

Reform Within the Communist Bloc

EUGEN LEMBERG

THE SOVIET INVASION of Czechoslovakia of August 21, 1968 interrupted a development which had been observed in the West with mounting interest and great expectations, namely, a reform movement in communism which had perhaps progressed farther with the Czechs and the Slovaks than anywhere else except Yugoslavia. In Czechoslovakia the situation was made especially significant by the fact that the Communist Party leadership itself had adopted the reforms. This movement, however, was also quite far advanced in other countries, in Poland and Hungary for example and it had its champions even in the Soviet Union. The reform ideas also found friends and prophets among leading West European Communists. Today, as a result of a number of separate actions carried out with different methods all these ideas seem to be extinguished. In Poland Leszek Kolakowski was expelled from the Party because of his revisionism and has since emigrated to the West, Kuron and Modzelewski have been sentenced to long prison terms, and even Adam Schaff, who was able to maintain his position as an orthodox Party philosopher longer than any of the others, has been taken to task. In Czechoslovakia the leading intellectuals of the Writers' Union and of other pro-reform groups have been subjected to a number of measures: they have been removed from their posts, muzzled, or prevented from leaving the country, and are in constant

danger of legal prosecution. Many, including Eduard Goldstuecker and Ota Sik, have emigrated. Communist reformers such as Dubcek, Smrkovsky, Hajek, and others have been removed from leading Party bodies and replaced by "conservatives". Even in Yugoslavia, critics of the Soviet Union (such as Mihajlo Mihajlov) or of communism itself (Milovan Djilas) are subjected to arrest to be released again depending on the momentary state of Soviet-Yugoslav relations. In the West European Communist Parties as well there is a penitent return to the rigid leadership of Moscow, a return marked by spectacular expulsions from the Party, such as that of Ernst Fischer in Austria and Roger Garaudy in France. In the Soviet Union itself Siniavskiy and Daniel, along with several of their friends, have been sentenced to long terms in labor camps, Solzhenitsyn has been excluded from the Writers' Union, and a stop is being put to courageous statements such as those of Sakharov. These developments round out the picture of a worldwide hardening of that communism which is ruled or influenced by Moscow.

The question is whether this hardening means the cessation of a many-sided intellectual awakening in the communist world, of revisionism, of the philosophic, political, and economic reform movements in communism. Have those anti-communists turned out to be right who, in their primitive but consistent anti-communism, deny

any movement or differentiation in Marxism-Leninism, who view communism as a monolithic and fundamentally unchanging bloc with which it is pointless to attempt to carry on a dialogue? This question is vital because much depends on the answer: not only everything connected with "*Ostpolitik*," the structuring of our political, economic, and cultural relations with the communist-governed countries of Eastern Europe, but also the intellectual development of the Western world. I need only mention a few key words to indicate what I mean: the reform movement in the Christian churches, especially in the Catholic Church since the Ecumenical Council; the birth and rebirth of nations in the "Third World"; the new radical Left; and also philosophical trends such as the evolutionism of Teilhard de Chardin. These are all evidence, not of indoctrination by communism, as many suspect, but of the global nature of great intellectual movements and problems which no longer pay heed to iron curtains and partitions separating ideologies and religions.

If I am now to attempt to answer the question of the death or continued existence of the reform movement in communism, then I must do so with a wider perspective than the recent and certainly discouraging impression left by the Prague catastrophe. I must reach out farther, in both space and time, in order to determine what reforming and revising forces are at work within communism, what role they play in the history of communism of various denominations, and also how these forces relate to the background of the present-day revolutionary movement throughout the world. Perhaps it is already apparent that an analysis of the communist reform movement is not only an internal communist affair but a matter of direct concern to us. We are now in the middle of a world revolution which was nudged into being by Marxism but

which is clearly slipping away from the established Marxist powers.

It was clear even before the "Prague spring" that a philosophical movement was behind the attempts at economic reform, de-Stalinization, and spiritual reintegration into Europe. This movement had its champions in all the countries of East Central Europe, with some initial symptoms visible even in the G.D.R. The parallelism of ideas and arguments in the various countries was amazing; such congruity of intellectual patterns was virtually unprecedented in this part of the continent.

