

CARTON 121

WRITINGS

"CULTURAL CHAUVINISM", VENCEREMOS BRIGADE

1971

ALLEN, PAM

2017/193
c

venceremos
brigade

bay area
regional

political
education
committee



Bob

topic
number

6

cultural chauvinism

This paper was prepared by the
Political Education Committee of
the Bay Area Regional Committee

Introduction:
reasons for
studying cul-
tural chauvinism

In our movement the concept of cultural chauvinism is a continuing source of misunderstanding. Like racism, the subject of cultural chauvinism is often treated in a personal and emotional way, instead of attempting to understand how it fits into the over-all capitalist social system. We cannot effectively combat cultural chauvinism unless we understand its social origins and its present ideological uses.

There are two other reasons for studying cultural chauvinism. In the first place, cultural chauvinism is a part of the ideology of Western imperialism. It provides a convenient set of ideas that serve to rationalize and justify the continued imperialist exploitation of the Third World. Secondly, because cultural chauvinist thinking pervades the capitalist societies of the West, it has even affected the left-wing movements in these countries, distorting and corrupting their understanding of the world-wide socialist struggle. This has caused some would-be radicals to, in effect, ally themselves with the imperialists against Third World socialists. It is especially important for Brigadistas, who will be living and working in a country which is attempting to construct a socialist culture, to sort out and seek to understand the bourgeois mental baggage we have acquired as a result of having been conditioned for many years by the capitalist culture of the U.S.

Bob
Marian
Summary

problem
with material
of

Two aspects
of culture

CULTURE

An initial source of confusion about cultural chauvinism is the basic idea of culture. What is culture? How may it be understood? Culture can be considered to have two mutually dependent aspects: non-material and material. The non-material aspect of culture includes the totality of knowledge and ideas (e.g. science and art), values (e.g. status symbols), patterns of behavior (e.g. social relations between capitalists and workers), and social institutions (e.g. the market, private property, the educational system) which operate in a given society. The most basic feature of the non-material culture is the manner in which a society organizes the productive life of its members (based on its historically developed technical levels, including both technical knowledge and "hardware.") This is so because the mode of production and resulting work relations are crucial in shaping many other aspects of the non-material culture, as will be discussed in following pages.

The material culture includes all artifacts and material goods and wealth (especially the instruments of production) resulting from human activity in a given society. Material culture is the social product of organized human labor. However, the decision as to what is produced is not merely a reflection of the physical needs of the masses. This decision is an outgrowth of the values and interests of the classes that control the production process. Thus, material and non-material culture are interdependent, and both are intimately linked to the social process of production. Indeed, organized social production is the foundation of all culture.

Misunderstandings of culture

Culture is sometimes defined in ways that can be completely misleading. For example, it is often equated with literature and art: to be a "cultured" person is to be familiar with the arts. This understanding of culture is exceedingly narrow and class-biased. Literature and art are expressions

①

1) social view
2) culture and
production and
is a product of
history (e.g. public education)
all separate
culture forms
2 social
production

①
of social consciousness. As such they are certainly a part of culture, but not its totality. Moreover, culture is not the exclusive "property" of certain privileged classes which patronize or produce art; cultural development depends on the social labor (physical and mental) of all the people. Even the solitary artist working alone must be a part of a symbol-sharing community that creates the basic social values (e.g. concepts of beauty, good, truth, etc.) and raw idea-materials that go into his art. Without these social essentials he could not produce any art. Therefore, "his" art is in reality a social process. ②

①
Youth culture Today the term "youth culture" has come into popular usage. This is another misleading view of culture. Youth culture refers primarily to personal life-styles; that is, living arrangements, modes of dress and speech, different forms of music and entertainment. Although youth culture is often hailed as "revolutionary," it frequently boils down to changes in styles and patterns of consumption behavior that have little if any revolutionary content. In what way is it more revolutionary to wear Levis and collect Rolling Stone albums than to wear three-button suits and attend the opera? Obviously this question oversimplifies the problem, but the point is that if we restrict culture to mean personal life-styles, then revolution is reduced to exchanging one style for another. Clearly, such a "revolution" would have little meaning or value for most of the world's peoples. ⑤

②
Why does the youth culture focus so much on life-styles? The idea of a youth culture originated in the rebellion of discontented middle-class white youth. A major reason for this rebellion was that thousands of white youth were being prevented from entering productive roles in American society by the stagnating economy of the Sixties. Excluded from meaningful productive roles, these alienated youth proceeded to make a virtue of necessity by ostensibly rejecting what they considered to be the bourgeois values and life-styles of their parents. Many of them rejected the capitalist work ethic

rural
communes?

and instead withdrew into communes to create new life-styles. Unfortunately, the life-styles created were often little more than the inverse of the bourgeois life-style, since they were done in a social vacuum and were unrelated to the relations of production, the process of meeting basic human needs. Thus, youth culture offered a dramatically "new" way of "relating" and consuming in a society that remained basically unchanged.

