

JAN SEDLÁČEK

## SOCIOLOGY OF THE INTELLIGENTSIA IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN THE LAST DECADE

### I. SUBJECT AND CONCEPT OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE INTELLIGENTSIA

Prior to going to the actual substance of our informative article it is essential to point out certain fundamental problems with which the notion of the intelligentsia to designate a certain category of members of the society is closely associated. The fact is that while in some national sociologies this concept is usual and common, there are others where it has not been used at all. If we are to be explicit it is necessary to state that the concept of the intelligentsia in the above-mentioned sense has been employed traditionally roughly from the middle of the last century particularly in Russian and Soviet sociology, in German, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Yugoslav sociology as well as in other sociologies of a majority of the nations of Eastern, South-Eastern and Central Europe, whereas in the national sociologies of Western Europe and the United States it has been used only by social thinkers with Marxist orientation. Whenever the concept of the intelligentsia in the sociological sense has been used it has been taken to describe and include those members of a given society who earn their means of subsistence by intellectual work, are distinguished by a higher level of education than that existing as a rule in the given society, while performing functions bound up with intellectual work, etc. (There is a whole series of classifications and definitions of the intelligentsia, and thus also of features that are regarded as substantial. Nevertheless, all of these contain the performance of intellectual work as a key characteristics.) After what has been written there is a question that suggests itself with impelling irresistibility, i. e. why it is in some national sociologies (as well as in the way of thinking of certain nations) and with sociologists of Marxist orientation that this concept is usual and of considerable frequency, while in other places this has not been the case. It is evident that in seeking an answer to this one has to go back into history.

The concept in the above-mentioned sense of the term had acquired currency in the last century primarily in those countries where there the capitalist forms of

economy had been relatively late in developing, where there had been a strong national oppression, where feudal forms of political power had not been abolished, and where not only higher but often even secondary education had been for the whole of last century, and in some places even at the turn of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, a privilege of only a narrow social group, or even of individuals alone. Under these conditions education had itself been a social factor of such significance that it meant, on the one hand, apart from the privileges of birth and property, the only possible road to social advancement for some individuals from the so-called lower strata, while, on the other hand, it also resulted in the formation of certain links and of a feeling of fellow-being among those who had acquired such education and by that very fact became substantially differentiated from both those groups who had secured their privileged position through other means and from the masses of the uneducated rest of the population.

There had, of course, been other circumstances that had led to the formation of the feeling of belonging together and of certain internal links inside the so-called intelligentsia. In countries with predominating feudal political relations this had been primarily the fact that here a large part of the intelligentsia saw its main political mission in the struggle against the crudest form of state oppression and for installing democratic methods of government. This had been typical e. g. for the overwhelming majority of members of the so-called intelligentsia in Russia.

In Bohemia, in Slovakia, in Poland and some other countries of Central and Eastern Europe a majority of the intelligentsia had again stood in the vanguard of the struggle for national liberation. It had been particularly typical of both Czech and Slovak intellectuals during the whole of the last century that in their own notions but also in those of public opinion they were the only actual representatives of the nation that had been deprived of its fundamental political and cultural institutions. Here the so-called intelligentsia had for a certain period of time fulfilled the role of the leading national power, for those social groups that played this role in other nations were — for certain historical reasons — not in existence: since the second half of the seventeenth century one could hardly speak of there having been any Czech national aristocracy, while the bourgeoisie itself was still too insignificant and the proletariat had not yet organized itself as a social force.

For all these reasons, therefore, intellectuals in all the above-mentioned countries in the last century had been a far more integrated group than had been the case in the West where the objective development had gone different ways. This fact had, of course, spread even into the consciousness of the society, whether into the current forms, or into forms of scientific reasoning. Here the intelligentsia was — and as we shall yet see has been up to the present day — conceived as a relatively well integrated social stratum endowed with

special functions, with an important social mission (sometimes being referred to as the so-called conscience of the nation) as well as possessing specific views, attitudes, a specific style of life, and so on. To put it briefly, those forms of existence that had for certain concrete historical reasons been regarded as being typical of the intelligentsia in the last century are being regarded as realistic even today.

It was Marxist theory as well that had contributed to the conception of the intelligentsia as a relatively well integrated social group. In particular Kautsky and Lenin were those who at the turn of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries devoted rather a great deal of attention to the problem of the so-called intelligentsia, especially with regard to its role in political life. Both Kautsky and Lenin after him were seeking an answer to the question of the extent to which the intelligentsia could make its contribution to the development, organization and instilling class-consciousness into the working class movement. It was these two thinkers who had laid the foundations for a Marxist theory of the intelligentsia from which Marxists were to proceed for many years to come and which used to be taken for a point of departure. This, in my opinion, was to lead to two consequences for the subsequent development of Marxist thought. In the first place it was the fact that there had often been a mistaken tendency (which was of course in contradiction both with the methodological prerequisites of Marxism and with the intentions of Lenin himself) to transfer whatever had been said by Kautsky about the intelligentsia of Germany and by Lenin about the intelligentsia of Russia, as about certain groups existing in concrete time and space conditions, to intellectuals in other countries and societies as well. Secondly, the fact that even in later times the approach to the so-called intelligentsia was a onesided one, i. e. in terms of its political qualities and political differentiation, in terms of its relationship to the working class movement and to the socialist revolution, other important and substantial aspects of its existence and inner differentiation being overlooked. This accounts for the fact why some Marxists particularly in the period of the dogmatization of Marxism tended to see a certain relatively well integrated stratum in their own intellectuals as well although here there had never been a group with such characteristics as those, e. g. in Russia or in Poland in existence for historical reasons.

There is another fact worth mentioning. Among Marxists the intelligentsia is generally defined as a social stratum comprising people who obtain their means of subsistence by intellectual work. This definition — however current it may be among theoreticians as well as politicians and in the way of thinking of the wide masses of the population in socialist countries — has its weak points which are quite evident. The two basic concepts on which it rests are unfortunately nowhere defined with any exactitude, nor can they be said to be employed in anything like a unified way. Marxist theoreticians (as a matter

of fact not unlike as those of their colleagues who proceed from other theoretical positions and traditions of thought) do not even agree as to what is meant by a social stratum or on how to define exactly intellectual work to make it unequivocally distinguishable from physical work, and to make it capable of becoming an exact criterion for the identification of the so-called intelligentsia.

There is yet another fact that deserves mention here and that has contributed to the simplified conception of the so-called intelligentsia in the national sociologies of the socialist countries and with Marxists in the West. In the dogmatized Marxism of the thirties to fifties of our century, particularly under the influence of some of Stalin's works, a wrong conception of the class structure of socialist society began to spread in which the undifferentiated intelligentsia is supposed to take — side by side with workers and peasants — a certain unified position with the same roles and functions. This fact was pointed out and poignantly expressed by the Polish sociologist Jan Szczepanski when he wrote: „Here intelligentsia was promoted from diffused categories — from the point of view of class — and groups of professions to a status of one stratum. And it is here that an error is being committed consisting in a number of qualities, both objective and subjective, being ascribed to it. It is often said that the fact that one belongs to this stratum is given by a certain type of personality, that a person coming from the ranks of the intelligentsia must possess certain psychic characteristics and must take up certain political attitudes. This stratum is believed to create certain consciousness of its own interests, to constitute a certain unified stratum. Hypotheses and simplifications of this kind seem to be a general phenomenon in discussions on intelligentsia.“<sup>1)</sup>

From the above-mentioned brief observations it may be at least roughly evident why it is that in certain national sociologies a special branch of researches and reflections referred to as the sociology of the intelligentsia has come into being, why these problems have traditionally had their own significant position even in Marxism, and why, on the other hand, in other national sociologies problems relating to the various categories of intellectuals and educated strata have been solved within some other sociological disciplines.