The common philosophical denominator of all these tendencies toward reform and revisionism, even in the areas of economic and social policy, can be traced back to Karl Marx. It is actually based fundamentally on a false or insufficiently thought-out anthropology, a weakness characteristic of many of the great ideological systems of world history. Like other founders of great teachings of salvation, Marx attempted to "heal the world on one issue," namely through a change in economic relationships. He thought that evil would disappear from the world with the abolition of private ownership of the means of production. Marx did not expect that man would remain man, unchanged, after the social-economic revolution; that man would settle himself into the new relationships and build an all-encompassing bureaucracy in order to continue to exploit his fellow man, albeit with new methods; that man would continue to live from the work of others; that alienation would not be transcended even under socialism; that man would be offered no solution to the deepest human problems, to the question of the meaning of life, death, suffering, love, and guilt. No wonder then that Lenin, after the breakthrough of the Marxist revolution in a country not prepared for revolution in the Marxist

sense (Russia), was forced to work with the same old human material. In order to carry out the revolution and keep it in power he had to establish a dictatorship *over* the proletariat instead of a dictatorship of the proletariat. He had to build up, or permit the development of, that bureaucratic system for which the revolution is today reproached by the radical Left as well as by Marxist revisionists, not to mention conservatives and liberals among the so-called bourgeoisie. The sympathy enjoyed by Mao Tse-tung among one of these critical groups, the radical Left, is the result primarily of his attempt to destroy precisely this party bureaucracy through the Cultural Revolution. Of course he cannot succeed either, without jumping from the frying pan into the fire; that is, replacing the party apparatus with some kind of military dictatorship.

This error of anthropology, which can be traced directly back to Marx, is the source of lasting unrest and movement within Communist parties. It is the cause of repeated new attempts at revisionism and reform. This alone makes it clear that revisionism and reform Marxism are endemic to this ideological system. They are not phenomena that can be eliminated by the exercise of power on the part of a bureaucratic or military machine.

The Marxists of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe react with two typical postures to this anthropological deficiency in their doctrine. The more orthodox among them are frustrated by the fact that the introduction of socialism has not automatically led to the creation of the new man. They compensate for this frustration through the fervent belief that such men can be created by means of education, persuasion, and perhaps even by gradual breeding. In any case they trust in the effectiveness of isolation from the outside world, censorship, repression, and, at worst,

penitentiaries or insane asylums. The modern, undogmatic Marxists, on the other hand, do not view Marxism as a super-historical, self-contained teaching. They are concerned rather with the further development, modernization, and humanization of the doctrine. These are the reformers and revisionists who concentrate with astonishing unanimity on that empty spot in the original Marxist doctrine, on its missing anthropology.

Shortly after 1960, at the time of the now famous Kafka Conference near Prague (1963), which discussed the continuing effects of alienation in socialist societies, a book appeared by Adam Schaff initiating a lively controversy. In this book (*Filosofia czlowieka*, Warsaw 1962) Schaff raised the question, is a philosophical anthropology based on Marxism necessary as a separate scientific discipline? Schaff maintained the affirmative. He was opposed by Arnost Kolman who dismissed the desire for such a discipline as resulting from the feeling of some Marxists that they ought to be in league with existentialists and left-wing Catholics. One sees that the attempt to fill the anthropological gap in Marxism is motivated in part by the desire to reopen a dialogue with the non-Marxist world of thought.

But the necessity for a Marxist philosophy of Man was not to be refuted. Simultaneously with Adam Schaff, the young Czech philosopher Karel Kosik published his *Dialektika Konkretniho* (Prague 1963, German translation Frankfurt/Main 1967). This work was based in part on statements made as early as 1960. Kosik described a dialectic consisting, on the one hand, of idealistic isolation of meaning and, on the other hand, positivistic removal of meaning from reality. He justified as a product of this dialectic the periodically recurring waves of anthropologism which hope to recall attention to forgotten man.

Just how intensively this topic occupied the intellectuals of East Central Europe was demonstrated shortly thereafter by Adam Schaff's Book, *Marxism and the Individual* (German and Polish editions 1965). Schaff points out the individualist-humanistic starting point of the young Marx. Marx's goal is the liberation of the individual—of the "whole man"—from the "alienation" caused by capitalist conditions of production. During the 1960's numerous studies appeared by philosophers, sociologists, and psychologists in East Central Europe and, not least, in the Soviet Union, concerning the problem of the individual, of personality, of man and his freedom. When one views such studies one gets the impression that the entire system of socialist states is in the grips of a renaissance of the individual. A passionate search is in progress for the humanistic sources in Marx, which are now defended against the one-sided collectivism and economism of Marx's epigones and executors.