It must be admitted that youth culture has made a positive contribution to the political movement by raising questions about destructive social values, and by pointing out the ways in which capitalist society dehumanizes even those who are not victims of brutal economic or racial oppression. However, it has misled some people into thinking that by changing their personal life-styles they can somehow change the social system. This faulty line of thinking ignores the fact that personal life-styles simply reflect the possibilities inherent in the existing social system, not vice versa. (Youth culture represents alienation from the urban rat-race and suburban status seeking, but it does not transcend or overturn these social realities.) Also, this kind of reasoning tends to foster selfish individualism -- "doing your own thing" -- at the expense of collective action. Youth culture thus becomes an expression of individual privilege that runs directly counter to the collective social needs of the poor and working classes. For the bulk of the population individual liberation can come only as the result of uniting to overthrow the entire oppressive system, not by seeking out a protected niche within it for individual salvation. Thus we can now see that youth culture is tolerated as a "liberated" island within capitalist America because (1) it does not threaten basic production relations, (2) it has nothing to offer the poor or discontented workers, and (3) it is a fertile hunting ground for hip capitalists looking to hustle new styles of music, clothes, health foods, etc.

e.g.
competition

e.g. street markets

③

youth culture
regresses to individual
production or small-
scale social production
e.g. rural communes

Culture as a
"thing-in-it-
self"

Culture is often regarded as an independent thing-in-itself. Each nation is said to have its own

- ① Culture as maker of history, rather than culture as made by history
 ② ~~the~~ world, no longer consists of isolated national cultures
 ③ Domination of capitalist culture which is international



Bob

refer to underdevelopment paper

peculiar culture which develops according to its own internal rules and laws without regard to any external factors. Before the advent of European colonialism and the diffusion of capitalist culture to almost all parts of the world, this view of culture had much validity. But in the world as it has existed since about 1700, the subordination of traditional cultures to capitalist penetration is the outstanding feature. The result has been a globalized capitalist culture. Capitalism destroyed the basis of traditional cultures by imposing capitalist property and work relations. Capitalism thus swept away the old cultures or reconstructed them in its own image. At the same time, however, the development of capitalism from the commercial to the industrial stage was made possible by Europe's contact with and exploitation of the colonial world. Thus capitalist culture, too, must be examined from an international rather than a national perspective.

CHANGES IN CULTURAL LIFE UNDER CAPITALISM

From the standpoint of culture capitalism has been a revolutionary force. It has provided the driving power for drastic changes in all aspects of social life. In Europe this process occurred gradually and was spread over several centuries. This is not to imply that no hardship accompanied the transition from feudalism to capitalism. The enclosure movement in England, for example, in which peasants were forced off their communal lands in order to facilitate the commercialization of agriculture, caused much strife and hardship for the peasantry. But this probably was not as severe as the wholesale social disruption spawned by the relatively sudden imposition of capitalist colonialism on non-European societies. The spread of the market (with its definition of land and labor as commodities) tore Third World peoples up by their roots and shook them loose from social relationships that had existed for centuries. By radically transforming the economies and social structures of colonized nations, capitalism forcibly shut the door on the past

Bob

Summarize

* hardship of this process

Can't reverse growth (historical judgement)

e.g. transition from
peasantry to proletarian
can't be reversed

and made any kind of real "return" to the old way
of life impossible.

Changes in the
production pro-
cess, work re-
lations

progressive
stage

cf. modern
with
market
wage
maker

~~Basic contradiction~~

basic contradiction
of capitalism:
social production
vs private
appropriation.

exploits labor

Wherever it has penetrated, capitalism has brought
about basic changes in social life. To begin with,
it completely altered the process of production.

Capitalism "socialized" the production process by
(1) replacing the individual producer of pre-capi-
talist societies with an organized social workforce,
and (2) replacing individual tools with social
tools (e.g. plantations, factories, etc.) However,
the developing capitalist classes assured their
control over this social process by imposing the
concept of capitalist private property, under
which ownership is separated from creation. Thus,
all "things," including labor power, were reduced
to commodities that could be bought and sold as
property on the market. This in turn stimulated a
tremendous circulation of money and commodities
as a subsidiary aspect of capitalism. More import-
antly, however, capitalist production revolutionized
work relations. The alienation of the worker from
the land and the means of production combined with
the money-wage system made the capitalist class (and
not the workers) the controller of the quantity and
type of work performed by the workers. The worker,
compelled to sell his labor power (in order to
live) to the owner of the means of production (the
capitalist), was thereby reduced to a mere cog in
the capitalist social order. The capitalist-puritan
work ethic -- extolling the virtues of hard labor --
sprang forth as part of the ideology to justify this
social relationship.

Concentration of capital

On the world scale the emergence of capitalism re-
sulted in the concentration of capital (the means
of production) in a small part of the world --
western Europe. The early colonial plunder of the
non-European world combined with the capitalist
slave trade provided a global base for the accumu-
lation of capital in Europe. Moreover, by breaking
up the age-old patterns of their agricultural econ-
omy, and by forcing shifts to exportable crops,
colonialism destroyed the self-sufficiency of the
colonized societies. Instead, these societies were

brought into the world-wide system of commodity circulation, contributing their economic "surplus" to the growing capital of Europe. Colonialism also created a vast pool of pauperized labor as it seized peasant-occupied lands for plantation purposes and other uses by foreign enterprise. Traditional craftsmen were reduced to common wage laborers as ancient handicrafts were exposed to withering competition from European industrial exports.

This process of capital accumulation in the industrially advanced capitalist nations -- and consequent "underdevelopment" of much of the rest of the world -- was frozen in place with the advent of imperialism. Where colonialism plundered nations, imperialism sought to block their economic development by preventing the accumulation of capital and the creation of an industrial base. Although the expansion of commodity circulation, the pauperization of large numbers of peasants and artisans, and the contact with advanced technology provided a powerful impetus to the development of capitalism in the colonized world, this development was forcibly shunted from its normal course, distorted and crippled to suit the purposes of Western imperialism.