If the question is asked what it is that the sociology of the intelligentsia is concerned with the answer is made difficult by the deficiency just referred to, i. e. lack of clarity and definite classification of the concept of the intelligentsia. On the basis of the literature available it can be said that as far as the deliberations of Czechoslovak sociologists are concerned the subject of the sociology of the intelligentsia has been conceived in a very wide way. It includes the problems of social position, role, and of social functions of all the cate-

<sup>1)</sup> Jan Szczepański: *Struktura inteligencji w Polsce, Kultura i Społeczeństwo* (Structure of the Intelligentsia in Poland, Culture and Community), Nos. 1—2, 1960, p. 31.

gories of intellectual workers, ranging from those who work predominantly in a mechanical way (e. g. some categories of clerks and officials) through those in whose work elements of mechanical work intermingle with creative work (e. g. some categories of teachers, physicians, lawyers etc.) to those with whom elements of creative work quite evidently predominate (creative artists, writers, scientists and others).

Thus conceived the sociology of the intelligentsia is not only connected with a number of other disciplines but at the same time takes its cue from the findings of some related social sciences. Out of these there are three to be mentioned here which from this point of view are the most important: history, psychology, and political economy. History affords the sociology of the intelligentsia valuable data on the problems of the emergence of the division of labour into manual and intellectual, and on the problem of the development of the social position, the role and functions of intellectuals in history. Psychology can be of assistance here by its attempts at defining more precisely the concept of intellectual work, as much as by its efforts aimed at noting substantial features of creative activity. (This concept is of particular importance in the analysis of the so-called creative intelligentsia, or in other words, of intellectuals. Finally it is political economy that helps the sociology of the intelligentsia by its analyses of various economic aspects of intellectual work and of those performing it. Here the question is one of evaluating the importance of this work in the production process, one whether it is possible to describe this kind of work as productive, etc.)

Among sociological disciplines the sociology of the intelligentsia is most closely connected with the sociology of classes and social stratification, with the sociology of knowledge, the sociology of politics, the sociology of culture, and the sociology of professions. The results of all these disciplines are taken as points of departure in one way or another for the sociology of the intelligentsia, of course, this dependence cannot be understood to work one way alone. The fact is that the sociology of the intelligentsia reciprocally makes its own contribution to the development of the above-mentioned sociological disciplines.

## II. RESULTS HITHERTO ACHIEVED

Before embarking on enumerating some of the principal questions which have been dealt with in works written by Czechoslovak authors in the field of the sociology of the intelligentsia, and prior to describing basic results achieved by these authors in these studies it is impossible to omit recalling one work which though falling as to its time of origin outside the scope of the period which it is intended to follow here must be mentioned in view of the im-

portance attaching to it. It is the extensive monograph written by the Czech author Inocenc Arnošt Bláha *Sociologie inteligence* (The Sociology of the Intelligentsia, Prague, 1937) which, in its own day and in its own sphere of investigation, had been a unique work, not only within the context of our own national sociology but it is no exaggeration to say on the European and world scale as well. Whatever exceptions and critical comments one may have to Bláha's conception of the intelligentsia, its social functions and to the general theoretical starting-point adopted by the author — and there may be a great many of these — it remains an undeniable fact that especially by its extent and profundity this work was at the time of its publication, and has remained until now, a most significant attempt at a comprehensive monographic treatment of problems attaching to that part of society which in certain spheres came to be termed the „intelligentsia“.

The definition of the concept of the intelligentsia being one of the most problematic questions in any sociological analysis of this social category (as has already been pointed out), Bláha himself could not help attempting to render it more precise. This is what he does in the first pages of his book. Having rejected the views asserting that the intelligentsia is a state or a class, part of the bourgeoisie, or a middle estate he goes on to make an analysis of his own. The theoretical point of departure adopted by Bláha is the functional conception of society. In harmony with the views of Alfred Weber and Karl Mannheim Bláha's conception of the intelligentsia is to regard it as fully unclassifiable as to class and estate but as something that „floats freely in the social space“<sup>2)</sup>. The basic „crystallizing principle“, „the unifying axis“ of all intelligentsia is not the fact that each of its members possesses a certain modicum of education“ but „participation in a certain function, in the function directed towards creating intellectual values, towards organizing and integrating society in their name, in short, towards a spiritualizing function“<sup>3)</sup>.

In Bláha's view the intelligentsia is thus characterized, above all, functionally — i. e. by its social functions. Of course Bláha's conception of these functions and thus also of the intelligentsia — is extremely wide. He includes not only the so-called „intelligentsia by virtue of its chief profession“, i. e. those „for whom their social function, whether directed to creating spiritual values, or to organizing society in their name, is at the same time the main source of sustaining their existence, but also the so-called „intelligentsia by virtue of its subsidiary profession“ which may be taken to include all those (workers, peasants, employees, intelligentsia etc.) who, while active in another principal profession in their own social category, are operative in view of their secondary function as

<sup>2)</sup> I. A. Bláha, *Sociologie inteligence*, (The Sociology of the Intelligentsia), Prague, 1937, pp. 58—59.

<sup>3)</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 59.

a factor of spiritualization, of intellectual organization.<sup>4)</sup> Already this departing and untenably wide definition of the so-called intelligentsia tends to make the concept that was to have been defined into an extraordinarily hazy one, which cannot but reflect in a negative way on the entire subsequent analysis undertaken by Bláha. Bláha goes on to specify this spiritualizing function of the intelligentsia by classifying it into four groups. These are the functions of 1. spiritual creation, 2. of organization and circulation, 3. of unification, 4. of spiritual consumption.

Throughout Bláha's work the underlying leitmotif is his conviction about the intelligentsia's specific mission in society which at times even assumes certain traits of a Messiah mission. Thus, e. g. one reads: „Of course, the power-wielding and economic circles, too, have their ideologies and their emotional systems, i. e. a certain measure of spirituality. However, these ideologies and emotional systems could become an element tending to disintegrate society if there did not exist a sphere possessed of „totalizing“ ideology and emotional system, i. e. one canalizing all particular systems and ideologies to make them fit into a generally spiritual order of all-society continuities. It is only here that there arise ideas that are all-embracing, emotional systems that are all-including, ideals under whose standards all people can close their ranks in a fighting, serving as well as loving manner. Here ideas and ideals are worth more than power and the economic situation, while these are valid only in so far as they serve ideas and ideals.“<sup>5)</sup> It is this province that it is the domain of the working of the intelligentsia's spiritualizing function. It seems that the above statements by Bláha can be regarded as a particular form of utopia rather than a reliable description of a really existing social situation. It is difficult to conceive that in a society where there are very substantial social conflicts between various large social groups the intelligentsia as a whole could manage to disentangle itself from this conflicting situation. The experience hitherto gained proves conclusively that this has never been the case and that even the so-called intelligentsia has always been internally differentiated, in a way not unlike that characterizing the rest of the society.

Let us add a brief mention of the contents of the remaining parts of the book where Bláha gives an outline of the historical development of intellectuals, analyzes the functions of the intelligentsia, its functional types, psychic prerequisites of its functioning, social origin of its members, consequences of its functioning in its material and spiritual life (standards of behaviour and social and psychic features), and finally the internal and external conditions of what he calls a crisis of the intelligentsia.

Repeating the point made earlier in this study we must say that regardless

<sup>4)</sup> Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>5)</sup> Ibid., p. 65.

of numerous reservations we have to Bláha's book this work has a bearing upon contemporary Czechoslovak sociology of the intelligentsia as an inspiration in many respects: one cannot deny it possesses a number of bright partial observations and valuable conclusions, and another fact is that as to its width and universality it has not yet been surpassed by any further works in this field.

