

THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

Vol. XLI, No. 2

OCTOBER 1971

Whole No. 91

CONTENTS

- | | | |
|--|------------------------|----|
| On the Theories of Capital and Distribution | <i>Izumi HISHIYAMA</i> | 1 |
| Georg Lukács and the Hungarian Revolution
of 1918-19 | <i>Toshihiko HIRAI</i> | 24 |
| State Monopoly Capitalism and Organisation
of Struggls for Survival | <i>Jun IKEGAMI</i> | 46 |
-

PUBLISHED BY

THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY

SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

GEORG LUKÁCS AND THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION OF 1918-19

by Toshihiko HIRAI*

I Three Anti-Monarchy Movements in Hungary

Partly because Hungary in the early days of this century when the thoughts of young Lukács were formed in the country, was lagging behind in the social, political and economic development in comparison with west European countries and partly because of different social patterns from the said advanced countries, in the anti-monarchical movements in Hungary we can find a few unique features of its own.

According to the "Development of Hungarian Industrial Class" by Gyula Rézler, it is reported that the proportional numbers of industrial workers in 1880's were less than 1 % of the total population of Hungary.¹⁾ Since that time her manufacturing industry began to make a certain extent of progress during the transitional period to this century and incidentally the class-composition began to undergo some changes according to such circumstance. Yet Hungary in the early days of this century as a whole was an agricultural country as she used to. Because her agriculture which was a principal industry, was given such a great blow by the import of very cheap wheat in an enormous quantity to the middle and east European countries from America during the latter half of the last century that the gentry could no longer cope with the fluctuating and unstable market economy and people had to surrender themselves to the nobles who were great landowners and to the monarchical power of government based on such foundation.²⁾ According to the official memorandum about Hungarian landownerships in 1918, 2/3 of all agricultural lands was owned by only 1/7 of all landowners and the remaining 6/7 of them owned no more than 1/3 of all agricultural lands. Particularly the living standard of "those agricultural workers who did not own their lands" was in extremely destitute and miserable conditions. When Victor Zitta made a survey of the living standard of Hungarian population from an aspect of illiteracy and tuberculosis, he pointed out that the rate of Hungarian illiteracy showed as high as 33% of her total population in comparison with 0.4% in Germany and 0.2 in Denmark and further reported that the number of tubercular patients

* Professor of Economics, Kyoto University

1) Gyula Rézler, *A Magyar Nagyipari Munkásság Kialakulása* (Development of the Hungarian Industrial Working Class), 2nd ed., Budapest, 1945. p. 98.

2) Victor Zitta, *Georg Lukács' Marxism: Alienation, Dialectics, Revolution — A Study in Utopia and Ideology*, Hague, 1964. pp. 29-30.

was as many as 1/6 of the total population.³⁾

On the other hand as to her political system, Hungary had been under ruling of the Habsburg Monarchy since 1867. Although an representative system was only formerly in existence, the right to vote was limited only to a very small number of the privileged class and the freedom to hold any meeting or to form any organisation, had never been secured.⁴⁾ The report which a Hungarian representative of Socialist Democratic Party addressed to the International Congress in Stuttgart, August 18–24, 1907, included the following passages. “There exists no law providing for the freedom of meeting in Hungary. The meetings are often controled by official order from the government authorities. Our party has never been free to form even one political club or any other organisation owing to the government prohibitive regulations. But the workers, who were equipped with the class consciousness, have managed themselves to form a “free association” to function in secret. This particular free association is the fundamental element of the organisation of our Party.”⁵⁾ Furthermore, the authorities concerned were always keeping their watchful eyes against any anti-government movement and they often exercised their supreme power, intending to plot oppressive measures repeatedly upon the masses. For an example, Zitta made the following explanation. “In those days in 1903 when Lukács was playing an active part in the Nyugat circles, General Fejérvary exercised his ruling over the country by using his mighty power after dissolving the Parliament. There was no prospect whatsoever to settle any political problem in Hungary and it became possible for the government to mobilize human power and natural resources without difficulty as results of the World War of 1914.”⁶⁾

Then, was there no chance for any anti-monarchy movement to take place under such dark social, political and economical conditions? Now, the present writer shall proceed to describe the background history and characteristics of general situations in Hungary by presenting them in the following three different trends of movements, taking reference to the painstaking work entitled, “Béla Kun and the Hungarian Soviet Republic - The Origin and Role of the Communist Party of Hungary in the Revolutions of 1918–19/1967)” written by Rudolf L. Tökés.

(a) Hungarian Socialist Democratic Party

It was in 1860's that the buds of Hungarian socialist movements began to grow up for the first time. The origin of such movements was characterized with the fact that socialist idea was introduced from abroad by the hands of the Hun-

3) Oszkár Jászi, *Ungarns Sühne*, Intro. by E. Bernstein. pp. 1–20.

4) Victor Zitta, *ibid.*, p. 30.

5) “Report of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party to the International (Socialist) Congress” to be held in Stuttgart, Aug. 18–24, 1907 in Erényi, *Selected Documents*, Vol. 3. pp. 552–553.

6) Victor Zitta, *ibid.*, p. 30.

graian, the Austrian or German workmen who happened to have some knowledge of Lassallian or Marxian thoughts while trying to work in Germany. "On 23rd February 1968 they formed the 'General Workers Association' for the first time which was a group of Budapest proletariat with a political aim in their mind."⁷⁾ It was five years afterward from the days when Lassalle's "Der Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein" was formed (1863). Because the spontaneous development of proletariat of Hungary was not so active, it was natural that it could not be free from being greatly influenced by the international labor movements and socialistic movements and particularly by movements in Germany and this, indeed, prescribed the character and destiny of Hungarian Socialist Democratic Party.⁸⁾ In fact the Hungarian General Workers Association directed their purpose toward the acquisition of the universal manhood suffrage and a direct parliamentary representation of the working class rather than toward the immediate approach to socialism, by taking the model of Arbeiterverein of Lassalle: and in this way the subsequent course of the Socialist Democratic Party began to trace the direction toward the bourgeois democratism.