Changes in family life

The emergence of the capitalist mode of production and capitalist property relations affected other basic areas of social life. Traditional family structures were radically transformed and disorganized. For the capitalist bourgeoisie the monogamous, nuclear family became the new social ideal. This family structure provided a convenient social instrument for transmitting property from father to son (with the mother as a subordinate intermediary). For workers a different dynamic was involved. As capitalism developed and the peasants were wrenched from the land by the commercialization of agriculture, the traditional large, extended family structure started to disintegrate. The move from the rural areas to towns and cities in search of work broke up old family life patterns. Further, socialized production under capitalism required a large highly mobile labor

7

average family residence in U.S. is 2 yrs

Cf. underdevelopment
paper

Creates underdev
+ economic
dependency

bourgeois
family &
property
prevents dispersal
of property
"Forsythe Saga"

Working class
family &
mobility

force that could migrate easily from one workplace to another in accordance with cyclical variations in labor requirements. Consequently, the extended family was fragmented into the close-knit nuclear family: husband, wife and a few children. But the pressure of capitalist work relations made any form of stable family life impossible for many workers, especially among those in the reserve army of unskilled labor who are compelled to migrate in search of work even more frequently than the more "secure" sections of the working class. Thus, the family tended to break up into smaller units or fall apart altogether under the impact of capitalism.

West African
cities

Changes in
education

education
previously
limited

shoe maker
weaver

workers may perform
many different jobs
in one lifetime.
need general
ed. skills

delivery job
cleaner
assembly line worker
machine operator
(shoes
weaving)

interchangeability

The institution of education gives us another vantage point from which to examine cultural changes under capitalism. In pre-capitalist societies formal education was virtually non-existent for the masses (except for religious indoctrination). Formal education was reserved for those aspiring to enter the governing bureaucracy (as in ancient China) or it served as a method of class differentiation (as in medieval Europe). Individual skills were passed on from craftsman to apprentice, but this too affected only a small part of the population.

With the development of social production under capitalism, education became "democratized." Public educational systems were established to provide rudimentary training for the masses. Social production requires the dissemination of generalized education among the workers who must be prepared to perform a wide range of jobs and to move easily from one job to another as technological changes bring about changes in production. Hence capitalist production demands widespread general knowledge, not the ossified skills of the artisan. *interchangeability of workers*

At the same time, college and university education is structured to provide the capitalist with an elite of managers, scientists, engineers, teachers, and other professionals to run the private and pub-

lic bureaucracies that dominate the society.
(Colleges also serve as a way of controlling the labor supply by withdrawing students -- 8 million at present -- from the active labor force.)

Changes in political organization Capitalism has also had great impact on the political organization of human societies. Specifically, capitalism prompted the development of the modern nation-state. Capitalism needed the nation-state because the state provides a rational legal framework with laws which define and protect property, enforce contracts, settle disputes, and prevent arbitrary interference in private business relationships by the sovereign power. Furthermore the modern state also establishes a uniform marketing system, develops a communication and transportation network, and collects taxes that can be used to underwrite businesses and industries (e.g. the military-industrial complex). In general, the modern nation-state acts as a "hot house" to accelerate capitalist development.

Common territory, econ, politics, ~~and~~

cf feudal fiefdoms

While the state served as a catalyst and referee for competition within its own borders, it also served to stimulate competition between its own traders and industrialists and those of other countries. The capitalist world was thus divided into aggressive nation-states that sought to parcel out the rest of the world between them.

The form of the nation-state varies greatly; from monarchies or republics, from liberal welfare states to openly fascist states. But in every case the state apparatus serves as a political bureau for the capitalist classes. It is the emergence of capitalism that creates the need and material basis for the nation-state; while at the same time the nation-state is a prerequisite for the further maturation of capitalism.

Science and Technology It is quite evident that science and technology have been harnessed to capitalism and made subservient to the dominant classes. Why did this come about? Science may be considered to be an expression of the necessity to rationally understand and

universal
+
democratic

control the environment in which we live.

This desire for understanding is not restricted to certain races or cultures; it is universal. It springs from the fact that human survival depends on the operation of the intellect (reasoning ability) rather than on purely instinctive behavior (as in animals). As such science can be found, at least in rudimentary form, in all societies -- although it may sometimes be blended and confused with religious or mystical "knowledge."

In ancient societies where the wealth of the ruling classes was based on land and/or tribute from subjects there was little stimulus for scientific development. What scientific activity there was, was largely the product of individual thinkers and experimenters working alone. Under capitalism, however, where the wealth of the ruling classes is based on exploitation and continuous development of productive forces, science becomes paramount, for it is only through the application of science (technology) that productive forces can be advanced. Capitalist competition stimulates revolutionary technological development as a side effect of the mad scramble to maximize profits. In addition, capitalism transforms scientific development into a social process, with well-financed research institutes replacing the individual experimenter. Finally, the establishment of belligerent nation-states, with their insatiable need for armaments and military technology, further stimulated science while binding it ever more tightly to the needs of the dominant classes. All in all, capitalism gave a tremendous boost to science, but at the same time it distorted science's democratic character by making it subservient to the technological and military needs of the capitalist classes.

standardized
assembly
e.g. line
science not a
reflection of
cultural spirit
of West.
technology
not the enemy

Literature
and Art

Literature and art are expressions of the human desire to understand the world by projecting images of it. However, since literature and art are not in themselves directly productive of food, clothing, and shelter, the great majority of writers and artists throughout history have been dependent for their survival upon the patronage of the dominant.

universal
+
dominant

"opera"
elaborate, stylized

commodities

T.V.

classes. Consequently the dominant art of any society tends to reflect the interests and pre-occupations of the dominant classes. This dominant art is usually referred to as "high culture."

"Folk culture," on the other hand, refers to the art and music of the masses. It reflects their needs and pre-occupations. Running through folk culture are themes of hardship, discontent, desire to escape from or struggle against oppression, joy with small victories, etc.

Capitalism seeks to replace high culture and folk culture with "mass culture." It does this by turning the production of literature, drama, art and music into commercial operations aimed at making money. Mass culture is therefore the end product of "packaging" that part of culture that can be commercialized. It is really little more than advertising which pretends to be "cultural," since its chief function is to promote the life-styles and consumption habits of the capitalist status-quo. Mass culture thus is a propaganda medium for capitalism. Moreover, the aggressive promotion of mass culture around the world is an example of cultural imperialism, since the purpose is to break down what remains of national cultures, and to make other nations more dependent on commodities and "cultural products" of the imperialist countries.