However, let us now proceed to that part of our report which should be its real core, i. e. an outline of the most substantial results achieved in the field of the sociology of the intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia in about the last ten years. The choice of this period has not been accidental. A more pronounced revival of interest in the problems of the so-called intelligentsia among theoreticians of society with Marxist orientation occurred at the time when the apparently impenetrable armour-plate of dogmatized Marxism began to break following some outstanding events which had taken place in the world Communist movement and in socialist countries in the course of 1956. Though this period cannot be said to have meant a final farewell to the old methods in political as well as scientific work it is necessary to realize that since that year the salutary process inside Czechoslovak society has never ceased in spite of the recurrence of the past and of the repeated tendencies to put a stop to it. The first more significant results of the heightened theoretical interest in the problems of the intelligentsia who in the dogmatism period had been — for a number of purely practical but also some pseudotheoretical reasons — relegated into the background (though there has never been any lack of vague and uniformly propagandist articles regarding the so-called „important role of the intelligentsia under socialism“) began to appear around the year 1958. However, it must be borne in mind that these are not as yet works written by authors regarded as sociologists (sociology not being officially recognized in Czechoslovakia until as late as 1963) but by people who had devoted their attention to these problems largely within the framework of very widely conceived historical materialism.

It stands to reason that in their theoretical works Czechoslovak sociologists did not immediately discard their simplified views of social problems. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that in the last ten years a pronounced progressive tendency towards greater objectivity in their own studies can be observed. This, of course, also applies to those concerned in one way or another with the intelligentsia.

Which were the questions in the field of the sociology of the intelligentsia that had stood in the forefront of interest among Czechoslovak theoreticians? It appears that they may be summarized into about five main sets of problems: 1. the question of defining the concept of intelligentsia in sociology, 2. problems of the place of the intelligentsia in the social stratification and the implied problems of the division of labour into manual and intellectual; a more profound characterization of intellectual work, 3. problems of the advent of the



so-called intelligentsia, of its historical development in general up to the present times, of evolutionary changes within the intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia in the recent decades in particular, 4. problems of the role of the so-called intelligentsia in political life, particularly problems of its relation to the working class movement and to socialism, 5. questions of inner differentiation of the so-called intelligentsia and specific problems of its individual components.

### *1. Problem of Defining the Concept of the Intelligentsia in Sociology*

The earliest more profound attempts at defining the intelligentsia as a sociological category which are to be encountered in the works by Czechoslovak sociologists in the late fifties and early sixties still bear many traces of the entirely traditional approach. In spite of programmatic declarations on the necessity of a concretely historical investigation of every phenomenon there is a strong and repeated trend to form a definition of the intelligentsia valid once and for all, that could be applied to intellectual workers in all societies at all times, thus a trend that is essentially a historic one. In defining the intelligentsia as a component of socialist society one tends to overemphasize those characteristics which are common to all intellectual workers, while, on the contrary, the problems of the inner differentiation of this category is frequently being overlooked, or else reduced to class differentiation alone. As *genus proximum* of the concept of the intelligentsia the concept of *stratum* is commonly used in definitions; this concept, however, itself not being as a rule exactly defined or clarified. This is all the more relevant as neither in Marxist theory nor in the works of its founders this concept is applied in anything like a uniform way. The same applies to the concept of intellectual work which is not lacking in any of the above mentioned definitions, unfortunately without having been satisfactorily defined anywhere.

As far as the actual definitions of the so-called intelligentsia as they are encountered in the works of Czechoslovak theoreticians are concerned, a very rough division into two groups appears to be possible: 1. those who in defining this social category lay stress primarily on functions performed in society by its members, and 2. those who emphasize chiefly their socioeconomic status and their position in the class and stratification structure and in the division of labour.

The first standpoint is most poignantly represented by Jan Macků who basing his view on the enumeration of the fundamental functions performed by members of the intelligentsia defines the volume of the concept of the intelligentsia as follows: „Intelligentsia is an independent social stratum of people engaged predominantly in intellectual work whose members perform the following functions on the basis of social division of labour: they create scientific, artistic

and world-outlook philosophical ontological values, disseminate and apply these values, while taking part in economic and organizational as well as public administration activities“.<sup>6)</sup> This definition of the intelligentsia „as such“, of the intelligentsia „in general“ seems to suffer quite obviously from that ahistoricism that has been referred to above. This is, indeed, pointed out by Karel Linhart who — while dealing with the same set of problems — commented on J. Macků's definition in the following way: „This deficiency is a consequence... of the endeavour to define the concept of the intelligentsia in such a way as to make it applicable to all socioeconomic formations.“<sup>7)</sup>

The other point of view is represented by a whole series of authors all of whom mainly emphasize the fact that the intelligentsia gains its means of subsistence by selling intellectual labour or its products, that the conditions of this sale used to change considerably in the process of historical development, and that it is substantially differentiated as to class and functions no less than as to spheres in which it is active. Thus, Miloš Húsek writes: „Intelligentsia is a socioeconomic category, consisting of intellectual workers for whom intellectual work is a source of existence, to whom the exercise of the social functions of intellectual work is entrusted as to a particular social group — nowadays of predominantly salaried workers. It includes intellectual workers from material production and from the circulation sphere as well as from from other fields of the non-productive sphere of social activity activities. Intelligentsia is no kind of „above-class“ extrasocial economic category as alleged by many bourgeois sociologists, no kind of genuinely merely „cultural stratum“ (Theodor Geiger) that forms its ranks around „the spiritualizing function in society“ (I. A. Bláha) and „floats freely in social space“ (Alfred Weber). Nor can it be included as a whole at the present juncture in the individual principal social classes as some Marxist authors have tried to do, dividing the intelligentsia into bourgeois, petty bourgeois and proletarian. This division did have and still retains its justification and significance, however, it must be enlarged upon“<sup>8)</sup> Similar features of the intelligentsia are so emphasized by Karel Linhart:

<sup>6)</sup> J. Macků: K otázce postavení inteligence ve společnosti v díle Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university, řada sociálněvědná (On the problem of the position of intelligentsia in society in Volume of Studies by Members of Philosophical Faculty, University of Brno, Social Science Series, G 4, 1960, pp. 47—48.

<sup>7)</sup> K. Linhart: K problematice vymezení pojmu inteligence a vztahu buržoazní inteligence k základním třídám v kapitalistické společenskoeconomické formaci v díle Sborník prací Pedagogického institutu v Brně k 40. výročí KSČ, (On the Problem of Defining the Concept of the Intelligentsia and the Relation of Bourgeois Intelligentsia to the Basic Classes in the Capitalist Socioeconomic Formation in The Memorial Volume of Studies by Members of the Pedagogical Institute in Brno in Honour of the Fortieth Anniversary of the CPC), Vol. X, Social Science Series, II, Prague 1961, p. 330.

<sup>8)</sup> M. Húsek: Místo a funkce inteligence v soudobé kapitalistické společnosti v díle Intelligence za kapitalismu a socialismu — The place and function of the intelligentsia in contemporary capitalist society in Intelligentsia under Capitalism and Socialism], Prague 1962, p. 27.

„Intelligentsia in capitalist socioeconomic formation is a social interclass stratum of predominantly intellectually working people who for the most part do socially essential work. Its members derive their living either from the sale of the capacity for qualified intellectual work, or from that of its results. On the basis of social division of labour they perform the following fundamental functions: they create scientific, artistic and world-outlook philosophical ontological values, disseminate and apply these values, being active in the economic and organizational, educational sphere and in that of public administration.“<sup>9)</sup>

A similar standpoint is taken up in the works by the following authors: L. Dziedzinská<sup>10)</sup>, E. Kadlecová<sup>11)</sup>, J. Kohout<sup>12)</sup>, G. Riedel<sup>13)</sup>, B. Weiner<sup>14)</sup>, and J. Sedláček<sup>15)</sup>.

In connection with this outline of attempts at defining the so-called intelligentsia we cannot omit mentioning one view of intellectual workers which has been in evidence particularly in current thinking yet an echo of which can be very clearly detected also in one definition claiming scientific objectivity. It is that sort of approach to intelligentsia when this category is defined as a stratum of people doing economically unproductive work. What we have in mind is the study by G. Riedel referred to above where he says: „... intelligentsia is a so-

<sup>9)</sup> K. Linhart, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

<sup>10)</sup> Intelligence — její místo a funkce ve společnosti (Intelligentsia — Its Place and Function in Society), Hradec Králové 1958, p. 8; Příspěvek k charakteristice inteligence za kapitalismu (A Contribution to the Characteristic of Intelligentsia under Capitalism), Přehled (Survey), No. 2, Vol. IV, 1959, p. 61; K otázce existence relativně samostatné vrstvy inteligence v díle Základní teoretické otázky výstavby socialismu a komunismu ve světle výsledků společenských věd (On the problem of the existence of a relatively independent stratum of intelligentsia in Fundamental Theoretical Problems of the Building of Socialism and Communism in the Light of the Findings of Social-Sciences), Prague, 1962, p. 481.