Needless to say, not all of Hungarian labor movements were pushed forward in concerted efforts with the Lassalle group. As it is widely known, in 1875 in Germany the Lassalle group and the Eisenach group were jointed together to form "die Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands" and as its of the Hungarian laboures, too, began to push forward the strike movements powerfully in those days in 1880's under the banner of "the principles of proletarian internationalism" and tended to trace the road to radicalism. This tendency was accelerated in an increasing trend, after the Hainfeld United Congress of the Austrian Social Democratic Party was formed in 1889. The minority group of Marxian internationalists won a serious struggle for supremacy of power against the majority group of Marxian reformationists in the course of subsequent one year and the Hungarian Social Democratic Party was formed on 7th December 1890 at the decision of their first Congress held by the newly formed organisation.⁹⁾ Yet, since this newly formed party was under the influences of the leaders of German and Austrian Social Democratic Party, i.e. Bebel and Adler, and the guiding staff was also controled by a few urban proletariat springing up from the labor union - for instance, Ernő Garami, Dezső Bokányi and Sándor Garbai, etc., it was impossible for them to perform any effective and proper movements of their own.¹⁰⁾

One of the most conspicuous example of such situation, proving remarkably the weakness of Hungarian Social Democratic Party, was the fact that, though the

7) Rudolf L. Tökés, "Béla Kun and the Hungarian Soviet Republic, *The Origins and Role of the Communist Party of Hungary in the revolutions 1918-1919*, New York, 1967. p. 1.

8) Franz Mehring, "Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie", Berlin, 1960, Zweiter Teil, S. 77.

9) R. L. Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 3.

10) R. L. Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 251.

greatest revolutionary potentiality in Hungary then was a great number of agricultural workers, it was impossible for the leaders of the Party to give any guidance about the agricultural problems. The agricultural workers who were suffering from the low wages and heavy labor and who were always disclosed under oppression of the authoritative power of local police, carried on frequent large-scaled strikes from 1894 to 1904 and held a demand to the committee of the party at Budapest to reinforce the solidarity between the urban workers and rural proletariat. However, the government authorities exercised particularly strict legal controls over any labor movement staked in localities other than cities and the Social Democratic Party was rather reluctant to be concerned with the farmers' struggles. Therefore the radical socialists under a leadership of István Várkonyi, being dissatisfied with such situation, formed the "Independent Socialist Party" in 1897 and another group with Vilmos Mezőfi as a president leader further established the "Hungarian Reconstructed Socialist Democratic Party" in 1904.¹¹⁾

Now, at this point I shall offer a suggestion beforehand that the above-mentioned organisational and ideological character of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party became an underlying cause of the frustration of the Hungarian revolution, with which Lukács had to be confronted.

(b) Hungarian Anarcho-syndicalism

Because the tactics of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party that used to be dependent upon the trade union became more and more inflexible and it became impossible for the leaders of this party to set up a proper policy of their struggle at a most serious stage, subsequent to the opposition by the group of farmers mentioned before, a syndicalist group with Ervin Szabó as its leader was given birth within the party in 1904-5. This group, being different from the said leftist radicals, was composed mostly of intelligentsia. Among them, for example, Béla Szantó and Gyula Alpari were journalists and Jene László was a lawyer. In addition Lajos Tarczai, Véla Vágó and László Ludas joined this group. It is not clearly known whether all of these members of this group were anarchosyndicalists or not, in the strict sense of the words, but they were the component members of the so-called Szabó group. They say that the Hungarian Social Democratic Party was strongly influenced by the German and Austrian Social Democratic Parties, while it can be said that the Hungarian anarchosyndicalists similarly had a great deal of French influences.

The anarchosyndicalism achieved its gradual progress by going through the process, through which the French anarchists participated in the labor union movements in 1890's and concentrated themselves into *Confédération Générale du Travail* of 1902.¹²⁾ According to Woodcock, "the specific features of anarcho-

11) These two parties which broke off from the Hungarian Social Democratic Party formed the Association of Agrarian Laborer in later days. Tőkés, *ibid.*, p. 6.

syndicalism lay in that the diverse elements in the past were made adaptable to the environment of industrial society at the closing period of 19th century, that the labor union was made to become a center of their class struggle and that it created a theory to regard the labor union as a nucleus of a new society. The two specific features — that they placed emphasis not upon a commune but upon the labor union as a basic unit of a society and that they placed more stress upon industrial activities rather than upon plot or violent behaviors — are two conspicuous points which distinguish the anarchosyndicalism from the anarcho-communists or the collectivists.¹³⁾ Evin Szabó (1877–1918), who was interested in reading books written by Marx, Nietzsche, Proudhon and Kropotkin while studying history and philosophy in Wien in the days of 1899–1903, had much in common with this anarcho-syndicalism in idea and thereupon intended to revive the stagnated Hungarian socialist movements.

Especially Szabó raised objection against the bureaucratic ruling of the labor union staff members over the poorer laborers at the Hungarian Social Democratic Party Congress of 1905 and advocated the significance of a socialistic revolution through the spontaneity and the solidarity of all workers. “Will it be possible for any political party, of which means of struggle has turned into such state of mannerism that, when a leader issues an order to march on, his men simply follow the order by ‘marching on’ blindly and obediently, to propagandize or lecture a lofty ideal of socialism? Those who are in need of training for socialism are not soldiers but traitors or other spontaneous strugglers. It should never be forgotten that socialism must bring forth a society of free men.”¹⁴⁾ As long as Szabó opposed against the “timid parliamentarism” of the leaders of the party and laid stress on the significance of spontaneous revolutionary struggles by the lower working class it can’t be concluded that he added an idea of Hungarian originality to syndicalism. Rather, as pointed out by Tökés, “in Hungary the conditions were sufficiently ripe for proletariat to maintain and contend their selfconfidence and homogeneity with France” thought the Hungarian syndicalists. There is something of direct introduction of French syndicalism in the way of thinking of Ervin Szabó. Consequently such idea could not take root in the Hungarian labor movements and it gave a considerable influence rather to the group of leftist intelligentsia. Speaking of what Lukács was concerned, he was a member of Budapest Socialist Student Group which was organized by Szabó, and Szabó gave marked influences to the Galileo circle which became afterward a Hungarian leftists’ Student Organisation.¹⁵⁾

12) Tökés, *ibid.*, pp. 9–16.

13) George Woodcock, “*Anarchism — A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*”, 1962

14) Ervin Szabó (Ernö Szontágh), “Hogyan Módosítsuk a Pártzervezeti Szabályzatot?” (How to modify the Party Statutes?) in Erényi, *Selected Documents*....., Vol. 3. pp. 263–264.