High culture remains as an artistic and upper class ideal under capitalism, but it is largely drained of content, being more concerned with form and technique -- "art for art's sake." Folk culture is suppressed or co-opted -- as happened with jazz, blues and hillbilly music. Folk culture must be destroyed or transformed because its content represents a protest against oppression.

This review of some of the changes in culture under capitalism gives us a basis for understanding cultural chauvinism.

Note: all these changes and developments can be explained by examining dynamics of capitalism, not by looking at European culture or white racial characteristics

not only
changes,
just some
of major ones

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM IN GENERAL

① It is a characteristic of the capitalist political-economy that it gives rise to the illusion that all directly coercive relations between people are swept away clean. Indeed, slavery and serfdom are no longer "compatible" with the unhindered development of the capitalist mode of production. Instead, the coercive relations become indirect, based on "natural" property rights and the operation of the "free" market. Thus, bourgeois "freedom" means the unlimited access to an unrestricted market, "freedom" built on the "solid" rock of private property. Given this fact, the wage laborer is "free" in two senses; free of direct coercion and free of all property. The worker's alienation thus takes the form in which his labor of yesterday, capital, confronts him today as an impersonal master and compels him to subjugate his labor power to the accumulation of more capital for his class enemy. The only way he can survive is by making his oppressor stronger. This is the unfreedom of capitalism disguised as bourgeois "freedom."

② With the rise of imperialism this unfreedom operates on a global scale. Thus, the massive human suffering over the last four centuries because of merciless plunder and inhuman slavery gave birth to the highly developed industry concentrated in a small corner of the globe. In turn, the imperialist nations, through the economic shackles they have constructed, demand stepped up services and raw materials to facilitate the further accumulation of monopoly capital.

③ As part of its global strategy, imperialism promotes the internationalization of "natural" capitalist property rights. It violently rejects the suggestion that its developed industry might be the work of, and belong to, mankind as a whole. On the contrary, it promotes the idea that its industrial prowess is the "natural" right of "Western man."

Bourgeois
"freedom"

Coercion indirect
through wage
An excuse
why do people
(explain)
work?
Not directly
forced

inherent
chauvinism of
imperialism

Creating not equal to BWNHOG

Definition of Cultural chauvinism is derived from this inherent chauvinism of imperialism. Cultural chauvinism is based on the myth that a unique and independent cultural heritage and development accounts for the greater material advancement of western Europe and North America when compared with other areas of the world. By separating culture from economics and history, cultural chauvinism treats culture as a metaphysical attribute of a people or nation. Culture is made to appear as a natural or divine endowment of a "superior" people. As such cultural chauvinism is a variation on the older idea of racial chauvinism. At one time the material advancement of Europe was attributed to white racial "superiority." However, as the 19th century Social Darwinist idea of the inherent inferiority of non-white peoples was discredited, the new rhetoric of cultural "backwardness" was advanced as the ideology of imperialism.

- 5 Reasons for cultural chauvinism
- Several factors account for this change in ideology. Unlike colonial plunder and slavery, imperialism requires the aid of comprador classes within the neo-colonies which act as liason between the imperialists and the exploited. Ideologically, the "right" of these comprador classes to rule could not be based on racial "superiority" since they were drawn from the same racial stock as the native masses. Hence, assimilation to "western culture" (westernization) replaced race as the yardstick for privilege in the neo-colonial world. Secondly, the increasing frequency of national wars of liberation and the wholesale "independence" of Asia and Africa after World War II discredited the old mythology of racism. Thirdly, the development of Marxism and the world socialist movement challenged the very foundations of capitalism and all of its ideological pretensions. Fourthly, the rise of fascism as the logical consequence of old-style racial chauvinism unsettled liberal capitalists who sought to equate capitalism with progressive social forces. Finally, on the domestic scene, the massive northward migration and integration of black workers into the lowest levels of monopoly

capitalism required modifications in ideology. Black people were no longer inferior, merely "culturally deprived."

(3) The end result of these changes was the elevation of the idea of "western culture" to a mystical category that somehow "explains" the material advancement of Europe and North America. At the same time, non-white nations are advised to "westernize" themselves if they want to "catch up." The western culture concept is thereby imbued with a distinct ideological role in the spread of imperialism. By identifying political modernization and economic development with "westernization," imperialism is disguised as a beneficial cultural force.

Uniqueness thesis We have suggested that "western culture" and "westernization" are examples of cultural chauvinism. Why is this so? To begin with, many cultural characteristics of western nations are treated as though they are unique and could not have developed elsewhere. For example, the "western" work ethic is often contrasted with the supposed laziness and indolence of non-western peoples. Concern for general public education is also said to be a unique western characteristic. The same goes for political organization: the nation-state as contrasted with tribal or other "primitive" forms of organization. Of course, the west's scientific and technological advancement are glorified as the crowning glory of "western culture." This list could be extended, but it is apparent that the alleged unique qualities of "western culture" are nothing more than the general attributes of capitalist culture. And capitalist culture is inherently universal; its characteristic forms are not restricted to any particular race, nation or region. On the contrary, capitalism takes all feudal or traditional cultures and reconstructs them according to universal patterns that best serve its own needs. True, capitalist culture developed first in Europe, but it is not unique to Europe. That would be like saying that because geometry developed first in Egypt it is unique to Egypt.