In the same period of the early sixties the desire for a Marxist teaching of ethics was audible on the fringes of Marxism, from Georg Lukács, Ernst Bloch and Jean Paul Sartre. Thus it was hoped that the fateful gap could be closed in Marx's poorly developed anthropology. This attempt attests also to the realization from the lesson of Stalinism of the abysses into which man may fall, even under socialism. The point of departure for all these discussions is clearly the Twentieth Party Congress of the CPSU in 1956 with Khrushchev's famous revelations about Stalin.

But there is more than revulsion against Stalinism behind this interest in an anthropology on Marxist foundations. This is an international trend toward the further development of Marxist thought that began under and even before Stalin. The participants include the Czech avantgarde of the

1920's (Karel Teige and Vitezslav Nezval), the surrealists around André Breton, some structuralists from Roman Jakobson to Claude Lévi-Strauss, and also the "Frankfurt School" with Erich Fromm and, to a certain extent, Herbert Marcuse. The writings of the younger Czech philosopher Robert Kalivoda—known for his studies of the Hussite movement—are characteristic for this trend. Kalivoda attempts to overcome the official vulgar materialism by rounding out Karl Marx with a certain admixture of Sigmund Freud. He rejects the orthodox Marxist picture of man, which has been reduced to Pavlovian reflex theory and mechanistic socio-economics. In contrast he emphasizes, with Freud, the variability of the human drives constituting the ego and providing the distinctively human element in man. This is the precondition of "sublimation" in the Freudian sense, the foundation of all intellectual life and culture. The reform-Marxist anthropology described above is concerned with precisely this autonomy of the psychic element. It is concerned with what Karel Kosík calls the Subject, which (as set down by Freud and elucidated by Sartre) is trapped between the Id and the Super-ego. It is the common philosophical concern of all these reformers to reconcile the dignity and freedom of the Subject with Marxism, indeed to derive that freedom from a properly understood Marxism.

The controversy about the need for or the luxury of a Marxist anthropology might still appear as a purely theoretical problem of Marxist philosophers, if it were not for the fact that it is recognizable as the background, even the intellectual basis, of the economic and political reforms in Eastern Europe in the 1950's and 1960's.

The intention of all these reforms and attempts at reform was to take better account of the reality of man. For this is the weakness of the eschatological teaching of salva-

tion. The latter sacrifices living generations to a utopian future. It overestimates man on the one hand, by expecting that the abolition of private property will lead him to offer his contribution cheerfully and selflessly. It underestimates him on the other hand, by reducing him to an instrument, without opinions and without character, of an unrealistic doctrine.

Thus all economic reform projects in the East are geared to harnessing certain general human characteristics which had been ignored by Marxist-Leninist doctrine. The desire for possessions and profit are again to be used as driving forces in the process of production. An attempt was made everywhere to replace ideologically conditioned price regulation with natural regulation by supply and demand, in other words, to re-establish the function of the free market. Enterprises were permitted to work on the principle of profitability. Thus they were exposed to the pressure of competition in the marketplace. All this gave the appearance of a restoration of capitalism. Hence it was resisted by orthodox Marxists and welcomed by Western observers as liberalization. But it was not intended to be capitalist, any more than were the simultaneous beginnings of workers' control in the factories, a plan taken over from the Yugoslav model. It was based simply on a more realistic awareness of human economic behavior and hence on a better and not ideologically deformed anthropology.

Similar observations can be made regarding the political reforms and the intellectual, artistic, and literary emancipation movement in Eastern Europe. In this respect it is only necessary to read the brilliant criticism of socialist realism by Abram Tertz (the pseudonym of Andrei Siniavskiy, now serving a long term in a labor camp). This criticism is not just a matter of literary esthetics. It delves rather into the most profound questions: the

meaning of life, of faith, and of martyrdom. It is a discussion of human existence and the Russian fate worthy of a Dostoyevski, superior even through the experience of the tragic salvation of the world by Bolshevism, an experience which Dostoyevski could foresee only in vague outlines. Equally symptomatic of the anthropological core of the freedom movement among Soviet poets and artists is Mihajlo Mihajlov's observation in "Moscow Summer 1964" regarding the ballad singer Bulat Okudschawa. The singer had achieved unheard of popularity among Soviet youth because he "had not forgotten that in addition to the state, history, space flights, the collision of social systems, and gigantic building projects, there is something else, something called man."