(c) Radical Intelligentsia Movements

Under a circumstance where the development of the labor class is retarded owing to the presmaturity of capitalistic production system, a class of bourgeois, particularly small bourgeois intelligentsia often plays an important part of all anti-monarchical movements. However, if this is viewed from its reverse side, it is also true that the intelligentsia movements tended to be a movement by the principles of elite because there was a great gap between intelligentsia and actual labor class. The anarcho-syndicalism mentioned before is a good example of such case. Particularly in Hungary, "all energies were led to be directed toward the cultural creativity owing to the lack of opportunities for any practical social progress".¹⁵⁾ A group of intelligentsia used to be taking the lead of all revolutionary movements at the stage of historical crisis of Hungary. "Almost all of the leaders of the revolution of 1848 were poets. Among them the name of Sándor Petöfi is internationally known." Endre Ady, one of the greatest of the Westernizers and one of the greatest poets of the twentieth century, was praised as "one of Saints of the Hungarian revolution of 1919."¹⁷⁾ On the other hand, however, it can be concluded to say that the movement carried on by intelligentsia, particularly by small intelligentsia group, had many phases of varied kinds and for that reason their activities had many turns and twists in carrying out their movements.

It was just at the turning point of this century 1900 that the intelligentsia movement came to spring up for the first time in Hungary from a background different from that of the labor movements. But during the period after the World War I and before the revolution of 1919, their movements were splitted into two currents. According to "Cultur and Revolution—Intellectuals in the Hungarian Revolutions of 1918–19" written by David Kettler, one of those two currents was regimented in the "Nyugat" which was an art movement and "society for social science" and its organ "Huszadik Század" — the so-called modernisation or West-Europeanization movements. The other current was "Szellemkek", the so-called Lukács group in 1917–18, which was a kind of cultural reformation movement.¹⁸⁾ These two currents, needless to say, originated from one and the same movement at the beginning. Since Szabó and Lukács used to write for the magazines, "Nyugat" and "Huszadik", it can't be said that they had nothing in common between them. However, speaking of their tendency, they were both expressing an opposite character of intelligentsia in those days. That is to say, the former claimed a

15) Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 11.

16) Zitta, *ibid.*, p. 23.

17) Zitta, *ibid.*, p. 22.

18) David Kettler, "Cultur and Revolution — Intellectuals in the Hungarian Revolutions of 1918–19" Luchterhand, 1967, Traslated by M. Tokunaga, p. 125.

demand for the universal suffrage and the land reformation for the purpose to reform the unreasonable political administration and economic system of Hungarian empire in those days and made it his ultimate aim to realise a rational political administration based on reasonable social sciences. In contrast with it, Szellek established the Free School of Spiritual Sciences and took a revolutionary culturalism for his ultimate aim from a standpoint of the spiritual science.

Be the matter as it may, the anti-monarchy movement by the intelligentsia group opened its curtain in the way of radical oppositions against the out-of-date academism of the Budapest University in 1900. The leaders of this group were Gyula Pikler, then professor of law and philosophy of the Budapest University and around this leader were Oszkár Jászi and Mihály Polanyi as his supporters. These people held the following credo of the youth against the suffocating dark atmosphere of the University. "It became increasingly evident that research in history and social sciences lost its integrity and was forced to operate under the aegis of the feudalistic government We lost faith in the church and religion as guidelines or possible sources of support. A corollary of this view was the belief that favorable changes could be expected only through the emancipation of the people, thus paving the road for a better, fuller, and more honest life. Therefore, we looked with genuine sympathy on the agrarian and industrial type of socialist movements. "19)

Concurrently with this university struggle, on 1st January 1900, Oszkár Jászi who was also a bearer of the university struggle, began to publish the monthly magazine, "The Twentieth Century" and one year later the editors and contributors of this magazine established the "Society for Social Sciences". The former advocated a "new spiritual and moral synthesis" as their aim and the latter intended to provide a place to hold open discussion on the varied subjects such as social, political and economic problems. A great many anti-monarchical journalists, philosophers, sociologists, historians, etc. gathered together at the center of this magazine and society and made it a rule to create heated discussions on the popular and current subjects such as the characteristics of, Fabian socialism, syndicalism, anarchism, Austrian-Marxism, etc. or the way how they could be applied to Hungarian society. In the course of a short period immediately after the first edition of this magazine, the number of its subscribers — they were also the members of this society — counted as many as several thousands and constituted a very strong political power.

However, this group of "Twentieth Century" began to take the course of a gradual disintegration before long owing to their middle-class characteristics —

19) Tökés, *ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

we can often see it in the leftist cultural movements of this kind. And then most of the members of this society had something common in that they were anti-monarchical in general, but as far as their thoughts maintained with faith were concerned, their opinions were so diversified as to stand for Marx, Bernstein, Spencer, Comte, Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, etc. When this society was obliged to turn toward the leftist idea, and once some problems of socialism had to be taken up in a more definite shape, those who belonged to the moderate group with Christian members as its center, withdrew themselves from this society and people formed a saloon of a reformation group. As soon as the said moderate group was cleared in this way, this society made a rapid approach to proletariat and facilitated their solidarity with them. As its result "the Free School of Social Sciences" was inaugurated in the fall of 1906 and the major group of this school i.e. Jászi group devoted themselves to realise socialism by way of educating the working class. Jászi made the following description of the intelligentsia proletariat, making evaluation of them as advanced guards for the working class. "We, the intelligentsia, must change a half-conscious view of life and the world of the masses into a perfect conception of the world and must engage ourselves to overturn the existing society by using weapons of morality, science and art."²⁰ Furthermore, this group was maintaining such a standpoint much closer to anarcho-sindicalism that their movements were pushed forward under the slogan to confront against "doctrine, authority and concentration."

Yet, on the other hand this Jászi group firmly continued to be bourgeois intelligentsia in all events, without converting themselves to take the proletariat standpoint, and always endeavored to keep themselves within the frame of privileged intelligentsia. As its result the Socialist Democratic Party as well as the working class had antipathy against such an intelligentsia group.²¹ It was impossible for intelligentsia group with their own standpoint fixed in their mind to try to transplant a revolutionary thought in the mind of proletariat from the outside. Indeed, Jászi constantly maintained an antagonistic attitude against the World War I and instituted the "Radical Party" in 1914, but it is pointed out by Kettler that this Radical Party was by no means radical but was merely a group of reformers with the nature of opposing party. In short, their fundamental standpoint was to try to facilitate the movements to modernize Hungary basing on the west European rationalism and they could make themselves to provide a support for the political administration acquired through Károlyi's bourgeois democratic revolution in 1918, but they could never venture to plunge into a proletarian revolution.

20) Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 19.

21) Kettler, *ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 224.