Bob (1)

Cultural Imperialism

Smoking
Kathy
①

Cultural imperialism (sometimes termed cultural colonialism) refers to specific tactics used in this process. Cultural imperialism attempts to facilitate capitalist penetration/exploitation of a nation by breaking down its particular cultural forms and actively preventing the independent development of new forms. Thus, the intelligentsia of an underdeveloped nation may be encouraged to assimilate the cultural values and standards of the imperialist power -- i.e. to become "Westernized" -- in the name of cultural "liberation" from the shackles of pre-capitalist traditions. Most recently the tactics of cultural imperialism have included the use of mass media, "cultural congresses," bourgeois professors, Peace Corps volunteers, U.S. Information Agency, etc. to spread capitalist propaganda in underdeveloped nations. U.S. foundations, such as the Ford Foundation, are heavily involved in higher education and the cultural institutions of these nations in an effort to "integrate" them into the capitalist culture of the imperialist countries. Such tactics serve to demoralize and confuse the peoples in these nations, making effective resistance to imperialism more difficult to organize. Cultural imperialism has been quite clever in disguising its intentions. In fact, it is characteristic of cultural imperialism that it claims to be interested in improving the welfare of the people it is in reality destroying.

Capitalism
as ethnic
secret

②
Sometimes the "uniqueness" argument is used in other ways. For example it may be contended that without Europeans, contemporary cultural development would have been impossible, or that only the European "mental frame" is capable of sustaining and developing capitalist culture. These arguments ignore the objective historical reality, and try to mystify Europe by implying that capitalist culture is some kind of ethnic secret of Europeans.

Independence
thesis

③

Capitalist
development
depends on
underdevelopment

This brings us to the second element of chauvinism in "western culture" concept; that is the idea that it developed independently of the rest of the world. This is a total deception. We have already indicated that colonial plunder and the slave trade provided much of the capital that made European industrial and cultural development possible. The development of the steam engine, heavy industry, ship-building and many modern financial institutions were all financed directly or indirectly by the slave trade and other forms of colonial exploitation. In fact, it is no exaggeration to suggest that the Industrial Revolution, which enabled Europe and North America to leap far ahead of the rest of the world in the production of material goods, would have been delayed by several centuries if not for the capital provided by colonialism. Furthermore, today this state of "overdevelopment" can be maintained only by actively preventing "underdeveloped" nations from reorganizing their political economy and using their resources to develop themselves. This is the chief function of modern imperialism.

Why capitalism
arose in Europe

Marxism

①

Therefore, we need only consider the question of why the capitalist culture developed first in Europe. Was this the result of European cultural "superiority" or were other factors at work? Three basic pre-conditions are requisite for capitalist development" (1) a steady increase in agricultural output accompanied by massive displacement of the peasant population (creating a potential industrial labor force); (2) society-wide propagation of a division of labor resulting in the emergence of a class of merchants and traders; and (3) massive accumulation of capital in the hands of the developing merchant class. It is the convergence of these historically conditioned processes that signals the development of capitalism. The first two processes were maturing in many parts of the world during the pre-capitalist era, but it was the spectacular development of the third process in Europe that shaped all subsequent history. Mercantile accumulations were large and

Great
internal
&
external
trade

Corrected

Mention Euro.
geography
- rivers & natural ports

rapidly acquired in western Europe because (1) the geographical location of many European countries gave them the opportunity to develop maritime and river trade at an early date, and (2) such trade was paradoxically stimulated by Europe's relative "underdevelopment" and paucity of valued natural resources. Thus, European traders traveled to the tropics in search of spice, tea, ivory, indigo, etc.; to Asia seeking high quality cloth, ornaments, pottery, etc.; and finally the wild scramble to bring back precious metals and stones that were in short supply in Europe.

② Europe's location on a cross-roads of trade routes between more economically developed civilizations and/ or countries more richly endowed with natural resources, stimulated an explosive advance of trade and capitalist accumulation by the European merchants. The requirements of navigation and trade in turn fostered the rapid development of scientific knowledge and weapons technology that enabled Europe to begin the colonial plunder of other areas, thereby throwing them onto the course of underdevelopment.

③ We may conclude, therefore, that capitalist culture is more highly advanced in the West, not because of pre-existing psychological or cultural traits of Europeans, but because (1) capitalist culture arose first in Europe for ~~the~~ specific historical reasons, and (2) its rapid advancement in the 18th and 19th centuries was made possible by colonialist exploitation of much of the world. Thus, Europe and North America reached great material and cultural heights not because white people were cultural giants but because they were standing on the shoulders of the world's colonized peoples.

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM ON THE LEFT

① Because cultural chauvinism, the ideological component of modern imperialism, is so widespread in Western societies, its poison has also seeped into parts of what is broadly referred to as the Left. Cultural arrogance in the movements for 17

reflection
not a
checklist

social change is largely a reflection of the cultural chauvinism rampant in imperialist nations. While the negative effects of cultural chauvinism have not been of the same magnitude inside the Left as compared with the general society, nevertheless it has been an enduring source of friction and conflict, thereby undermining unity on the one hand and promoting opportunism on the other. Clearly, the struggle against cultural chauvinism within the Left must have top priority if a true revolutionary unity is to be forged on a world scale.

Marxism as the
"property" of
Europeans

Smoking

(2)

If we observe the Left in Western nations it will be seen that the primary way in which cultural chauvinism manifests itself is the attempt to picture the world socialist movement as nothing more than a continuation and extension of the "European political tradition." Under this rubric socialism is reduced to a mere projection of the progressive ideas of "Western culture." It is probably true that socialist thought had to emerge first among those intellectuals located in the very center of the most advanced sector of world capitalism. They were in the best position to observe the overall workings of capitalism, and therefore could formulate theories relating to its development and eventual disintegration. But it is chauvinist to picture Marxian socialism as understandable only within the cultural milieu of Europe and the U.S. The origins of authorship should not be confused with the areas of relevance. Marxism is a set of theories and methods of analysis which apply to the global capitalist system as a whole. Unlike capitalist trade secrets, Marxism is not a commodity; hence no private ownership of it can be claimed. Yet, this is precisely what some radicalized intellectuals of the West have done. In effect, they have claimed Marxism as their private ideological property, and this claim has then been used to elevate alienated intellectuals to the role of guardians of the ideological purity of the socialist movement.

consequences

"distortions" of socialism?