<sup>11)</sup> Několik poznámek k procesu vzniku socialistické inteligence v Československu v díle Základní teoretické otázky výstavby socialismu a komunismu ve světle výsledků společenských věd (A few observations on the process of the rise of socialist intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia in Fundamental Theoretical Problems of the Building of Socialism and Communism in the Light of the Findings of Social Sciences), Prague 1962, p. 467.

<sup>12)</sup> Intelligence a soudobá buržoazní sociologie (Intelligentsia and the Contemporary Bourgeois Sociology), Prague 1962.

<sup>13)</sup> K definici pojmu inteligence (On the definition of the concept of intelligentsia) in Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university, řada sociálních věd (Volume of Studies by Members of Philosophical Faculty, University of Brno, Social Science Series), Brno 1958, p. 50.

<sup>14)</sup> Postavení inteligence v socialismu (The Position of the Intelligentsia under Socialism), Prague 1960, p. 3.

<sup>15)</sup> Poznámky o inteligenci a jejím vztahu k proletariátu za kapitalismu v díle Sborník za kapitalismu v díle Sborník k šedesátinám prof. dr. Ludvíka Svobody (Remarks on intelligentsia and its relation to the proletariat under capitalism „in Memorial Volume on the Sixtieth Birthday of Prof. Dr. Ludvík Svoboda), Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Philosophica et Historica, No. 2, 1963, p. 271. Tvůrčí inteligence a dělnické hnutí za kapitalismu v díle Sborník k šedesátinám prof. dr. Jiřiny Popelové, (Creative intelligentsia and the working class movement under capitalism“ in Memorial Volume to the Sixtieth Birthday of Prof. Dr. Jiřina Popelová), Acta Universitatis Carolinae — Philosophica et Historica, No. 1, 1964, p.71—72; Intelligence (Intelligentsia) in Stručný filosofický slovník (A Short Dictionary of Philosophy), Prague 1966, pp. 193—194.

cial interclass stratum performing predominantly economically unproductive yet socially necessary work in the sphere of qualified intellectual activities, and in exploiting formations making its living by selling its capacity for this kind of work, or by selling of its results."<sup>16)</sup> This view has been criticized by L. Dziedzinská in her study *Contribution to the characteristic of the intelligentsia under capitalism*.

Let us, for the moment, leave aside the disputable question which appears to be of decisive importance in judging this conception of the so-called intelligentsia: what is in fact productive work and what are its distinctive features? As sociologists we are primarily interested in what the consequences are of the above approach to the intelligentsia say in our own society. And here we can answer directly that these consequences are extremely negative in the extreme. From the so-called non-productive character of those engaged in intellectual work the general run of people in their way of thinking seem to derive deduce certain conclusions concerning a moral evaluation of the intelligentsia, of its significance for social life and the like. These views if allowed to spread on a mass scale and if they are not opposed effectively sow the seed of artificial discord between those working manually and those working intellectually, are being misused by some conservative elements inside the working class, and tend to impair seriously the conditions for successful work of the intelligentsia without which the existence of modern society is unthinkable, without which modern society can hardly be expected to exist.

At the same time the view that intellectual work in all its aspects is unproductive while all physical manual work is held to be productive is profoundly mistaken. Apart from this, the viewpoint of productiveness need not always necessarily coincide with viewpoint of social significance of the work done as had been pointed out some time ago in a very poignant way e. g. by Jiří Cvekl.<sup>17)</sup>

Since the question of what is productive work is one for the economists to solve, not for sociologists, let us refer — to conclude our brief remark — to one of the most recent works on the subject whose author is Eugen Löbl. This is what he writes: „It can be a matter of dispute which kind of intellectual work can be regarded as a production factor. Is it only that type kind of intellectual work which has its immediate share in the process of transforming a force of nature into a force of production? (After all, the same debatable question can be raised in connection with manual work as well. Here, too, there is a whole series of working acts actions that have nothing to do in the immediate sense with this transformation process.)

The answer should essentially be as follows: every kind of work without

<sup>16)</sup> G. Riedel, op. cit., p. 50.

<sup>17)</sup> J. Cvekl: *Lid a osobnost v dějinách* (The People and Personality in History), Prague 1961, p. 176.

which the given production is unthinkable and which constitutes an integrating component of production is productive work. This kind of work has then to be conceived as a production factor. There is no sense in making a distinction whether a certain type of work is performed in the workshop or outside it, and whether it alters the properties of the thing or not, etc. . . .

The same applies to intellectual work. If we wish to establish whether a certain type of intellectual work is a productive one it is essential to find out whether modern production could do without it, or whether it forms an inseparable part of it.<sup>18)</sup>

Obviously, the border line between productive and non-productive work does not coincide with that between manual and intellectual work. This is why the criterion of „non-productivity of work“ is unsuitable in defining the so-called intelligentsia. It is equally obvious that any negative moral or other evaluation and the depreciation of the importance of the social role of the so-called intelligentsia by referring to its alleged non-productivity is scientifically untenable, and is always bound to have some other foundation than rational argumentation.

*2. The problem of the place of the intelligentsia in social stratification and the parallel problem of the division of labour into manual and intellectual; a more profound characteristic of intellectual work*

All these are questions to which a definite attitude is taken by all the authors whose studies we have quoted here. Particularly the question of the place of the intelligentsia in the social stratification, of its relation to the other social classes and strata has been a subject of repeated heated discussions in recent years, the reason being, among other things, that its solution may have significant consequences also in the realm of practical politics. Yet even in this sphere a dogmatic, and in many respects schematic, approach could often be observed. A great number of opinions bore a considerably speculative character, the main reason for this being the fact that the foundation for general judgments did not rest on a sufficient amount of objectively established and verified empirical data. It was only in connection with the exchange of views on the condition of the working class in capitalist countries that took place on the pages of the journal *Problems of Peace and Socialism*,<sup>19)</sup> and in connection with an important conference on social structure of socialist society organized by the University Institute of Marxism-Leninism in co-operation with the Philosophical Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences at Hrazany

<sup>18)</sup> E. Löbl: *Úvahy o duševnej práci a bohatstve národa* (Reflections on Intellectual Work and the Wealth of a Nation), Bratislava 1967, p. 94.

<sup>19)</sup> What changes are taking place in the composition of the working class, *Problems of Peace and Socialism* Nos. 5, 9, 12 of 1960, Nos. 4, 5, 6, 9 of 1961.

in June 1964<sup>20</sup>) that the first intimations of a more responsible and more objective approach began to appear. However, this set of problems has been reported on for the benefit of those sociologists in foreign countries who might be interested relatively in detail and substantial outline by Jan Macků in his paper *Zur Diskussion des Begriffs „Intelligenz“ auf der Konferenz in Hrazany*<sup>21</sup>) we will not deal with this problem in the present paper, and will concentrate on how Czechoslovak authors in recent years have approached a question connected with it, i. e. the question of the division of labour into manual and intellectual and a deeper analysis of intellectual work.

Though this is a question to which attention is devoted in one way or another by most authors who try to analyze the problems of intelligentsia hitherto the most extensive and most profound attempt at its solution is represented by the studies of Zdeněk Valenta.<sup>22</sup>) In particular the book by this author entitled *Physical and Intellectual Work under Socialism* is an attempt to give an all-round solution of a number of key questions concerning the two kinds of work referred to above. Though we are not always disposed to agree with the author's conclusions it is not possible to deny that he has succeeded in posing correctly those problems which are really of greatest importance in this field. It may become more apparent from a brief enumeration of problems analyzed in the book.