II Lukács and Cultural Revolutionary Movement

Another intelligentsia movement came about on a horizon entirely different from Jászi's "Association of Social Sciences" or rather on a standpoint of "Spiritual Science" in opposition to the said horizon during the period from the World War I to the Hungarian revolution. Upon returning to Budapest from Heidelberg, Lukács felt European cultural crisis in the course of the World War and organised a researching group with a definite intention to overcome such difficulties. This was the so-called revolutionary culturalism as pointed out by Kettler. It was nothing other than "an attempt to devote energies to relieve the human soul by confirming the dignity of human mind, through cultural renovation" confronting against the stereotyped European civilisation in these days, instead of merely trying to raise the level of undeveloped situations in Hungary to the level of modern rationalism of western European countries.²²⁾ The names of those who participated in the Lukács group were Béla Balázs, Anna Lesnay, Béla Fogarasi, Karl Mannheim and Arnold Hauser.

The character of activities of this group is described in the "Annals of Dialogue with Anna Lesnay" in the following way by Kettler. "A meeting for general talks was held on every Sunday regularly at the house of Béla Balázs who was a writer and a friend of Lukács during the period 1915-18. This Sunday meeting was arranged by Lukács in most cases and chaired by him. He usually presented some subject matters to begin with and all of those present carried on thoroughgoing and careful discussions on the themes thus presented. The most typical topics of the talks taken up at this meeting were mainly problems concerned with morality and literature: in particular the ideas of Dostoevsky and German mysticism held by Eckhart, etc. were the central points of argument. If viewed from a political tendency, this group might just well be described to be, roughly speaking, more like "pro-leftists", yet it would seem to have been much closer to actual realities, if, how non-political these people were without single exception, was emphasised. This group had, indeed, something more similar to a religious meeting rather than a political meeting. This meeting was filled with something of ceremonial air as if religious, and those present were all obliged to speak nothing but perfect truth whatever the matter was to be talked about."²³⁾ This quoted passage is speaking of the atmosphere of the group in their inauguration days and the thoughts of Lukács in those days fairly well. The reason is because it is assumable that the character of this group was far more non-political than the predisposition of the "Society of Social Sciences" mentioned before and that this group was, so to speak, a privileged intelligentsia circle.

Then, what trend of the thoughts had Lukács in his mind in those days

22) Kettler, *ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 245.

23) Kettler *ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 235.

during the World War I? As already mentioned before, when the leftist intelligentsia movements began to be actively engaged in Hungary in the early days of the beginning of this century, Lukács also ventured upon an attempt, when 19 years old in 1904, to proceed with the anti-monarchy movement by organizing "Thália Theatre Movement" in Budapest in concerted efforts with Saneor Hevesi and László Banóczy, but no sooner than their plays were opened to the labor class,²⁴⁾ their movement was crushed by the authoritative power of Hungarian Monarchy and he was fully awakened with what Hungarian status quo was then. Who deeply impressed his soul at a starting point of his thought, was a heroic poet of the Hungarian revolution, Endre Ady. The latest study of Mészáros corroborates that the dialectics of Lukács in his youth originated from his cognition of Hungarian status quo prevailing in those days and his attempt to overcome such situations.

Ady composed series of poems representing Hungarian spiritlessness and stagnation in those days, and placed emphasis on responsibility to overcome such desperate situations. This behavior was based on his profound idea of eschatology and his principle of the prophetic messianism, but it awakened the consciousness of crisis in the soul of Lukács in his youth in a dramatic form of either salvation or total disaster and his mind was lighted up with stimulation.²⁵⁾ Such resistance directed against then existing society might assumably have made him approach toward the political radicalism. At the same time such sentiment of his was not only a specific ideology peculiar to Hungary but also indicating common critical problems of European cultures in the 20th century. According to Mészáros, "Those who rebelled against the latter had to aim—in ideological terms—at the transcendence of all the existing forms of impotence—enhancing partial opposition."²⁶⁾ Nevertheless, on the other hand the essential quality of this resistance was "the concerns of universality". This resistance brought about several outstanding culminations of the twentieth century's European cultures such as Ady, Lukács, Bartók, Kodály, Attila József, etc. Speaking of Lukács who became a Marxian, he had always a firm belief that "a religious power peculiar to the primitive Christianity which could satisfy the soul" should be a universal principle, and this way of thinking had to be confronted with the standpoint which sought for the principles of socialism. Hence, if conversely viewed, wouldn't it be assumable that the tragedy of Lukács, and incidentally the tragedy of the Hungarian Revolution were caused from the fact that the said universal principle had to be cut off from objective development? And we can conclude that because he was by far too much concerned with such universality at this early days, "speciality" above all

24) G. H. R. Parkinson, "Introduction" in *Georg Lukács*, p. 2 Japanese Transl. p. 2-3.

25) Ady, *A magyar tragédia nagy éneke* (Great Poet of the Hungarian Tragedy) 1939. p. 28 of the volume *Az Irástudók Felelősége* (The Intellectuals' Responsibility), Moscow, 1944.

26) Mészáros. *Ibid.*, p. 44. Japanese Transl. p. 68.

had to be pushed forward in his later days.

Such historical consciousness of Lukács was further deepened by the World War I, which was straightforwardly expressed in his writing entitled "Theory of Novel" in 1914–15. Lukács made recollection of it in the following way. "From the winter of 1914 to 1915 I kept opposing against the war, always making objection against the meaninglessness and inhumanity of war and subjectively making my passionate protest. My feeling as a whole was utterly pessimistic as was desperate. I criticised the existing capitalistic status as "the days of perfect sins" by using the words of Fichte. In other words my subjective intent was to march forward to make a protest".²⁷⁾ This war which was raging not only in Hungary but also extensively throughout the whole Europe, was nothing other than a symbol of "the days of the perfect sins" and Lukács pursued this as "the tragedy of European cultures in 20th century".

An ideal image of Lukács in his youth was the Greece in its ancient days similarly as in the cases of classical thinkers such as Rousseau, Hegel or Marx.²⁸⁾ It was a harmonized world where human soul and things, or ego and the world are not separated — a world of totality. Lukács made a description of such image of an ideal world, as it were, a conception of a complete circle in the following way. "Be it a road along which we can keep going or along which we must keep going, the days when the stars in the sky could be the map of that road and could shed their light on that road, ought to be happy. All kinds of things would be something new for those days, and yet each and everything would have something of intimacy. Everything would be adventuresome, and yet it could be assets. This world would spread far out extensively and yet the world would seem to be as if our own home, because the fires kindled in one soul would be identical with the stars in their substantial characteristics. Things would be in a state of sharp distinction — the world from the ego and the light from the fire. Nevertheless they would be not in any event in a state of no interrelation because the fire would be a soul of respective light and the fire would be manifested as costumes for each fire. The behaviors of all souls would be filled with meanings in such state of affairs and be integrated into one complete circle with such dualism. They would come to completion in their meanings and also in relation to their exterior meanings."²⁹⁾

However, human being would be unable to lead their peaceful living in this circle. Man carried on the performance of his soul in the ancient world of Greece. Such creative power of the soul is the very substantial nature of man, but at the same time this substantial nature cut this circle apart. This is, indeed,

27) Georg Lukács, *Essay über Realismus*, 1950. Transl. by Itō & Komori, p. 43.