Two corollaries stem from this kind of chauvinism. First, some "left-wing" chauvinists create the illusion that socialist revolutions in Russia, China, Cuba, Vietnam, etc., are somehow "distortions" of the basic Marxist vision. This chauvinist assertion should not be confused with the correct attempt to account for the additional problems confronting revolutionary governments in these countries -- e.g. problems of overcoming underdevelopment in the face of capitalist encirclement. Rather the essential argument of the "left-wing" chauvinists is that "true" socialism can emerge only out of the "progressive political tradition" of the advanced capitalist nation. It is the undialectical nature of such thinking that underlies its chauvinism. It conveniently ignores the dialectical relationship between the rise of imperialism and the encrusting of underdevelopment, and the consequent vanguard role played by national liberation movements in the world socialist struggle. The rise of socialism in the underdeveloped world is no "distortion;" it is the dialectical result of the globalization of monopoly capital.

Europe: "center" of Marxism?

A second corollary of this chauvinist line reluctantly admits the validity of socialist revolutions in the underdeveloped world, but it continues to cling to the notion that Europe is the "philosophical and theoretical center" of Marxism. For these armchair coaches of revolution, theory and practice are separated by continental boundaries, and "their" Marxism is reduced to an intellectual exercise resulting in the proliferation of lengthy theoretical treatises and "definitive" critiques of those engaged in actual struggle. Of course, the audience for such caricatures of Marxism is chiefly other alienated intellectuals and the more "sophisticated" members of the bourgeoisie who are titillated by these intellectual games.

"Padilla Affair"

Occasionally, left-wing chauvinism becomes a virtual ally of cultural imperialism. Thus we recently saw a group of "leftist" intellectuals of Europe and the U.S., along with their Latin

American disciples, spring up in defense of "cultural freedom" which the revolutionary government of Cuba supposedly trampled upon when it criticized the parasitical mode of life of a Cuban poet. The poet, Herberto Padilla, was, on the one hand, criticized because some of his poetry glorified the very values the revolution was trying to change in Cuban life. But on the other hand he was disciplined because he provided erroneous information to Cuba's enemies -- the bourgeois press. However, with their insistent demands for "freedom of expression" the Western intellectuals completely confused these two separate issues in the "Padilla affair." Moreover, by elevating themselves to universal critics on the grounds that they are the true carriers of Marxist tradition, they confused their privileged position in bourgeois society with the objective needs of the Cuban revolution to defend itself. Their reaction to the criticism of Padilla indicated that they feared a revolution that insisted that intellectuals and artists cannot stand above the revolution but must be transformed by it. In sum, their attempt to "channel" the Cuban revolution along what they subjectively considered to be the correct path was hardly distinguishable from the cultural imperialism of the capitalist nations. Their criticisms showed little understanding of Cuba's desire to build a culture based on the masses, instead of the kind of elite and cynical "culture" that is characteristic of alienated intellectuals in bourgeois societies.

Two negative reactions to cultural chauvinism

These "leftist" versions of cultural chauvinism have provoked corresponding reaction among sincere revolutionaries, but not all of these have been positive. For example, some non-white revolutionaries react to left-wing chauvinism by rejecting Marxism on the grounds that it is a racist European ideology. This line of reasoning confuses the subjective claims of left-wing chauvinists with objective social reality. It is like refusing to study mathematics on the grounds that since at this point in history most mathe-

cynical
individualistic

~~Herbert~~
Bob

Miklós

①

Rejection of technology
e.g. ~~books~~ in
Algeria

maticians are Europeans, then mathematics must be some kind of racist European thought-pattern. Of course many chauvinists would like us to believe precisely that, but we must avoid falling into such traps. Marxism is an analytical tool, and like mathematics or any other science, its usefulness does not depend on the race of the person employing it.

Some white revolutionaries react to left-wing chauvinism by becoming professional "supporters" of Third World revolution. This sometimes happens with revolutionary journalists who spend all of their time travelling from one country to another in the role of revolutionary press agents. The danger here is that they may adopt a cosmopolitan rather than an international view of revolution; they may come to regard world revolution as a single, monolithic process rather than a collection of interrelated but distinct national struggles, and they may forget that international solidarity does not simply mean "supporting" the struggles of others, but also working for change in your own country.

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM IN THE U.S. MOVEMENT

Looking specifically at the United States we can see that cultural chauvinism has precipitated much ideological confusion and organizational havoc in the movement. For example, many people are in the habit of judging others according to how well they measure up to the "standards" of "Western culture." This leads to a kind of cultural absolutism that can become a severe problem, especially in movement organizations where people from different classes and ethnic backgrounds come into close contact. Thus, they tend to approve of people who approach problems in a superficially intellectual manner, while they're suspicious of people who seem to rely on intuition. They approve of people who handle language according to the standard rules of grammar, and they react against people who seem to invent words and rules as they go along. Over the years we have become

Common struggle
vs
identical struggle
same
(2)

Shelly (1)

Cultural
absolutism

style / e
vs content

accustomed to certain cultural styles and many of us tend to reject people who follow different styles: intellectualism vs. intuition; verbal dexterity vs. verbal inventiveness. Unfortunately, the chauvinist habit of judging people according to arbitrary and abstract cultural "norms" (divorced from social history) means that we get hung up on style and lose sight of content. We alienate each other by becoming self-righteous about styles, forgetting that the real problem is not how we communicate but what we communicate.

