

As well the subject as the sovereign.
Gower merits closer study in any examination of ideas current in Richard II's England. It is perhaps significant that in one version of the *Confessio Amantis*, where Fr Gervase finds 'no reference to Richard', Gower replaces

A bok for king Richards sake
with A bok for Engelondes sake,
The yer sextenthe of kyng Richarde.

Fuller discussion of what ideas were current in Richard's court about England, kingship, imperium, and community would have been welcome. There is reference to the study of Roman Law which one would like to see expanded. There could be something more about the significance of someone like Roger Walden, a butcher's son, among the king's secretaries. A notable gap is caused by the absence of any discussion of the higher clergy and their relationship to Court and government; the few references to Archbishop Arundel do not fill the gap.

It is one of the merits of this book that we want more and that, deliberately, discussion and indeed argument is provoked. One last suggestion, which might be worth considering; the author's query as to why St Catherine of Alexandria was such a popular saint, in an age when women mattered so much at court and elsewhere, may be largely answered by a comparison of the fictional heroine Felice of Warwick with the figure of Catherine current in the *Legenda Aurea*. Beautiful, noble, learned and indomitable, Catherine is so like Felice, except that she has Christ alone for spouse.

There are some misprints to be corrected in the next edition, e.g. on pp. 31, 59, 112, 120, 168, 196. Something might be added on p. 179 to explain the system of quotation from Langland. And why not use the modernization of *Piers Plowman* by Henry Wells, so highly commended by Mr Christopher Dawson and Professors Coghill and R. W. Chambers?

ANTHONY ROSS, O.P.

KARL MARX: THE EVOLUTION OF HIS THOUGHT, by Roger Garaudy. *Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1968.* 223 pp. 25s. (Translation of: Karl Marx, *Seghers, Paris, 1964*, by Nan Apotheker.)

DIALOGUE OF CHRISTIANITY AND MARXISM, edited by James Klugmann. *Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1968.* 110 pp. 7s. 6d.

Sartre's Marxism, with its emphasis upon the central place of human praxis, has been developed outside but in an often strained dialogue with the French Communist Party; Louis Althusser's anti-humanist Marxist structuralism has been developed inside the French Party, but also in a strained dialogue. Roger Garaudy, a prominent member of the Political Bureau of the French Party, has attempted, in *Karl Marx*, to rid Marxism 'of the revisions which, for three-quarters of a century, have sought to drape themselves in its prestige'. The 'hope' of these revisions, which include phenomenology, existentialism, 'even theology', was the domestication of 'the demand and the means for transforming the world' (p. 12). On the other hand, Garaudy aims to put 'an end to the dogmatic distortions engendered or fostered by some of Stalin's interpretations, which took Marxism back to the infantile stage of pre-critical philosophy' (p. 13). Garaudy's book is an excellent statement of the theoretical position of European Communist Parties on Marx's work. It is carefully unpretentious, unadventurous, liberally sprinkled with optimistic declarations and observations. Its approaches to the contradictions of its positions are frustratingly meretricious.

Garaudy's attack on revisionism is actually

limited to one or two pejorative asides. Jean Yves Calvez' *La Pensée de Karl Marx*, is accused of profoundly reducing Marx's thought. Husserl, identified with Hegel, is immediately dismissed as an idealist. (But phenomenology is not rejected out of hand.) Little space is devoted to theology, but Garaudy notes that the Christian ideal of freedom is a conception not 'rooted in history and mankind's struggles'. Stalin is cited, and admonished, once, in connection with the historical schematization given in Stalin's *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*. Garaudy accuses Stalin of setting up a rigid Ptolemaic hypothesis.