38) Toshihiko Hirai, "Lukács Theory on Alienation", Part I in *Shisō*, Vol. 527, May 1968. pp. 16.

29) Georg Lukács, "Die Theorie des Romans. Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch über die Formen der grossen Epik", 1920, in *Collected Works of Lukács* Vol. 2, Hakusui-sha, p. 25.

a man's original sin and the fatality of the modern world which should be symbolized by "the world of perfect sins". "We have found one entity which could only be a reality in the inner side of ourselves. Therefore we are having a number of abysses between cognition and behaviors, souls and phenomena, and egos and the world, across which we could have no means to build a bridge and in which each of entities would spring up, leaving each to take its own course. For that reason our substantial nature is making a claim for us and thereby leading to result in creating an ever-becoming deeper and conspicuously dangerous abyss lying between us and ourselves."³⁰⁾ Every people living in this modern world is obliged to stand indisputably in the midst of such abyss, and philosophy and literature are being created from the cognition of feelings of such tensivity of man standing in the midst of such abyss: they are, so to speak the moves to overcome such situations. As long as such situations are prevailing, our world is growing larger unlimitedly and is much richer than the ancient Greek World. However, at the same time if it is admitted that "this richness itself would aufheben (transcend) the Greek product, i.e. positive meaning and that totality",³¹⁾ then it follows that Lukács had a grasping of the image of the modern world in the way of duality of something positive and something negative, being sharply conscious of such dialectic contradictions.

According to the Hegelian philosophy of history, an individual who disintegrated himself from the immediate community, becomes independent by realising his disintegration from an objective world and at the same time he keeps fighting a hard struggle to overcome such disintegration. According to Lukács, "the creative power of soul" is also the human substantial nature and our thinking seeks for its home tracing an endless course of road. This is none other than a journey of human self-consciousness. "The process which constitutes the inner form of the novel is the problematic individual's journey to himself; the road from gloomy captivity in reality which merely exists, which is heterogeneous and is meaningless for the individual — the road from this to clear self-knowledge."³²⁾ But this journey for Lukács has no destination in the absolute knowledge as in the case of Hegel. When man loses God and is given up by God "in the days of sins," the creative power of human soul can't but continue the endless and purposeless journey, which gives rise to disintegration. "When this self-knowledge is attained", Lukács continues to say, "the ideal that has been discovered does, it is true, appear in the midst of life as the meaning of life; but the division between 'is' and 'ought' is not transcended, and cannot be transcended in the sphere in which this is enacted, namely in the life-sphere of the novel."³³⁾

30) *Ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 31.

31) *Ibid.*, Japanese Transl. P. 31.

32) *Ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 78.

33) *Ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 78.

If so, was Lukács merely living in a desperate state of soul without being able to fill up the said abyss? Undoubtedly Lukács had a mind to think that it was impossible to restore the actuality once tore off into a state of totality in the past novels.³⁴⁾ But his mind was not merely filled with a sense of inactiveness at the bottom of such renunciation, but he was rather groping after the image of a new era. This must naturally be comprehended from his expectation placed on Dostoevskii for the "arrival of something new", even if it was a statement with a question mark in his "Theory of Novel".³⁵⁾ Furthermore, Lukács endeavored to seek for the bearers to overstep the prevailing "days of completed sins" in the Hungarian Revolution and still more in the proletarian class consciousness.

The backgrounds of the thoughts in the mind of Lukács in the days when he organised the Lukács group in 1915, may be summarised as mentioned above. This group broke off from a mere saloon and formed the "Free School of Spiritual Science" which was different in nature from the "Society of Social Sciences". Later on Lukács pointed out the specific characteristics of this school by his own remarks in the following way. "What was substantially linking the instructors together, was an opposition against the capitalism in the name of idealistic philosophy. The denial of positivism was an attitude common to all of them."³⁶⁾ It may, indeed, be more properly said that Lukács, being different from the so-called modernizing movement based on rationalism and positivism of the Society of Social Sciences from an aspect of the romanticistic mysticism, was much closer to the German romanticism and was in fact non-political to a greater extent than the Society was. However, it is not proper to make an unfavorable criticism of the romanticism generally under one generalized pretext of an anti-modernization movement by merely contrasting the romanticism with the modernism. It may rather be more proper to say, as pointed out by Kettler, that the minority group who "linked the leftists' criticism with the radical revolutionary movements of the historical leftists" under a pretext of "culture" in confronting against the majority group of romanticism which felt themselves drawn towards the mere pessimistic view of life or medieval aristocratism only to oppose against the modern society was

34) *Ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 147.

35) Parkinson made the following statement about the "Theory of Novel". "The work has, indeed, serious defects. For example, seriously wrong with a theory of the novel that leads to the conclusion that Dostoevsky wrote no novels." Parkinson, *ibid.*, p. 5. Japanese Transl. p. 6. However this view one-sided. But I would rather think that Lukács in his youth was seeking for a premonition of "the arrival of something new" in Dostoevsky, by breaking up the ready-made limit of novels. Lukács made the following statement in a conclusion of "Theory of Novel" "Dostoevsky belongs to a new world. It is questionable whether he has made himself of Homer in this world or Dante...or whether he is only providing us with a few lines of an epic....". *Ibid.*, Japanese Transl. pp. 152-153.

36) Kettler, *Ibid.*, Japanese Transl. pp. 236-237.

none other than the Lukács group.³⁷⁾ We can call this group as “eastern-minded” or “East European minded” as so-called by Yon L. Erös in contrast to the “West European minded”.³⁸⁾ Of course it must be reminded that this group had a great limitation in a point that they thought problems of the social and economic conditions only as one phase of cultures at the most and that this group had nothing to do with the cognition based on social sciences.