In the political reform movement and criticism it is striking how precisely the arguments coincide, no matter whether they come from Milovan Djilas in Yugoslavia, from Kuron and Modzelewski in Poland, or from the authors of the famous *Two Thousand Words* in Prague. In the background is always the automatic nature of human behavior, just that fact which Marxism-Leninism did not take into account when it developed or tolerated bureaucratic machines, institutions, and relationships. These led necessarily to the formation of a new class system, a new control and exploitation of society by a privileged class, instead of paving the way for the loudly proclaimed classless society. But in this development they all see a new kind of alienation not anticipated by Marx, the alienation characteristic of the Leninist form of socialism even after the elimination of private ownership of the means of production. This alienation, they maintain, can only be overcome through the reform or even revolutionizing of just those bureaucratic machines and institutions which have been characteristic of socialism

until now. This is precisely that "socialism with a human face" which the Czech communists hoped to realize through their reforms, and which brought them the approval of broad segments of the non-communist population of Czechoslovakia.

Where did this approval come from? Hundreds of conversations with Czech friends, communist and non-communist, attest to the answer: it was the feeling that man—with all his qualities and longings, his demand for freedom, contact, and criticism—was no longer to be the instrument of a doctrine administered by a particularly incompetent bureaucracy. Man was to become man again, a calling for which he had been trained for centuries in a humanistic and democratic tradition. It was not accidental that the Prague reform movement was connected with a new wave of the Masaryk cult. In the Czech popular consciousness the father figure of Masaryk was the especially impressive embodiment of that humanistic tradition. It was characteristic of the Prague reform movement that it attempted to find a humane relationship to the Germans, especially to the Sudeten Germans, free from the traditional taint of nationalism. It is only the reinstated orthodox Soviet leadership which is putting a stop to this work of reconciliation and which considers it a dangerous policy of diversion and wedge-driving.

This socialism with a human face can no longer be explained merely as anti-Stalinism. It is equally directed against Lenin. As Rosa Luxemburg pointed out, it was Lenin who established a dictatorship over the proletariat instead of a dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus he laid the foundation for state-worship or, to use Kolakowski's term, institutional Marxism. The declared goal of revisionism and reform Marxism throughout the world is to liberate man from the control and manipulation of that system. For exactly this reason the

Prague spring was so fascinating for believing Marxists all over the world, including some members of executive bodies in non-governing communist parties in the capitalist countries.

This calls for a look at the particular role which Western communist parties, not in power, play in the broad and polymorphic reform movement within Marxism. In these parties a trend had developed long before the Prague spring which brought with it precisely the humanistic elements of revisionism. This trend resulted from the special situation of the Western parties, especially the continuing confrontation with a non-Marxist environment. They were forced, if only in the interest of effect on their own working class, to develop democratic and pluralistic models of society. Orthodox Marxists reproached them for espousing social-democracy. They declared themselves in favor of freedoms that Marxism-Leninism suppressed rigidly in its own area of rule. Finally, they sought dialogue and sometimes even political cooperation with bourgeois ideologies and movements, precisely the policy that brought down on the revisionists within the socialist bloc the charge of heresy.

Togliatti's famed political testament of 1964 was characteristic of this open posture toward the non-Marxist environment. The Italian Communist Party invoked Togliatti's statement in its 1965 Declaration of Principle. The declaration called not only for struggle under the capitalist regime, it also anticipated for the future socialist society autonomy of labor unions and all democratic organizations, which were no longer to be considered merely transmission belts of the Party (as they were by Lenin). The declaration even envisions the possibility of a plurality of political forces and a rejuvenation of democratic-parliamentary institutions—more or less a multi-party system. In relatively free Yugoslavia the revi-

sionist Michajlov was sent to prison for such a suggestion. In addition the C.P.I. makes Party membership independent of the applicant's world view; that is, even a believing Catholic is tolerated in the ranks of the Party.