What Valenta tries to do in the first place is to explain the reasons for the existence of the division of labour into manual and intellectual, coupled with the question whether the material and technical basis of socialism in Czechoslovakia helps to remove this, or, on the contrary, to make it more profound. He goes on to give a more general characteristics of both kinds of this work, and states his objections to the simplified views to the effect that the problem of intellectual and manual work has already been solved in Czechoslovakia. This part is followed by a comparison of the economic condition of groups of intellectual workers and those of manual workers, whereupon he tries to answer the question whether there are profound differences in the cultural and technical level between the two groups. In the subsequent chapter Valenta investigates the relation between brainwork and manual work and between those performing each of them as a problem of ethics. In the concluding chapters

<sup>20</sup>) The main contributions by the participants of this conference are contained in the work *Social Structure of Socialist Society*, Prague 1966.

<sup>21</sup>) See *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty*, Volume of Studies by Members of the Philosophical Faculty, Brno, G 9, 1965.

<sup>22</sup>) *Některé charakteristické rysy duševní práce za socialismu v díle Inteligence za kapitalismu a socialismu* (Some characteristic features of intellectual work under socialism in *The Intelligentsia under Capitalism and Socialism*), Prague, 1962, p. 100; *Fyzická a duševní práce za socialismu* (Physical and Intellectual Work under Socialism), Prague 1965; *Některé otázky postavení socialistické inteligence v díle Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti* (Some of the Condition of Socialist Intelligentsia in *Social Structure of Socialist Society*), Prague 1966, p. 436.

he goes on to consider to what extent the present-day trends in the material and technical basis of society (especially automation) help in removing, or conversely in deepening, the differences between manual and intellectual work, and even attempts to give certain predictions concerning this problem.

Valenta's treatise *Some Problems of the Condition of Socialist Intelligentsia* is of importance primarily because of his endeavour to define more closely the features of intellectual work, and to compare these with those of manual work. The conclusions the author arrives at are as follows:

„1. In intellectual work it is the expenditure of spiritual energy that predominates, as compared with manual work where the expenditure of muscle energy predominates. In intellectual work muscle energy plays only a subsidiary role.

2. In intellectual work it is the second member of the reflex arc that is much more involved, while in manual work the predominating part is played by the third member, i. e. the actual performance put up by man's physical organs. In intellectual work the same as manual work the first member of the reflex arc plays but a subordinate role. Both kinds of work begin to differ in the function of the second member which while playing a subordinate role in manual work plays, on the contrary, a dominating role in intellectual work. For the third member of the reflex act intellectual work has almost „everything ready“ through the activities of the second member while in manual work this is the principal act, and there is almost nothing „ready“ beforehand.

3. In intellectual work the chief organ employed is the brain unlike manual work where this is chiefly the hand called figuratively „the tool of tools“.

4. In intellectual work there are wider means of activity applied than in manual work. This is due to a number of reasons, among other things to its lower rate of technical equipment, and thus also to an altogether lower degree of subordination to rhythm and to requirements of machines in general, and therefore even to a lower degree of overall splitting caused by the necessity to perform more functions at the same time, to intertwining with power aspects, i. e. with asserting and enforcing wider interests than those of individual and contradictory activities. All this results also in an average higher degree of complexity of intellectual work and of its relatively higher cultural and technical requirements as compared with the analogical parameters of manual work. All this necessarily results in a higher objective possibility of creative activity in intellectual as compared with manual work.

5. The product of intellectual work generally does not appear in the shape of a material utility value but rather in a form that prepares the ground for their making, transpiring into operations of manual work in the check-up, etc. Therefore, intellectual work generally does not affect the work object immediately but rather the consciousness of those who actually manipulate the work object.

6. If performed for a long period a certain kind of intellectual work may result in certain consequences even for man's own development, which are relatively different from those brought about by manual work. These cannot be analyzed here both on account of their multiplicity and of their complexity. Yet it is possible to point out here that the „professional idiotism“ referred to by Marx concerns far more the sphere of intellectual work than the traditional spheres of the performance of manual work. This is not at the same time merely a negative phenomenon particularly if one considers the possibility of a phenomenon that is directly opposite to „professional idiotism“ and in our own days more harmful.“<sup>23)</sup>

Of course, in connection with this enumeration Valenta points out three important circumstances: 1. all these features are highly relative, 2. there is never „pure“ manual, or „pure“ intellectual work, 3. the actual work done depends also on the man performing it who may raise but also reduce the degree of participation of consciousness and of creative elements.

To conclude this part of our argument it is necessary to point out that a series of interesting new ideas concerning intellectual work and its performers is contained in the work by E. Löbl already referred to as well as in a book by M. Kusý „O vztahu tělesnej a duševnej práce “ (On the Relation between Manual and Intellectual Work.<sup>24)</sup>

*3. Problems of the rise of the so-called intelligentsia, of its historical development up to the present time in general, of development changes inside the intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia in recent decades in particular*

A number of authors have posed themselves the question what historical causes had brought about the separation of the functions of manual and intellectual work, and what changes had been undergone by those performing either of them. As far as the position of intellectual workers in the social structure of various societies is concerned there are roughly two standpoints that have crystallized among Czechoslovak sociologists. There are those who stress the point that the so-called intelligentsia as a special stratum differing quite ostensibly from the other classes and strata arises at the moment of separation of manual from intellectual work. This is the standpoint held e. g. by J. Macků, K. Linhart and others. Others believe that the performers on intellectual work had always until the advent of capitalism — from the point of view of their class position, their social interests as well as of their way of life —

<sup>23)</sup> Z. Valenta: Některé otázky postavení socialistické inteligence (Some problems of the condition of socialist intelligentsia), op. cit., pp. 443—444.

<sup>24)</sup> Bratislava, 1962.



essentially been, with extremely few exceptions, members of the ruling class, and it was only the specific conditions of social life under capitalism that had turned them into a special social group separated from the ruling class. This standpoint is one professed e. g. by L. Dziedzinská, and in the past it was also the standpoint taken by the author of the present paper.<sup>25)</sup> It appears, of course, that both these standpoints have not yet been sufficiently worked out, what they lack in particular is a deeper hinterland of historical facts, and that is why the solution of the problem in question undoubtedly deserves further well-founded studies.

Another aspect of the difference between the social status of performers of intellectual work in pre-capitalist socioeconomic formations and under capitalism was pointed out by E. Kadlecová when she wrote: „Earlier societies made it possible for people who made their living by intellectual work to exist inside its pores, but the existence itself of the society was independent of them. If they appeared on something like a mass scale they were either a sign of the decay of society, or a presage of new relations“.<sup>26)</sup>

The same idea is developed and more profoundly elaborated also in the book by E. Löbl who states: „Intelligentsia is being spoken of or referred to as a new social stratum. Is an appellation of this kind at all justified? For don't we know that as far back as in ancient times there had been intellectual workers?

A whole number of qualities possessed by intellectual workers today and centuries ago are the same. They are characterized by a certain level of education and by being intellectually active against the background of their education and intellectual faculties. Yet all the same from the sociological point of view present-day intellectual workers differ substantially from the intelligentsia of past centuries.

A teacher in the old economy need not have been any less educated and any less capable than his colleague of today. However, without the existence of teachers the volume and the mode of production of those days would not have changed.

If there were no teachers today the entire economic structure would break down. Without an educational system the rise and existence of that economy in which we are living is utterly unthinkable. And as has been pointed out in another connection this goes for all branches of intellectual work.

While at one time intellectual workers formed only a handful of people who differed from the others by their education, this feature has now ceased to be a characteristic one. The other social strata can reach the same level of education as a large proportion of the intellectuals, which means that the latter

<sup>25)</sup> J. Sedláček: K otázce vzniku inteligence v díle *Inteligence za kapitalismu a socialismu* [On the problem of the rise of intelligentsia in *Intelligentsia under Capitalism and Socialism*, op. cit., pp. 9—18.