No other revisionists are taken up directly. There is, it is true, a passing reference to the notion of the 'new middle classes'. Garaudy's refusal to extend and follow up the logic of his argument here is one of the most frustrating moments of the book. Garaudy upholds the view that Marx argued that 'capitalism leads to the growing proletarianization of the middle classes who, having once been owners of capital, no longer own anything beyond their own labour power', but follows this by saying that the 'new middle classes are primarily distinguished from the old middle classes only by the fact that they are no longer owners of the means of production but wage workers,

even if their wage level, the traditions they create for themselves, their way of life and their prejudices differentiate them, strictly speaking, from the proletariat' (p. 160). The casual nature of Garaudy's approach to this problem, the crucial problem of the determination of social class, in fact leaves the worrying thought that Garaudy might not even see the significance of his own statement. Is it possible that he is arguing that social differentiation and class polarization are *both* occurring?

The defence of Marxism against the revisionists is not persuasive, and in fact the major opponents of Garaudy's Marxism are not met at all—there is no mention or reference to the works of Lukacs, Sartre, Marcuse, Althusser, etc. It is not a great work of incisive political polemic.

'A total and militant humanism' is Garaudy's characterization of Marxism, and Garaudy refers many times to the notion of the 'total man'—sometimes with an unashamed religiosity. 'The "total man" . . . is not only man freed of alienation but man who partakes of universal life' (p. 75). 'The destruction of the capitalist, profit-based economy will put an end to the alienation of man and create the conditions for the expansion of the total man' (p. 158). As can be seen from these two quotations the notion of the total man is used by Garaudy in a completely uncritical way, its meaning always idealized and banal. The key quotation from Marx in this context doesn't help: Communism is the condition where 'anyone in whom there is a potential Raphael should be able to develop without hindrance', Or in Garaudy's words, the 'total man really grows when, in the classless society, the life of the individual and the life of society are no longer in opposition to each other' (p. 75). This rather crude essentialism of individual goodness pervades the book. The consequence has often been disastrous in the field of cultural analysis, and it is once more in this work: as an example of increasing alienation, apparently synonymous with a reduction in the 'total man', he says, 'In Paris, the amateur popular choruses which flourished in 1938 no longer exist, and the number of amateur concert societies has decreased in 20 years from 53 to 12, yielding to the passive leisure pursuits of television', there is a 'nervous attrition degrading . . . (the worker's) leisure by not affording

him anything other than passive, dehumanized and commercialized distractions' (p. 158). Thus in rejecting the changing technological basis of leisure Garaudy falls into conservatism based on an essentialist moralism.

A writer who strikingly resembles Garaudy in both style and mode of analysis is the English Marxist John Lewis who opens the *Dialogue of Christianity and Marxism* (containing the views of Christians and Marxists). Lewis says, 'Man is not *anything* inherently. . . . He remakes society when it becomes imperatively necessary, when it is that or disaster. When he does so, this in due course turns him into a better man, a man who is a bit nearer being a real man' (p. 103). And it is Lewis who quotes Garaudy: 'religion was not merely the "opium of the people", nor did it everywhere and at all times direct men from action or from struggle' (p. 4). The basis of the dialogue, says Lewis, is that 'While the Church is abandoning her crusade against Communism, Marxism has recognized the folly of the anti-God campaign' (p. 5). The dialogue centres largely on attempts to remove misunderstandings and to elicit mutually favourable, if tentative, attitudes to serious acceptance of the two positions as social movements and institutions which are certain to co-exist for some considerable period of time. Any really significant outcome of the dialogue in terms of mutual advance would have to involve two movements: Christians would have to move to a Marxist critique of the structure of society (as the *Slant* group has done), the Communists would have to move to an acceptance of the Church as a possible instrument of revolutionary, or at least progressive social change. Unfortunately, the dialogue remains very much at the level of humanist moralism, which merely reveals both groups as negatives of the existing socialist order: it is immoral. A Marxist account of the position of the Church in English culture and its role in the contemporary social structure as an institution, and an estimation of the revolutionary potential of the Church are fatal absences, however. A rejection of the present social structure by Christians is often the claim for a pre-industrial conflict-free community, a simple heaven. If that is the Christian case, it cannot be compatible with Marxism, even though it may think capitalism immoral and press for social change.

MICHAEL GANE