Togliatti was not without influence on the leading Austrian communist Franz Marek. In his journal, *The Way and the Goal (Weg und Ziel)*, and his book, *Philosophie der Weltrevolution*, Marek rejects fundamental Marxist theses and models of society such as the dictatorship of the proletariat as unsuitable for propaganda among progressive workers accustomed to democracy. Because of the attractiveness of socialism, Marek declares himself in favor of "respect for parliamentary traditions, for the multi-party system, the possibility . . . to replace one government by another according to the will of the people." It is not surprising that the leaders of the communist parties of Sweden and Norway approve of a parliamentary multi-party system with the resulting risk of a change of government. Like Ernst Fischer in Austria, the Swedish and Norwegian communists condemned emphatically the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia.

The front lines are thus indicated which divided reformers from orthodox Marxists throughout the world of Soviet-European communism. This perspective sheds some light on the expulsion of Ernst Fischer from the Austrian Communist Party and the exclusion of Roger Garaudy from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France, especially if one had the opportunity to observe the Party Congress at Neuilly closely on the screen. Since 1933 Garaudy has been a convinced and almost religious communist, despite his atheism. He has published the works of Lenin, and he is a respected philosopher. He welcomed enthusiastically the turn taken by Roman Catholicism under Pope John XXIII, as

Garaudy put it, from the spirit of the Crusades to the spirit of dialogue. He praised Christianity for discovering the personality of man, thus complementing Greek humanism and Marxist rationalism—a further example of the anthropological concern of reform Marxism. The unmasking of Stalin at the Twentieth Party Congress deeply shocked the believing Stalinist Garaudy, according to his own statement, but it did not shake his faith in a purified socialism. The hopes that he attached to the Prague spring of 1968 are thus all the more comprehensible. In his last book, *Le grand tournant du socialisme (The Great Turning Point of Socialism)*, he praises the Czech and Yugoslav development as the rediscovery of man, to whom Marxism was originally dedicated. Now, under pressure from Moscow, Garaudy has been chastised by that bureaucratic machine against which Marxist reformers hope to defend human freedom. Nothing could better illustrate the differences in human quality than the confrontation between Garaudy and his opponents, the mediocre bureaucrats. This confrontation made it clear that, while the case of Garaudy may be settled, the case of the Marxist reform movement among humanistic European intellectuals is not.

Viewed as a whole, it appears that intra-Marxist reformism and revisionism is a phenomenon that can be dammed up and suppressed for a time by military might and political repression, but it cannot be eliminated in the long run. Indeed it seems that the movement only gains impetus through such interventions, despite short-term losses and delays. For the issue is not, as Marxist orthodoxy would like to maintain, a step backward from the insights and accomplishments of Marxism but, on the contrary, a further development in the true sense of Hegel's concept of dialectic. The antithesis comes right out of one of the constructional peculiarities of the original

teaching: the anthropological flaw in Marxism is corrected by concentrated efforts to create a better anthropology based on Marxist theory. For the world-wide confrontation between East and West a surprising perspective thus results.

When confronted by Marxism of any kind, the Western world with its own ideological system easily slips into the role of a conservative. It is likely to defend a precious Western heritage against revolution. Many in the West see themselves only in this defensive, conservative role. We have seen, on the other hand, that the intra-Marxist reform movement appears progressive when compared with the conservative dogmatism of orthodox Marxists. The struggle of the reformers against the new post-revolutionary alienation brings them into proximity with Western democracy and all that it entails: the parliamentary multi-party system, the free market economy, freedom of the individual and of individual opinion. The reformers have opened an offensive against the calcified power system of "institutional" Marxism. They strive consciously to go "beyond Marxism," a phrase coined by Ernst Bloch which serves as the title of a recently published collection of essays by Arnold Kuenzli; a book, incidentally, well worth reading.

Karl Marx himself would probably be a revisionist today. His sharp critical glance would discover the actual alienation of man not only, and indeed hardly at all, in private ownership of the means of production, but rather in the monstrous military-bureaucratic apparatus of repression, an apparatus which is nowhere so ubiquitously and omnipotently present as in the Soviet system; that conservative and established socialism which has degraded Marx's original teaching of salvation to a means of power. Whoever understands anything of dialectic must recognize that a third dialectic

level begins here, where post-Marxist and pre-Marxist elements of a liberal humanism unite against an orthodox Marxism that has calcified as a result of its anthropological inadequacy.