Those “spiritualists” who gathered around Lukács and the “Free School of Spiritual Science” that was formed by them, were undoubtedly showing straightforward — they were the crisis consciousness and a strong sense of their mission to carry out their cultural renovations, commonly found among the Hungarian leftists and culturalistic intelligentsia. Kettler gave a full explanation of the characteristics of this group from the “Prospectus of the Free School” written by a good friend of Lukács, Béla Balázs and the lecture under a title of “Soul and Culture” delivered by Karl Manheim in his youth. According to their contentions, the present days are days when the mentality is about to awaken itself again and the European culture is going to take the course of a decisive turn to return to the metaphysical idealism after the positivism of 19th century. Under this circumstance “what is important is not a new knowledge but a new culture.”³⁹⁾

Yet the culture of the present days should be chargeable for lacking in the mental characteristics which should primarily enhance the value of culture. Thereby they endeavored to make a firm confirmation of the dignity of human mind through their cultural renovation and to do their best to relieve the human soul by opposing against the civilised capitalistic cultures of 20 century.

In the sense of the commitment just made, the intelligentsia who were composed of the “spiritualists” were supported by the commonly shared historical consciousness and religious messianism. At the same time, however, they couldn’t be anything more than abstract slogans and there existed considerable differences among their thoughts, too. The thoughts, ultimately speaking, would in no event be anything which could be carried into a movement, being something belonging to the individual personality in all events. When the Hungarian Revolution was brought about, this group was splitted roughly into two. Lukács took part in the Hungarian Revolution and published the “History and Class Consciousness” in 1923 and Manheim wrote the “Ideology and Utopia” in 1929. If this can be referred to as “a turning point of the destiny” of the two, then the questions such as ‘what was the cause to break them up into two, each of whom opposing against the other?’ and ‘what was the underlying back ground of opinions held by each of them?’, must be clarified.

37) Kettler, *ibid.*, Japanese Transl. pp. 217.

38) Kettler, *ibid.*, Japanese Trans. p. 237.

39) Kettler, *ibid.*, Japanese Transl. pp. 238–39.

III From Crisis Consciousness to Class Consciousness

(1) From Bourgeois Democratic Revolution to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The World War I couldn't but shake up the Hungarian despotism. A suffering of the defeat became decisive in the fall of 1918. The total number of deaths of the Hungarian army during the Great War counted approximately as many as 660,000, the injured 740,000 and captives 730,000: the loss of manpower was as great as 10% of her total population of about 21,000,000. Moreover, because of an extreme shortage of commodities especially in urban areas and pressed ways of national living, the bourgeois radicals and social democrats began to engage themselves suddenly and more actively in the anti-war movements in an increasing tendency and many large-scaled demonstrations took place. Under such pressing circumstance the Karl V who used to be held as a symbol of Hungarian absolute monarch decided the abdication of the throne and was forced to leave the matters of cabinet formation in the hand of Count Mihály Károlyi who used to be a leader of opposing parties in the wartime Parliament. The ruling in the way of old political system came to be collapsed and the former antigovernment-elements assumed the seat of a new authoritative power. The Count Károlyi immediately formed a coalition government of Bourgeois-Social Democratic Party; composed of Bourgeois Opposing Party of his own forming inside of the former Parliament, the bourgeois radicals under a leadership of Oszkár Jászi outside of the Parliament and Social Democratic Party under leaderships of Zsigmond Kunfi and Ernő Garami. This was the so-called "The Autumn Rose Revolution" and this revolution by the bourgeois democrats was carried out without any bloodshed.⁴⁰⁾

This democratic revolution was not merely a long-awaited historical reformation for many anti-monarchy parties that had been struggling for bare existence under the the ancien régime, but also was a new daybreak for the whole Hungarian people. Jászi gave the following statement to express his delight and expectation at the beginning of the revolution by making recollection of the "Draft Announcement" for the new National Congress in his "Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary". "Every line of it was written really in a democratic way being filled with breaths of the progress of society. We have been pushing the necessary reforms forward to its maximum extent as far as generally possible at the stage of a given economic and cultural development of this country: independence and legislation of Hungary, universal suffrage, international democratic alliance with neighboring countries, redistribution of privately owned large land, industrial policies by taking examples from other most progressive countries, if put in a few words, the governing right in the hands of farmers and the mass of laborers under

40) Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 83.

guidance of really creative and excellent intelligentsia — these are basic principles of the Hungarian October Revolution and with respects to these points there was a unanimous approval of public opinions not only of the related three parties at least in the beginning, but if ventured to say, of all working people.⁴¹⁾ It is also evident that these words were in line with the vision of modernization movements used to be conceived by the Society of Social Sciences supported and maintained by the Jászi group.

Yet the Hungarian democratic revolution was facing with extremely many difficulties from the very beginning and it incurred many serious contradictions. Since Hungary under the Armistice Treaty of 13th November had to lose one half of her old territories and the railroad net was seized by victorious counties, the shortage of living necessities was aggravated in much more serious and worse extent than during the wartime and such situation gave rise to riots and uprisings everywhere. Although the newly formed government had to cope with such political and economic crisis with a powerful posture, the said three powers regimented in the National Congress, could neither establish effective and adequate countermeasures owing to few political experience, nor lay a firm foothold of their own on the mass owing to their organisational weakness. The real power was then held rather by Józseph Pogány, Budapest Soldiers' Council under a leadership of young officers and Budapest Workers' Council: each of them having weapons and armed people's army and being in readiness for mobilization at any time. Since these organisations in those days were under supervision of the Social Democratic Party, in despite of the fact that only two members of them were allowed to become the cabinet ministers, these organisations had substantially much stronger power than bourgeois.⁴²⁾ However, the Social Democratic Party rather made a compromise with reformative policies of bourgeois without directly setting up a socialistic demand under the bourgeois administration and as its results a confrontation of "Reform or Revolution?" was given rise in the midst of socialists. The leftist radical party made an immediate appeal to the realisation of the socialistic political power through military uprising in opposition to "a quiet transitional road from war to peace" maintained by the majority party of social democrats. These people were so to speak a Rosa Luxemburg and Mehring in the Hungarian Revolution.

In the early part of November "the independent democratic socialist group" of Hungary announced their demand to establish the "Pure Socialist Republic" in their "Manifesto to the Proletariat of Hungary" in the following way. "There will be no privilege, exploitation, and lords and servants, but everyone will be

41) Oszkár Jászi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary*, London, 1924, p. 36.

42) Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 86.

workers and there will be only employer, the community of citizens — the state!!”⁴³⁾ Land should be re-distributed and the income must be paid in accordance with socially useful production under a new system, under which every component member will be working. This radicalist group was composed of syndicalists, engineer socialists and students for radicalist movements.⁴⁴⁾ They were excluded from the Hungarian People’s Congress and Budapest Worker’s Council by the majority of the Socialist Democratic Party at the beginning stage of revolution and for this reason their organisation was rather weak, getting very little support by the mass of people, but their power began to be strengthened gradually mainly owing to their activities outside of the Party.

