of our culture is almost identical with the Italian Communist Party's principle of the "autonomy of culture". The

1) See the FFA Background Analysis, "The Anti-Soviet Western Comrades," 29 March 1966.

Party wants to "intervene" in culture for the benefit of the best possible development of trends and forces which are socially active for the realization of socialism's humanitarian aims.²

The SED could not have done better (or worse) if it had planned to present the PCI with a graphically-illustrated example of much of what the Italians have been polemicizing against. A rebel with a cause, Havemann has been the subject of an intense campaign by dogmatists in East Germany who have largely chosen to overlook anything which might correspond to democratic procedures. He has been hounded out of the East German Party, deprived of his post at Humboldt University and, most recently, thrown out of the East German Academy of Sciences.³

Man and the State: The PCI's, the SED

Throughout the Havemann affair the SED leadership has in effect contradicted the PCI's ideological explanation of the relationship between man, the State and Marxism. Late last year, during the Italian Party's pre-congressional debate, the PCI ideologist Lucio Lombardo-Radice elaborated at length upon the Italian view of this relationship. "Our ideals," wrote Lombardo-Radice, "imply that the socialist State should not have any 'State doctrine' — it must be a socialist State, and not a Marxist State, a working-class State and a people's State, not an atheist State." Lombardo-Radice also argued against making Marxism a "sterile subject-matter" in schools and universities and emphasized that the State must be essentially laic in character and not accord a special role to any ideology. PCI Secretary-General Luigi Longo elevated a good portion of Lombardo-Radice's argument to official policy at the Party's XI Congress. In his opening address he declared:

Just as we are against a theocratic State, we are against the State's attributing any privilege whatever to an ideology, philosophy, religious faith or cultural and artistic school of thought, to the detriment of others.⁴

2) Emphasis added. Rede Prax, 1 April 1966.

3) See D. Miller's CIA Background Analysis, "Another Chapter in the Case of the Rebellious Professor," 2 April 1966.

4) See the FBI Background Analysis, "Marxism and Freedom at the XI PCI Congress," 25 January 1966.

5) See the FBI Background Analysis, "XI PCI Congress: The International Aspects," 31 January 1966.

The SED, meanwhile, was doing precisely the opposite. It was only a question of time before the POU turned its attention to the Havemann affair. And what better time than during the pre-Congressional debate, when the Party could turn the Havemann affair against its own dogmatists?

On 3 January, *L'Unita* printed what was ostensibly a review by Lombardo-Radice of an Italian edition of Havemann's "dialettica senza dogmi" -- a collection comprising his lecture at the Leipzig conference, and eleven lectures and four seminars at East Berlin's Humboldt University. But Lombardo-Radice offers much more. He presents the reader with a defense of "a great Communist" and an attack on dogmatism in East Germany.

Answering the main charge against Havemann in East Germany, Lombardo-Radice declares:

Havemann's polemic is actually not against communism, but for communism, not against Marxism, but for Marxism. He is violently against those philosophers who call themselves (most sincerely) Communists or Marxists, and who, therefore, because of their dogmatism, represent a heavy burden on the revolutionary, creative development of science and culture in the socialist society.

(Lombardo-Radice's emphasis)

Culture and ideology, as Lombardo-Radice is aware, are never far from politics in the Soviet bloc. The dogmatists, he writes, are those who have tried to make an immutable institution of Marxism:

In our opinion it is no accident that these dogmatic Marxists... whom the "galilean" Marxist Havemann so zealously criticizes are to be found among the heads of the "dialectical materialism" departments existing in the universities of East Germany and the Soviet Union. The division which Havemann rightly criticizes between dialectical materialism and determinism, original, scientific research is still an institutional fact in the universities of socialist countries: this division has crystallized into the transformation of Marxism (dialectical materialism) into a school subject; it has produced, and is producing, a kind of professional dogmatic information.

(Emphasis added)

Lombardo-Padice considers Havemann as a sort of martyr to the cause of de-stalinization. In other words, Havemann has been de-stalinizing at a much faster rate than the SED:

The permanence of such an institution contrasts with the movement of renewal and progress in the socialist countries to which the 20th Congress gave a start: it is, in our opinion, a form of cultural organization in contrast to this movement which therefore will have to be revised sooner or later. This (the resolution of -- and contrast does not come without struggles, as for example such painful cases as Havemann's: Lenin has shown us that the political struggle is not as wide and flat as the Nevsky-Prospect, and this is still true even once capitalism has been thrown down and socialism has been built or is being built.

Debate in L'Unita

It is probable (and with good reason) that the Lombardo-Padice article was regarded in East Germany as a direct attack against the SED's official cultural policy; Lombardo-Padice was, after all, doing nothing less than to throw into doubt the orthodoxy of SED ideology. On 5 April, four days after Leine Deutsches confirmed the news of Havemann's expulsion from the East German Academy, L'Unita printed a letter addressed to it by seven members of the Academy.⁶ The letter, which is followed by the PCI's response, is an attack on Lombardo-Padice's article. More generally, however, it is an attack on the PCI's ideological diplomacy, on its careful, subtle, but insistent selection of what is right and what is wrong with ideology in the Soviet bloc. Considered as a debate, the East German letter and the PCI's response provide a remarkable and highly useful example of the PCI's international strategy. The two arguments, particularly the East German letter, are not always perfectly clear, but in the PCI's response the main question is never obscured: does or does not Professor Havemann have the right to say and write what he thinks?