Cultural romanticism

Some movement people react against cultural absolutism by adopting a kind of cultural romanticism. This is particularly true among "life-style revolutionaries" who have rejected the overt trappings of capitalist culture. Everyone who has been through the usual public educational system is programmed to dislike authentic folk culture because it is "primitive" and "undignified." We are taught instead to regard "classic" literature, symphonic music and the fine arts as the highest cultural ideals. People who reject this kind of programming often simply invert it. Instead of being condescending toward folk culture they become romantically infatuated with it, and paternalistically demand that folk culture keep itself "pure" and unchanged. They thus deprive it of its developmental possibilities. All this does is replace condescension with paternalism, but both are cut from the same cloth. Cultural romanticism totally ignores the fact that folk culture is an expression of people who are oppressed, and that for folk culture to remain unchanged means that its creators must remain oppressed. Cultural romanticists therefore become accomplices in the bourgeois devastation of folk culture by playing the complementary role of scavengers and parasites.

Left-wing tokenism

As a reaction against the cultural chauvinism of the dominant society the movement sometimes indulges in what might be called left-wing tokenism.

Bridg ①

e.g. white who moves into banni to become Chicana

There are two subtypes of this tokenism; one directed outward, the other directed inward. The outward type puts a non-white person in a tokenist position as window dressing for non-chauvinism. We must take care, however, to distinguish when it is tokenism and when not, lest we fall into the trap of assuming that all multiracial situations are only masks for chauvinism. A crude but useful test is to ask the question: Are the non-white members of the organization hindered or aided by it in their effort to build a people's movement that cuts across ethnic lines?

603
Henry

(2)

The inward type of tokenism occurs when there is an obsessive preoccupation with creating small islands of racial harmony. This can happen if a multiracial group starts functioning solely as a refuge for people who are alienated by the racial and cultural strife of the dominant society. In this case maintenance of the inner racial harmony of the group becomes a substitute for struggle against the racial and cultural chauvinism of the outer society. This is similar to the individual escapism inherent in youth culture. It tries to cure a disease by treating the symptoms in isolation and completely overlooks the underlying causes.

Cultural
nationalism

(1)

Perhaps the most confusing reaction to chauvinism is the notion of cultural nationalism. In general, cultural nationalism refers to the idea that the road to revolution lies in developing the national culture of a particular colonized people. Reduced to its essentials, cultural nationalism is an intellectual reaction to the cultural chauvinism of the dominant society. It is an attempt to restore a traditional culture or to create new cultural values as a defense against the destructive encroachments of capitalist culture.

(2)

The problem is that cultural nationalism tries to restore the old or create a new culture without regard to the changed political and economic situation of colonized people. As we have seen, 23

Kathy

culture grows out of the organization of human labor, which is a political and economic process. Cultural nationalism puts the cart before the horse by trying to change culture before there is any change in the underlying political-economy. Hence, cultural nationalism, when separated from political struggle, runs into the same problems as youth culture. It often degenerates into a passive retreat into cultural mysticism. In addition, its pre-occupation with new (or old) forms of cultural expression -- music, art, clothing, hair styles, etc. -- makes it a bonanza for capitalists seeking new markets to exploit. At its worst cultural nationalism also fosters cultural arrogance between different but equally oppressed ethnic groups. It therefore hinders the development of a unified struggle of all colonized peoples against capitalist oppression.

③

We must not make the mistake, however, of concluding that cultural nationalism is totally negative. Like youth culture, cultural nationalism is an expression of genuine alienation from the dominant capitalist culture. If incorporated into the struggle for revolutionary political change, cultural nationalism can make a positive contribution by awakening racial-national consciousness to the need for change; but this can occur only if cultural nationalism becomes an avenue for creating socialist consciousness and culture rather than looking to restore traditions from the long dead past.

SOCIALIST CULTURE

Mariam

①

It is appropriate to close this paper with some comments on socialist culture. First, however, a distinction should be made between communist culture and socialist culture. Communist culture can develop only after the completion of the world socialist revolution. It would be a reflection of the cultural possibilities inherent in a classless society, a world community free of all forms of human exploitation. At this stage in history we cannot draw even a crude outline of communist

Culture in
struggle

culture because it is almost impossible for us to conceive of a world in which economic necessities and compulsions are no longer the driving forces of history. Presumably, as the socialist revolution advances the basic features of the future communist society will slowly emerge. Socialist culture, on the other hand, is present today. We can see it all around us in those countries that have taken the road to socialist construction while waging an intense and continuing class struggle. Socialist culture is a culture in struggle against capitalist and imperialist domination.

Content and
forms of
socialist
culture

We may observe that in its non-material aspect socialist culture around the world has a common content, although it takes different national forms. In content socialist culture affirms the struggle against class and national oppression. This is true whether one is talking about opera in China, music in Vietnam, or poster-art in Cuba. As to forms, each socialist country attempts to make use of those traditional forms that are part of its national heritage. This sometimes results, for example, in a merging of the technically more elaborate forms of high culture with the revolutionary content of folk culture. It should be noted though that socialist countries seek to avoid chauvinism. They do not hesitate to "borrow" cultural forms from other nations, including capitalist nations, if this can serve a useful purpose. This is because in socialist culture the primary element is content. As Fidel has pointed out, "For us, a revolutionary people in a revolutionary process, the value of cultural and artistic creations is determined by their usefulness for the people, by what they contribute to the liberation and happiness of mankind. Our standards are political. There cannot be aesthetic value...in opposition to man, justice, welfare, liberation and the happiness of man." Socialist culture also aims to make creators out of the entire people, instead of ascribing the creative process to an elite of intellectuals and artists.