It was on 16th November that the newly established government and the Social Democratic Party was drawn into a complete confusion when Béla Kun, who was fully equipped with teachings of the Russian Revolution, came back to Hungary. He then pointed out the similarity between the provisional government during the Russian revolution and the Károlyi Government during the Hungarian revolution and declared that “The Hungarian Kerenshchina will lead to the same end as was the case in Russia ... The Hungarian opportunists will have their October soon ...”.⁴⁵⁾ Hungarian fugitives who had much to learn in Russia and heretics of the Socialist Democratic Party met together on 24th November and formed the Communist Party of Hungary. Six members from Hungarian Volshevik, four members from the Social Democratic Party, one member respectively from the Independent Social Democrats, Revolutionary Social Democrats and Engineer Social Democrats — 13 members in all⁴⁶⁾—were appointed to be the Central Committee. At the same time they published the party organ entitled “Red Flag” (*Vörös Ujság*) and began their explicit activities of the Council towards Dictatorship of the proletariat taking a model of the Russian Revolution. Béla Szántó made a summary of the problems at issue contained in the “Class Struggle and Dictatorship of Proletariat in Hungary” (1920) in the following way. “The prerequisites to the class struggle is to foster the class consciousness of Hungarian proletariat, to set the proletariat apart from the ruling class spoiled by the war crimes and to awaken their sense of international solidarity. Under

43) S. Gábor (eds.), “A Magyar Munkásmozgalom Történetének Válogatott Dokumentumai” *Selected Documents from the History of the Hungarian Workers’ Movements*, Vol. 5, pp. 310–11, (Tökés, p. 90).

44) Gyula Hevcsi, *Egy Mérnök a Forradalomban* (An Engineer in the Revolution), Budapest, Europe, 1959. p. 103 (Tökés, p. 31)

45) Bela Kun, “Hungarian Kerenskyism”, *Pravda*, Oct. 31, Nov. 1, 1918 (Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 94)

46) The members of the central committee were composed of Kun, Rabinovits, Seidler, Vántus, Pór and Nánássy from Hungarian Volshevik; Vágó, Szántó, László and Rudas from Social Democratic Party; Solmo, independent socialist; Korven, revolutionary socialist; and Hevesi, engineer socialist. Tökés, *ibid.*, pp. 95–96.

such circumstances the Hungarian proletariat will be enabled to participate in a campaign of the world revolution of proletariat and to be linked together with the Soviet in Russia."⁴⁷ When many leftist revolutionary groups regimented themselves into the Communist Party, the movement of the proletarian revolution in Hungary began to become suddenly active.

(2) Background of Lukács' Class Consciousness

Lukács made following statement in his "Autobiography of his Thoughts", "After a little hesitation in December I joined the Hungarian Communist Party". Among the aforementioned "spiritualists", those who remained to act in concert with Lukács were Balázs, Fogarasi and Bulgár., while those who remained to be members of the group were Mannheim, Hauser, Fülepi, Anna Lesznay. Of course, Mannheim had no particular objection against the revolution and resumed the post of the professor of philosophy at the University of Budapest upon being requested by the Revolutionary Council in those days of 1919-revolution. But Mannheim who had an extreme feeling of hatred as if physiologically toward the then real politics, turned his back to the heated surrounding atmosphere and staked his life to stick to the road beyond politics.⁴⁸ Kettler made a quotation of the following critical remark from the "Annals of Conversation with Anna Lesznay". "Joining of Lukács with the Party was welcomed with a great surprise in the midst of such atmosphere created with in the Group and Saul was completely changed into Paul."⁴⁹ It must undoubtedly have appeared to be a great surprise to those who used to acknowledge only a strong nihilism and mysticism in Lukács during the wartime, but I think it is possible to draw a qualitative difference in the thoughts held by two intellectuals, from the facts that Lukács had been groping in pursuit of a historical carrier to overcome the gap between man and the world and between "is" and "ought" and how Lukács sought it in his "Theory of Novel" according to the Hegelian dialectics, while on the other hand Mannheim gave an explanation of crisis of culture in his lecture "Souls and Cultures" according to Comte.

Needless to say, I have no least intention to make a simple distinction of Mannheim and Lukács merely by using a schema of "A relativist or dialectician?" If viewed from an aspect of the Hegelianism, there appeared in succession some moves to combine Hegel and Marx together under the new-Hegelianism in those days in 1910's in opposition against the neo-Kantianism which was predominant in the early days of this century. A few illustrations of such moves are seen in the published works such as "Ideology of Cultural Philosophy" by D. Koigen (1910), "Hegel and Marx" by J. Plenge (1911), "Marx and Hegel" by S.

47) Béla Szántó, *Klassenkämpfe und die Diktatur des Proletariats in Ungarn*, Wien, 1920, S. 24.

48) Tooru Takahashi, *Mannheim and Ortega*, Chuokōron-sha. p. 25.

49) Kettler, *ibid.*, Japanese Transl. p. 248.

Hellander (1920) and "Hegelianism and Marxism" by S. Marck (1922). But the essence of dialectics is not concerned with categorical consistency or relationships as in the case of the formal logics is. It rather seeks to make a clear recognition of the stream of the world history from a broad standpoint of historical philosophy, to be concerned with the dynamic moves of history and to clarify the interrelationships between the subjective entity and the objective world.

As far as this point is concerned, Lukács in his youth was not a mere ideological mysticist from the beginning. We have already discussed that Lukács was seeking for combination with proletariat through "Thália Theatre Movement" while studying at the Budapest University: that he became a member of the "Budapest Socialist Student Club" formed by Ervin Szabó: that Lukács had no small influences from anarcho-syndicalism. Of course, the Hegelian dialectics had definitely something contradictory to anarchism, but these two ideas were so mixed up in the mind of Lukács as to be admitted by himself that the thoughts of Lukács in those days were of extremely complicated nature. And it was assumably because of this that spontaneity on some occasions and absoluteness or discipline of the party on the other occasions were over-emphasised. Be the matter as it may, Lukács in his early days was strongly conscious of a moral mission for the historical reformation through Szabó, and this was one of the dominant causes to make his Marxism implanted with a strong sense of ethicalism.