The professors: "In the summer of 1956 he (Havemann) made himself known with a criticism of dogmatism. This criticism contained, besides proper viewpoints, an erroneous theory whereby Marxist philosophy is not an autonomous science with its own object and its own specific problematics. It was precisely

6) The letter is signed by Dr. George Klaus, Dr. Guntter Heyden, Dr. Manfred Lühr, Dr. Hermann Ley, Dr. Alfred Seeling, Dr. Dieter Seydner and Dr. Herbert Thara.

in this that Havemann saw the origin of dogmatism, since anti-dogmatism reduced itself for him primarily to a limitation of Marxist-Leninist philosophy."

The PCI: "The affirmation of the seven German Marxist philosophers according to whom Marxist philosophy...is an individual science with its own objects and its own specific tasks...is without doubt a respectable affirmation, but certainly not indisputable, and even modifiable in the course of research into these problems."

The professors: "Ample discussions demonstrated that Havemann's argumentation was based on the acceptance of positivistic reasoning and gave to the struggle against dogmatism a false and harmful tendency toward revisionism."

The PCI: "What appears to us to be such mistaken in the letter to which we refer is the dogmatic way in which it affirms the absolute validity of one interpretation of Marxism and the absolute negativity of another. Dogmatism would mean, in fact, the affirmation of an orthodoxy which needs to be defended by all means against heresies. In the case under examination, Havemann is accused of the 'positivist revision' of Marxism because he sustains the need to revivify the philosophy through a determined scientific research conducted within each individual field with dialectic and spirit. Thus he, as is noted (but the seven German Marxist philosophers would have done well to recall it to the memory of the Italian public) the position held by Engels is 'Anti-Dühring' and in the 'Dialectic of Nature.'"

The professors: "As far as regards the content of the university courses that were published in West Germany under the title, 'Dialektik ohne Damm,' on the whole they do not furnish a positive contribution to the further elaboration of Marxist philosophy in connection with the new problems of science and socialist construction in the GDR.... Although the formulation of his theories is often very confused, and certainly sometimes contradictory, his fundamental line appears clearly: Marxist philosophy is broken down, in the spirit of positivism, into single sciences.... Philosophical revisionism in the courses of Havemann is accompanied by an abandonment and deformation of the fundamentally essential conceptions of scientific socialism and in general of the Marxist theory of society."

The PCI: "It seems that the seven philosophers reprove Havemann for the negation or the undervaluation of the 'general law of dialectics.' ...Havemann's position is without doubt susceptible in its turn to discussion, but we cannot, meanwhile, not record what anti-scientific assertions have been concocted, and even imposed, in the name of the 'general law of dialectics.' We cannot be record -- once and for all -- the

condemnation that Trofim Lysenko succeeded in having pronounced against modern genetics in the name of 'Marxism'. Consequently, Haremann's insistent reminder of 'internal logic' as dialectics in a determined scientific research has its value and its importance. Moreover, the 'extravagant and dogmatic points of view' on Marxism are not a Haremann invention."

The professors: "In the name of 'democratic' socialism and communism, Haremann turns against the methods and forms of socialist construction in the German Democratic Republic It led him to allow himself to be transformed into an instrument of propaganda aimed against the German Democratic Republic."

The PCI: "We will only record for a warning for us all that to stamp as inimical to the people and as agents of imperialism all comrades who disagreed with him was a characteristic of Stalin and not the least of his grave errors."

The professors: "We absolutely cannot agree with the opinion of comrade Lombardo-Ladice that Haremann's polemic are not aimed against Marxism and communism. With his practical action against the Unified Socialist Party of Germany, Haremann himself moved away from the ranks of the fighters for Marxism and communism. His exclusion from the Unified Socialist Party of Germany occurred when he put his conceptions that were hostile to socialism and the Party at the disposal of the West German press, since in this way he gave support to the worst enemies of the German people."

The PCI: "In our opinion, no persecutory measures should intervene in the confrontation of opinions. The State and socialist public institutions should not hold privileged any ideology. It is not admissible that in a socialist country a worker be removed from his job because he is religious instead of atheist, or because he is a positivist instead of a Marxist. This is for us Italian Communists a point of principle of exceptional importance: this point was a very important aspect of the report made by comrade Luigi Longo to the 11th Congress."

The philosophers: "Regarding the viewpoints on Marxist philosophy in the German Democratic Republic that were expressed in the article by comrade Lombardo-Ladice, we can only profoundly deplore that comrade Lombardo-Ladice arbitrarily gives belief to the ideas of Haremann instead of developing the basis of the facts his own viewpoint of the development of Marxist philosophy in the German Democratic Republic."

The PCI: "The seven German philosophers who have sent us this letter cannot maintain, before the Italian comrades who