<sup>26)</sup> E. Kadlecová: op. cit., p. 467.

do not differ so much by the level of their education as by their function in society. The contemporary economy, and more particularly that of the future, is not the work of a handful of educated men but literally of all intellectual workers who are distinguished, among other things, by the fact that as a social stratum they tend to grow in numbers continually, and that by their activities they create new working possibilities for other intellectual workers.<sup>27)</sup>

As far as the development transformations of Czechoslovak intelligentsia in recent decades are concerned, particularly those after the Second World War which as being extremely topical are understandably of greatest interest to us, these have not as yet been — with very few exceptions — accorded a more profound and well-founded theoretical treatment. There are quite a few empirical studies dealing with these problems but their empirical background is relatively rather weak.

The problems of differentiation of views in Czechoslovak intelligentsia in pre-Munich Republic were dealt with by J. Macků in one of his treatises.<sup>28)</sup> Here he devotes his attention to problems that had so far received only isolated treatment, i. e. basic factors affecting the psychology and ideology of the intelligentsia, the bearing of national tradition upon the development of opinion of the intelligentsia, and finally the fundamental aspects of the development of thinking of our intelligentsia in the pre-Munich Republic.

The attempt of L. Dziedzinská at determining the character of the changes in the status condition of the intelligentsia in the process of the building of socialism also belongs to this group.<sup>29)</sup> Here the author endeavours to answer — upon a relatively small area — questions of such significance as those about the character of the changes in the status condition of the intelligentsia resulting from the abolition of private ownership of means of production, changes in the social function of the intelligentsia issuing from the new foundation class of state power, the attitude relation of scientific intelligentsia to socialism, the numerical growth of the intelligentsia and the changes in the status condition of technical intelligentsia have been dealt with by Bedřich Weiner.<sup>30)</sup>

An interesting set of subsidiary problems of the constitution of a certain group of Czechoslovak intelligentsia after 1948 was tentatively dealt with by J. Čejka

<sup>27)</sup> E. Löbl: op. cit., p. 84.

<sup>28)</sup> J. Macků: K otázce názorové diferenciacie inteligence v předmnichovské republice v díle Inteligence za kapitalismu a socialismu (On the problem of differentiation of opinion in the intelligentsia in the pre-Munich Republic in *Intelligentsia under Capitalism and Socialism*), op. cit., pp. 42—55.

<sup>29)</sup> L. Dziedzinská: Změny v postavení inteligence v procesu budování socialismu v díle Inteligence za kapitalismu a socialismu (Changes in the status condition of the intelligentsia in the process of the building of socialism in *The Intelligentsia under Capitalism and Socialism*), op. cit., pp. 86—99.

<sup>30)</sup> B. Weiner: Úkoly technické inteligence v díle Inteligence za kapitalismu a socialismu (The task of technical intelligentsia in *Intelligentsia under Capitalism and Socialism*), op. cit., pp. 114—130.

in his study „State courses for the preparation of working people for admittance to universities and their contribution to the rise of working-class intelligentsia.“<sup>31)</sup> (In the years 1948 to 1954 the state courses for the preparation of working people for admittance to universities were designed to make it possible — in an accelerated form — for the most capable members of the working strata to pass the school-leaving examination, and thus to prepare them for entry into universities and other higher educational establishments.)

A number of valuable data and evaluations concerning changes inside Czechoslovak intelligentsia in the last twenty years is brought also by all the studies by Z. Valenta referred to above.

Very well-informed and well-founded studies as to empirical material concerning some aspects of the development of Czech intelligentsia in the years 1945 to 1948 are the two treatises by J. Maňák recently published in the Sociologický časopis (Sociological Review). The first of these entitled Početnost a struktura české inteligence v letech 1945—1948 (Numbers and structure of Czech intelligentsia in the years 1945 to 1948) brings valuable statistical data on the composition of the intelligentsia in the Czech Lands in the given period, while at the same time endeavouring to give a certain appreciation of the situation of those days from the point of view of the needs of the development of society. The general conclusion reached by the author is as follows: „In the years 1945 to 1948 a considerable increase in numbers of Czech intelligentsia can be observed. The average number of active intellectuals can be given as ranging between 580 and 590 thousand. An overwhelming majority of them were salaried employees. The numerically strongest part, more than two-thirds of the total, is represented by officials and clerical staff of state and enterprise administration. Practically the whole numerical increase in intelligentsia is accounted for by the increase in the numbers of office staff, while in the other groups increase is only very slight, or they are seen to be stagnating. From the point of view of numbers the statistics of those days were by no means so entirely unjustified in referring to all members of the intelligentsia who were employed as „officials“ — the administrative official being at the time the most frequent representative of Czech intelligentsia. Only far behind him there follow in the descending scale production technician, teacher, artist, clergyman, physician, lawyer, judge etc., the very last place being occupied by the scientist.

The structural set-up of Czech intelligentsia, particularly the growing predomination of administration officials, was a burning problem in the years 1945 to 1948. Its most poignant expression was the contradiction between the numbers of civil servants and the amount of means available for their remuneration — the so-called problem of civil servants concerned primarily intel-

<sup>31)</sup> See Intelligentsia under Capitalism and Socialism, op. cit., pp. 69—85.

lectuals employed by the state, but certain of its aspects were in evidence even in the economic sector with unfavourable impact on economic results.

The decisive cause of the growth in the numbers of office staff was economy based on rationing and the abolition of the brutal restrictive measures dating from the times of the occupation. A subsidiary concomitant cause were the consequences of the struggle for power, since each official post represented at the same time a certain power position.<sup>32)</sup>

The second treatise by J. Maňák entitled *Problematika odměňování české inteligence v letech 1945—1948 — Příspěvek k objasnění počátků nivelizace* (Problems of remuneration of Czech intelligentsia in the years 1949 to 1948 — A contribution to throwing light on the beginnings of levelling) endeavours to answer the question what are the roots of the problem which weighs very heavily upon contemporary Czechoslovak society acting as one of the serious brakes of its more rapid progress — the problem of unjustifiable levelling of wages and salaries probably not to be met with in any other society, this being the case both as regards the remuneration of the individual professional groups and of their individual members. Here, too, the author endeavours to give a certain evaluation of the processes he has succeeded in establishing on the basis of statistical data in particular, and arrives at the following more general conclusion: „Immediately after the liberation some of our economists had pointed out that from the economic point of view a certain levelling in remuneration could be justified only in countries with a high productivity of labour and with supply predominating over demand in the commodity market; at that time only the USA and Sweden were regarded as falling within that category... In this country, however, levelling took place under exactly opposite conditions. The reason for this was that in the revolution just under way in that period mass notions on better life asserted themselves. There were practically only two roads towards making these notions a reality. One was the road of positive construction, creation of new values, after the revolution had swept away obstacles standing in the way of increasing the wealth of the society as a whole. The fruits of proceeding along this road could not make themselves felt until after a longer period of time, and their amount and quality would be influenced not only by the effort exerted but also by objective preconditions, internal as well as external. The other road was one of redistribution of the existing social wealth, the road of change in the portion allotted to the individual classes and strata. It was with this road that the majority of the working people associated their efforts at attaining better life. And the less a revolution is able to achieve tangible results in the field of production, the less it is able

<sup>32)</sup> J. Maňák: *Početnost a struktura české inteligence v letech 1945—1948*, (Numbers and structure of Czech intelligentsia in the years 1945 to 1948), *Sociologický časopis* (Sociological Review), No. 4, 1967, p. 409.