In December 1918 Hungarian Communist Party made public propaganda of the meaning of proletarian revolution through the Soldier' Council, Workers' Council and all other similar organisations in confronting against the bourgeois political and administrative powers. Szántó and Rudas who joined the Communist Party leaving from the leftist group of Social Democratic Party severely impeached the Internationale II for the war crimes and advocated to take the same road as the Soviet Union traced.⁵⁰⁾ On the other hand, Lukács and Fogarasi who became a propaganda committee of the Party, after breaking themselves off from the convention of "spiritualist", proceeded to engage themselves in delivering lectures of the international class struggle and the moral mission of proletarian revolution. I can't at the present moment make the content of these lectures clear but it is possible to make his standpoint in those days of revolution clear from his writings on political matters entitled "Tactics and Ethics" drafted during the period up to the dictatorship of proletariat and also to find what was underlying on the background of his "History and Class Consciousness" in the light of aforementioned findings.⁵¹⁾

50) Tökés, *ibid.*, p. 108.

51) Georg Lukács, *Taktika és etika*, Budapest, 1919. This writing was translated into Germany contained in Peter Ludz, ed. *Schriften zur Ideologie und Politik*, 1967 and also Luchterhand, "Georg Lukács Works, Frühschriften II, 1968. Its Japanese version by H. Ikeda is contained in *Collected Works of Lukács in his early Day — Political Writing I*, Gōdō Publishing Co.

Now, then, the consciousness of crisis of Hungarian or rather the whole European cultures in the minds of the leftist intelligentsia made them find the means to overcome the said imminent crisis in proletariat or rather particularly in the class consciousness of proletariat. Lukács made his contention as if he were opposing against the "spiritualist group" in the following way. "Ethics is making the following demand to the conscience and consciousness of responsibility of every individual. That is, so to speak, the turn of the fate of the world is dependent upon whether each individual is active or inactive."⁵²⁾ Furthermore Lukács staked the destiny of Hungary on the class consciousness of proletariat and he devoted all of his efforts for that purpose, expecting that the ultimate and total emancipation of human beings which was his basic principle of universality would be realised only when his proletarian revolution could be carried out by overstepping the limits of the bourgeois revolution. Thus, it was only through the proletarian revolution that "the transcendental aim could be changed into an immanent aim". By this process it is meant that a type of utopian society should be cleared and brought into existence through constant materialisation, step by step, in conformity with logics of history". In other words it means that the aim is getting closer to its self-realisation rather than straightforward stepping into the existing social realities."⁵³⁾ It will be clearly seen that in these words the Hegelian philosophy of history is vividly reflected.⁵⁴⁾

Kautsky made distinction between ethics and material substance in the "Ethics and Materialistic Interpretation of History" (1906) and attempted to substantiate the former by the latter. In sharp contrast to such idea, Lukács implanted an idea of ethics and cognition to the class consciousness of proletariat, and attempted to launch into the realities by placing emphasis on the importance to carry out the proletarian revolution by one's own highest knowledge and conscience. "A morally right conduct is extremely closely related with a right cognition of the presently existing historical and philosophical situations. And the only one way in which such cognition could be made, is for everyone to exert such effort as to make conscious of such self-consciousness. The first and necessary requirement to serve for the said purpose is to form the class consciousness. So that a right conduct should be a right true norm the class consciousness must be formed, to begin with, in one's mind by conceiving a mission from an angle of the world history and by becoming conscious of one's own responsibility."⁵⁵⁾ If viewed in this way, it ought to be helpful for easier understanding of the meaning of my statement given before with respect to the totality of subjective entity of the class conscious-

52) Lukács, *ibid.*, S. 7. Japanese Transl. p. 19.

63) Lukács, *ibid.*, S. 3. Japanese Transl. p. 14-15.

54) Toshihiko Hirai, "Historical Consciousness in East Europe" in *Shisō*, Vol. 489, March 1965. p. 59.

55) Lukács, *ibid.*, S. 9. Japanese Transl. pp. 21-22.

ness.

Now, with all that have been discussed so far, it will lead us to say that in contrast to the fact that Karl Korsch, advocated the proletarian revolution through autonomous control of the workers belonging to their Council,⁵⁶⁾ the thoughts of Lukács was no more than an extremely abstract claim and that his standpoint was based on an optimist and presupposed harmonious view of life even if compared with his later works entitled "Reification and Consciousness of Proletariat". However, in a sense that he made grasp of the class consciousness as an objective possibility and he was considering that it could not be anything more than the first step of human emancipation, he must have had sufficient consideration for the relative weight of the class struggle to be further effectuated. Yet, speaking of his basic idea as a whole, it was an attempt to seek a universality of the world history in a primitive form of the class consciousness on the part of proletariat. That is the reason why this point had to be reversely changed later so that an emphasis had to be placed on the category of speciality, the mediation between "is" and "ought". However, isn't it all the more assumably that something of elementary nature might have been hidden in the said pursuit for such primitive universality? And it may safely be said that this very point is indicative of the unique character of Lukács.

Incidentally, as far as Lukács was endeavoring to press on realities from consciousness by all means, he was still standing on an extended line of the cultural renovation movements and all kinds of the physical and actually existing relations had been set apart from his visual field as something to be denied, and the phase of breaking off from all historical developments in the past had to show up. "The class struggle of proletariat means that a certain specific social order which is entirely different from any society ever existed before or a social order where any kind of oppressor can no longer exist will be given birth. No sooner than the days of economic subordination which is humiliation of the human dignity come to terminate — as declared by Marx — the blind and almighty power of economic forces ought to be broken up and the other kind of force deserving well of higher and more proper human dignity ought to be replaced. Therefore, a careful consideration and a correct cognition of true balancing of the forces of the prevailing economic and social conditions always, ought to be the mere prerequisites for correct conducts and correct tactics in the socialistic sense of the words and should not be the grounds for judgement of correctness."⁵⁷⁾ In this specific way of thinking the speciality of Lukács as "spiritualists" is shown up in a brighter shade and it is evident that how poor such idea is, if compared with Lenin. Nevertheless it ought

56) Toshihiko Hirai, "Marxism of Karl Korsch" in *Risō: Contemporary Leftists' Thoughts*, No. 451. December 1970. p. 57.

57) Lukács, *ibid.*, S. 4. Japanese Transl. p. 15.

to become possible, as pointed out by Mészáros, to seek after the primary factors, through which Lukács tried to build up and improve his own thought by making practical decision upon occasion to meet the requirements of the world history as if the task of an eternal revolution had been assigned him, always facing toward his ultimate aim.⁵⁸⁾

58) About Lukács in the days of proletarian revolution, this subject will be taken up in another writing entitled *Lukacs and Hungarian Soviet Republic*.