The precondition for this further development is that the Western world not regard itself as the conservative defender of a "correct" heritage, but rather as the pioneer of an ideal that has not yet been realized even in the West; in other words, that the West develop from its own ranks a critical revisionism that will have something in common with intra-Marxist revisionism. Whoever observes the relationship of Teilhard de Chardin to Roger Garaudy and Leszek Kolakowski, whoever has followed the dialogue between Marxist atheism and Christianity under the auspices of the Paulus Society or any of a number of similar discussions, whoever is familiar with these developments knows the intellectual kinship which is apparent in them. This kinship is rooted in an anthropology which, if not completely identical, at least works with the same categories on both sides.

This sketchy analysis of the reform movement within and without Marxism would be incomplete if we did not, in conclusion, risk a glance at the young radical Left. In its search for a revolutionary doctrine, the world's youth, thrown into a panic of existential anxiety by the worldwide crisis in education and perplexed by the population explosion and imminent famine, has hit upon Marxism. It does not take into consideration that this Marxism has long since been compromised by Leninist-Stalinist deformation and the repressive use of power. Youth is fascinated by Marxism only where it is still in the stage of struggle: in Mao's China, in Vietnam, in Cuba, and in the guerilla warfare around Che Guevara. Why precisely Marxism? One tries to find an explanation in the desire of some German professors to make up

for their long delay in comprehending the world-historical significance of Karl Marx. But in the end one cannot overlook what links the revolutionary youth with Marxism, despite the untimeliness and discredited state of the doctrine. It is the radicalness of thinking that sees no other alternative than to destroy the existing society. For Marx this may have meant early capitalist society, in which he knew only the defenseless, exploited, degraded proletariat. For the New Left it is "late capitalist" society, characterized by well-paid, organized, and protected workers, but also by an incomprehensible apparatus of production and administration, a military machine capable of extinguishing the human race, an industry which pays for all this but only this, and a third world full of starving peoples who receive development aid but who are fundamentally still only exploited. So it appears in any case to the neo-Marxist consciousness, and only this consciousness is not called "false consciousness."

For our purposes it is important only to note that this radical Left disassociates itself passionately in all its actions and writings from the established communism of the Soviet Union and its realm of power. The same is true of the labor unions, which have also developed into bureaucratic machines concerned only with power and money. This becomes especially clear in the pocket book of the Cohn-Bendit brothers with the revealing title, *Leftist Radicalism, A Violent Cure for the Old-Age Disease of Communism* (Reinbek b. Hamburg, 1968). The restraining policy of the Communist Party and the labor unions in France in May and June of 1968 may help to account for the book's outraged tone.

Thus the radical Left also attacks, if for quite different reasons, that same bureaucratic power apparatus against which the intra-Marxist, more or less revisionist, reform movement has struggled with varying

degrees of success since the days of Rosa Luxemburg and the Kronstadt sailors. The radical Left has one thing in common, however, with original Marxism, something that separates it from the humanistic revisionism of Kolakowski, Kosik, Ernst Fischer, and Roger Garaudy. It shares the anthropological flaw which in this case, unlike Marx, leads to anarchism and which is responsible for the change from revolution to dictatorship. Indeed, it makes this dictatorship a precondition for the success of the revolution. The mission of that humanistic revision is precisely to overcome, after bitter experience, such a fate of the revolution.

On the basis of this rather hasty survey, the intellectual front lines in the present world revolutionary situation can perhaps be characterized as follows: the young radical Left quite rightly calls attention to the vital unsolved problems of our society. It deserves to be taken seriously, although it is in great danger of repeating the transformation from revolution to dictatorship. On the other hand the Marxist reformation (as I called the movement of revisionists and reformers in a study made in 1967) has embarked upon a magnificent and self-sacrificing struggle to humanize and Europeanize the established, deformed, calcified Marxism which now exists. It is struggling for progress beyond Marxism and thus has the possibility of helping to shape the dialectical level that will succeed Marxism. The ideology of the Western world will participate in the new epoch only if it understands itself as guidepost to a post-Marxist society capable of solving the problems of established Marxism, and not as the defense and justification of pre-Marxist structures. In this role Western ideology is the ally of intra-Marxist revision and reform. Indeed the West can supply certain elements and forces which Marxism renounced in the fortuitous intellectual situation of the nineteenth century and which it now lacks.