to improve the living conditions of the people, the more and the more deeply it is bound to reach into the sphere of distribution where it favours those forces on which it leans, which are the mainstay of the revolution, and afflicts those who oppose it, or who move aside from the main revolutionary stream. These old findings are also borne out by the manner and extent of „doing away with unsound differences“ in remuneration in our own conditions which can be regarded as an emergency measure, exacted by socioeconomic needs of the developing revolution in conditions of general want. When judged from this aspect then levelling has the merit of ensuring that the masses of the working people worst remunerated in the past regard the new, the people's democratic regime as their own. In the conditions prevailing at the time levelling could ensure a „socially more just“ distribution of economic goods and chattels, but could not ensure their rapid growth. And it is here that lies one of the reasons for the failure of our postwar consolidation as well as for its limited character. Levelling could have only a temporary justification dictated by the needs of the struggle for revolutionary transformations in the sphere of power politics and of property ownership, whereas the perspective interests of the development of production and society called for its abolition. In any case, our present-day situation only goes to confirm that the solution was being deferred beyond a bearable limit without affording the possibility of avoiding the accompanying difficulties.“<sup>33)</sup>

*4. Problems of the role of the so-called intelligentsia particularly the problems of its relation to the working class movement and to socialism*

An objective treatment of the above questions, yet particularly of the problems of the role of the so-called intelligentsia in the political life of socialist society has until recent days when fundamental changes in the leadership of the Czechoslovak state as well as in that of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia encountered considerable — and one might even say — insuperable obstacles. In the framework of the officially proclaimed theory on the leading role of the working class until the period of completed building up of classless society there was understandably enough no room for acknowledging the fact that the intelligentsia might play anything like a more substantial role in social and particularly political life. Intellectuals, including scientists, writers and artists, were being officially regarded as essentially merely a kind of servants whose

<sup>33)</sup> J. Maňák: Problematika odměňování české inteligence v letech 1945—1948 — Příspěvek k objasnění počátků nivelizace [Problems of remuneration of Czech intelligentsia in the years 1945 to 1948 — A contribution to throwing light on the beginnings of levelling], Sociologický časopis [Sociological Review] No. 5. 1967, pp. 539—540.

purpose was to fulfil the tasks laid down by the ruling political elite. As to their own activity, this they were expected to show only within the limits this laid down. This, of course, resulted in the most intrinsic role of the intelligentsia, and especially of intellectuals as mappers out of new ways and problems and as criticizers of the negative aspects of social and political life being considerably tied up. It is easy to understand that one has never entirely succeeded in imposing this subordinate role on intellectuals. Nevertheless, a series of repressive measures tended to drive them more and more into this position. In Czechoslovak conditions this was, of course, more than paradoxical, since hardly in any other country have there been as many eminent intellectuals who were members or sympathizers of the Communist Party, this dating back to the times of the bourgeois republic. Though in the period under review no theoretician could afford to come into the open with the idea that it is in particular some intellectuals who have been the most consistent critics of the deformations of socialism this was actually the case. This notion was pointed out in a very impressive way on behalf of Czechoslovak theoreticians by the outstanding Austrian Marxist Ernst Fischer in his treatise „The Intellectual and Power“ published in the weekly of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union *Literární noviny* in 1966.<sup>34)</sup> This treatise by the very fact that it outlined some new functions that the intellectuals should have in a socialist society as well encountered strong opposition among official theoreticians and politicians. In this respect the stand taken by Jan Fojtik was specially typical, the latter not hesitating to subject Fischer's conception to sharp criticism in a series of articles published by *Rudé Právo*, the daily of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.<sup>35)</sup> Even though it is of course possible to argue with Fischer's conception in some points, the way this was done by J. Fojtik and the time context in which this occurred was not designed to contribute to the development of Marxist theory of intellectuals but pursued an entirely obvious political aim: to deter any intellectuals who might dare claim their own natural function in society.

One of the ways of expressing certain antiofficial ideas concerning the role of the intelligentsia in politics was to evaluate the part played by intellectuals in the development of the revolutionary workers' movement in the past, and to point out that every time in the past when certain anti-intellectual tendencies began to appear in this movement the result would be failures and defeats. A number of authors often drew the attention of readers to the great part taken by the intelligentsia in the creation of socialist ideology as well as

<sup>34)</sup> See *Literární noviny*, Vol. XV, No. 25 dated 18. 8. 1966, pp. 1 and 3.

<sup>35)</sup> J. Fojtik: *Intelektuál — hrdina moderní utopie* (The Intellectual — Hero of a Modern Utopia), *Rudé právo* of 29. 7. 1966, p. 3, of 2. 8. 1966, p. 3, 5. 8. 1966, p. 3 and 9. 8. 1966, p. 3.

in laying down the political line of Communist and workers' parties in the past, and the conclusion they would draw from this fact was that at the moment when these parties assume power, it cannot be otherwise.<sup>36)</sup> A certain positive role in gaining ground for this point of view has been played by some ideas of such Marxists as Kautsky, Lenin, and Gramsci. All the same, the fact is that the whole set of problems of the role of the so-called intelligentsia has yet to be subjected to a more profound theoretical treatment.

*5. Problems of inner differentiation of the so-called intelligentsia and specific problems of its individual components*

Czechoslovak sociological literature does not in any way abound in outlines and summaries of the question of what possibilities there are of an internal differentiation of the intelligentsia. As far as the differentiation of the intelligentsia in capitalist society is concerned the main emphasis placed by Czechoslovak theoreticians — not unlike by Marxists in other countries — was on the class characteristics of the individual components of this category. Here most authors proceeded primarily from Marx's — well-known ideas from *The Capital*, and especially from *The Theories of Surplus Value* in which Marx deals chiefly with the position and role of the so-called technical intelligentsia in the labour process, and goes on to classify intelligentsia from the point of view of the product which is the result of its labour. These observations of Marx's are extraordinarily stimulating, and particularly in discussions on the socioeconomic status of the intelligentsia under capitalism have been paid justified attention in this country in recent years. Let us not forget, however, that these questions were being solved by Marx in a more or less marginal way, the problem of the so-called intelligentsia not being in the forefront of attention at all in his day. After all it was Marx himself who wrote in conclusion of the discussion referred to above: „All these expressions of capitalist production in this sphere (i. e. in the sphere of intellectual labour — J. S.) are so insignificant in comparison with production as a whole that we need not pay any attention to them whatsoever.“<sup>37)</sup>

A series of new suggestions was brought into the investigation of different-

<sup>36)</sup> Cf. especially the following: J. Kohout: op. cit.; E. Kadlecová, op. cit.; J. Sedláček: *Poznámky o inteligenci a jejím vztahu k proletariátu za kapitalismu* (Notes on intelligentsia and its relation to the proletariat under capitalism), op. cit.; J. Sedláček: *Tvůrčí inteligence a dělnické hnutí za kapitalismu* (Creative intelligentsia and the working-class movement under capitalism), op. cit.; F. Červinka: *Polemika o poměru tzv. akademické inteligence k dělnické třídě na konci minulého a počátkem našeho století* (Polemics on the relation of the so-called academic intelligentsia to the working class at the close of the last and the beginning of this century) in *Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis* 1961, tomus II, Fasc. 2.

<sup>37)</sup> K. Marx: *Teorie o nadhodnotě I* (Theory of the Surplus Value I), Prague 1958, p. 420.

iation of intelligentsia by V. I. Lenin. In his day the problem of this category was already more topical than in Marx's day, and even from the point of view of the development of the working-class movement and its policy was acquiring ever greater importance. Lenin's views on the differentiation of Russian intelligentsia can be summarized into a finding that the basic criterion of this differentiation in these views was the criterion of class, finding its expression before the October Revolution primarily in the socioeconomic status of its individual components and in their ideological orientation, while after the Revolution in their attitudes to, and opinions of, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of the new society. It was this approach to the differentiation of the intelligentsia that survived for many long years among sociologists with Marxist orientation — and also among Czechoslovak sociologists in the period after 1948 — even though in view of the changed conditions it would have been necessary not to remain satisfied with this premise and to search for further motives and elements of differentiation that had been constituting themselves along with the transformation of the socialist society.

Theoreticians of society had been — for a relatively long time — influenced by the official idea that after the socialist revolution the intelligentsia split into two components, i. e. the so-called old intelligentsia educated still in the capitalist society and marked by various „survivals“, and a new, intelligentsia sprung from the people, etc. This division which in Czechoslovakia has never corresponded with the actual situation in the ranks of the intelligentsia was very often associated with extremely negative consequences for the activities of some eminent scientists, writers and artists. Apart from this, at the most one other differentiation was recognized, i. e. into the so-called humanistic and technical intelligentsia which, in view of its being far too general one, could not do either in any more respectable theoretical as well as research tests.

Nor can a more profound approach to this problem be met with until quite recent years. Thus, for instance, J. Macků no longer makes do with a mere class differentiation of intelligentsia and lays stress on differentiation as to function connected with a classification according to the large spheres of social life such as social consciousness and social being.<sup>38)</sup>

In a more elaborated form this notion is contained in M. Húsek and Z. Valenta.

In his study *Místo a funkce inteligence v soudobé kapitalistické společnosti* (The Position and function of intelligentsia in contemporary capitalist society), M. Húsek comes to the conclusion that in the process of the social division of labour the following seven spheres of social labour and all-society functions

<sup>38)</sup> See J. Macků: *K otázce postavení inteligence ve společnosti* (On the problem of the position of the intelligentsia in society), op. cit., pp. 42—53.



become gradually independent according to which it is also possible to classify the intelligentsia:

1. The sphere of economics, production and distribution involving the function of production, organization, records and control, and planning.
2. The sphere of politics and law involving the functions of political control, legal system, and public administration.
3. The spheres of ideology, philosophy and religion involving the function involving the functions of creating and disseminating ideology, development of philosophy and religion.
4. The sphere of art involving the function of developing both creative and reproductive art.
5. The sphere of education, further education, enlightenment and propaganda involving the respective functions.
6. The sphere of health and social welfare involving the functions of health service and social services.
7. The sphere of science involving the functions of developing natural and social sciences, of developing scientific knowledge.<sup>39)</sup>

In a similar way Z. Valenta in his treatise *Některé otázky postavení socialistické inteligence* (Some problems of the position of socialist intelligentsia) distinguishes six basic spheres of intelligentsia's activities: 1. management of production, 2. social administration, 3. social consciousness including ideology, 4. social being from the point of view of „simple and extended reproduction“, 5. health and social care, 6. sciences (gnoseological, ideological, and applied).<sup>40)</sup>

The author of the present paper holds — as he has after all already indicated in the entry „Intelligentsia“ in the *Short Dictionary of Philosophy*<sup>41)</sup> — that the so-called intelligentsia is a highly differentiated category, namely in several respects.

1. From the viewpoint of conditions in which it validates its intellectual work or its result. This can take two forms: a) by way of mercenary sale of labour power to the entrepreneur, b) by way of independent sale of intellectual labour power or its results directly to the consumer.

2. From the viewpoint of the inner functional division of intellectual labour. Here two criteria are of greatest importance: a) which class the intelligentsia serves for the most part by performing intellectual work, b) in what spheres of social life it is chiefly active.

3. From the viewpoint of the character of intellectual work itself. The intelligentsia is thus divided into a) that part which is engaged in that kind of intellectual work that is largely of mechanical, ever repeated in substantial features, and so almost of automatized character (majority of administrative staff

<sup>39)</sup> See M. Húsek, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

<sup>40)</sup> See *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti* (Social Structure of Socialist Society), *op. cit.*, p. 458.

<sup>41)</sup> See *Stručný filosofický slovník* (A Short Dictionary of Philosophy), Prague 1966, p. 193.

and lower technical workers), b) that part whose activities involve seeking new ways, discovering means hitherto unused, and attaining qualitatively new results and goals, i. e. creative intelligentsia sometimes referred to as intellectuals. Hence follows the considerable economic, political and ideological heterogeneity of this category in modern societies.

The outline given above makes it clear that the criteria of the inner differentiation of the social category of intelligentsia can be varied and very numerous. In a sociological analysis, however, one should not apply criteria of any and every kind, one should not create statistical criteria from outside out of the various groups of the intelligentsia that are not integrated in any way internally, but one should look for such features as are so substantial and significant that out of individuals and aggregates which are characterized by them they form internally integrated strata who need not but can be aware of this integration, or can invest it also with a certain formal political framework.

### III. GOALS AND PERSPECTIVES

It is evident from our brief outline of some of the basic results in the sphere of the sociology of the intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia that a great number of studies dealing with these problems have been in many respects largely of speculative character, and have not been based on data obtained by empirical researches. This fact is understandable if one considers that until recent years researches of this kind — within the officially proclaimed theory of empirical sociology as „bourgeois pseudoscience“ — had been regarded as undesirable and anti-Marxist. In our opinion the main task now facing the sociology of the intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia consists, therefore, in embarking upon field research work oriented at various categories and strata of intellectual workers. Results obtained in these researches will be at least of double importance:

1. In confrontation with them it will be possible to verify the existing hitherto purely theoretical reflections on intelligentsia, and it will be established how far these are true to facts and what is not in keeping with reality. It will be of particular interest to find out whether it is still possible in our society to speak of anything like a relatively unified and internally knit stratum of intelligentsia, or if this is no longer possible.

2. In these researches new concrete findings will be obtained regarding the structure, roles and functions of the individual categories of intelligentsia in our society, findings that are absolutely essential for both practice and further theoretical considerations.

It appears that the only viable road in this sphere can no longer be under any circumstances to try and proclaim some kind of general and speculative

opinions on the so-called intelligentsia „in general“, intelligentsia „as such“, but to focus one's attention on an acquaintance with, and a description of, the individual strata and categories. This is also the direction taken by the first researches that are being embarked upon in this country. It is only on their foundation that it will be possible to make an attempt at a certain theoretical synthesis concerning the position of the so-called intelligentsia in Czechoslovak society.

At the moment the project that can be expected to bring most in the way of findings seems to be the research into vertical social differentiation and mobility of the population in the ČSSR organized by the research team centred around the University Institute of Marxism-Leninism, Charles University, Prague (in cooperation with the Sociological Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and the Slovak Academy of Sciences, of the Department of Sociology at the Prague School of Economics, and the Department of Philosophy at the Faculty of General Medicine, Charles University).<sup>42)</sup> This research is — as regards extent and depth — unique not only in socialist countries but also in countries with high sociological culture and with rich traditions of empirical sociology. The problematics of the sociology of the intelligentsia will no doubt profit particularly from those parts of the research project that are concerned with questions of work and professions, with political system, the way of life, leisure time, with education and qualification, the prestige of occupation, social interaction, preferences and aloofness, and with notions about the social stratification and self-identification of the population of the ČSSR.

In addition to this, there are many other partial preliminary researches under way which it is often impossible even to register in their entirety, the most important results of which, however, are sure to be published in one way or another in due course. A certain outline of the problems that are the object of most intensive efforts in this field at the moment was recently given by the scientific conference on the sociology of the intelligentsia held in Brno in December 1967, whose participants concerned themselves with questions that could be divided as to their subjects into three large groups:

1. General problems: the subject of the sociology of the intelligentsia, criteria of the status of the intelligentsia in socialist society, social functions of the intelligentsia, vertical social mobility and the intelligentsia, intellectuals and politicians.
2. Problems of the individual categories of the intelligentsia: status and functions of the propagandist, students as a special group of young intelligentsia, the possibilities for the graduates of the College of Agriculture in Brno of finding jobs and utilizing their knowledge in practical life, the prestige of an officer, and of a woman-intellectual.
3. Methodological problems of the

<sup>42)</sup> For detailed information on the research project see Sociologický časopis [Sociological Review], No. 6, 1967.

research into intelligentsia: theoretical approach to research into technical intelligentsia, questions of research into the ways the graduates of technical universities and colleges assert themselves in practical life, problem of the teacher's working load outside the classroom, social function of the intelligentsia in the local community, methodology of research into the relationship between the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the intelligentsia, and the ideological attitudes of Czechoslovak intelligentsia in the years 1945—1948.

In conclusion it is necessary to point out that the publishing plans of Czechoslovak Publishing Houses have made provisions for publishing, in the nearest future, several new works dealing with some aspects of the problems of the sociology of the intelligentsia.