Planning
replaces
market

As for material culture, it should be noted that under socialism the quantity and types of production would be determined not by the market mechanism, but by rational planning based on the social needs of the masses. This does not mean that all problems are solved overnight. In fact, for underdeveloped countries it means that highest priority will be placed on industrial development and economic self-sufficiency, for it is precisely in these two areas that underdeveloped nations have been crippled by imperialism. This is why in many socialist countries there is a lack of many consumer commodities. The available economic surplus is being channeled into long-term industrial development as the only sure route out of the backwardness imposed by imperialism.

Changes in
cultural life
under socialism

In terms of specific cultural features, under socialism work relations undergo considerable change. Workers themselves are brought into the decision-making process, while managers are relegated to the role of administrators carrying out decisions made by the workers. At the same time labor is no longer a commodity. Under socialism people no longer work only in order to live, but live in order to do work that is socially meaningful. Labor becomes the measure of life instead of an unwanted burden. Consequently, as workers become production-oriented under socialism, the correlation between wages and work begins to break down, to be replaced by a more equal distribution of income based on social need.

The family unit remains under socialism but it is no longer tied to property relations or economic compulsion. Instead the family becomes a voluntary unit based on equality among its members. Still, it should be observed that most socialist countries have adopted measures to strengthen family life, which was often severely disrupted under the impact of imperialism.

Since socialized production reaches its apex under socialism it follows that the dissemination of general public education is an urgent necessity.

Socialist culture does not simply destroy all aspects of capitalist culture, it keeps progressive aspects and links them directly to general social needs

④ In order to overcome backwardness most socialist countries have adopted crash programs aimed at eliminating illiteracy and ignorance among the masses. They have also opened the doors of higher education to the workers. Simultaneously, socialist countries have tried to break down the capitalist distinction between an elite of thinkers on one hand versus a mass of doers on the other. Under socialist culture education is intimately linked to production: colleges for factory workers, work brigades for college students.

⑤ As far as political organization is concerned, the nation-state continues to exist under socialism but its class nature is fundamentally altered. Instead of being a political bureau of the capitalist classes the state becomes the political instrument of the working class, and serves the interests of that class. Consequently, workers' committees become more important than parliament or congress; the people speak for themselves at their places of work, rather than being "represented" by self-seeking politicians in the capital city.

⑥ Of course science and technology are vigorously promoted under socialism as vehicles for advancing economic and cultural development. However, science is divorced from the capitalist profit motive and is tied instead to the social needs of the nation as a whole. As in other areas, rational planning replaces the social anarchy of the market and technology is made a servant of the people instead of being a mad juggernaut before which people feel helpless.

As for the role of art and literature in socialist culture, we close with an extract from Cuba's First National Congress on Education and Culture:

Distinction between way institutions work under Capitalist and Socialist systems

Harry

Culture and revolution "We are a blockaded nation. We are building socialism only a few steps away from the center of world imperialism, on a continent where until very recently it held absolute power. The danger of military aggression by Yankee imperialism against Cuba is no speculation; it has been present throughout our revolutionary process.

Shaw
"Art is a weapon of the Revolution. A product of the fighting spirit of our people. A weapon against the penetration of the enemy. Our art and literature will be a valuable tool for the formation of our young people in the spirit of revolutionary morals, excluding the selfishness and other aberrations typical of bourgeois culture.

"A new society cannot pay homage to the filth of capitalism. Socialism cannot begin where Rome ended. Our artistic works will heighten man's sensitivity and culture, creating in him a collectivist conscience and leaving no room for enemy diversionism in any of its forms."

339-25 *DM*

NOTES ON CULTURAL CHAUVINISM (Second Draft)

Intro.

In our movement the concept of cultural chauvinism is a continuing source of misunderstanding. Like racism, the subject of cultural chauvinism is often treated in a personal and emotional way instead of attempting to understand how it fits into the overall capitalist social system. We cannot effectively combat cultural chauvinism unless we understand its social origins and its present ideological uses.

There are two ^{other} ~~important~~ reasons for studying cultural chauvinism. In the first place, cultural chauvinism is a part of the ideology of Western imperialism. It provides a convenient set of ideas that serve to rationalize and justify the continued imperialist exploitation of the Third World. Secondly, because cultural chauvinist thinking pervades the capitalist societies of the West, it has even affected the left-wing movements in these countries, distorting and corrupting their understanding of the world-wide socialist struggle. This has caused some would-be radicals to, in effect, ally themselves with the imperialists. against Third World socialists. It is especially important for Brigadistas, who will be living and working in a country ~~where~~ which is attempting to construct a socialist culture, to sort out and seek to understand the bourgeois mental baggage we have acquired as a result of having been conditioned for many years by the capitalist culture of the U.S.

CULTURE

An initial source of confusion about cultural chauvinism is the basic idea of culture. What is culture? How may it be understood? Culture can be considered to have two mutually dependent aspects: non-material and material. The non-material aspect of culture includes the totality of knowledge and ideas (e.g., science and art), values (e.g. status symbols), patterns of behavior (e.g., social relations between

2/2/2/2/2

capitalists and workers), and social institutions (e.g., the market, private property, the educational system) which operate in a given society. The most basic feature of the non-material culture is the manner in which a society organizes the productive life of its members (based on its historically developed technical levels, including both technical knowledge and "hardware.") This is so because the mode of production and resulting work relations are crucial in shaping ~~many~~ many other aspects of the non-material culture, as will be discussed in following pages.

The material culture includes all artifacts and material goods and wealth (especially the instruments of production) resulting from human activity in a given society. Material culture is the social product of organized human labor. However, the decision as to what is produced is not merely a reflection of the physical needs of the masses. This decision is an outgrowth of the values and interests of the classes that control the production process. Thus, material and non-material culture are ^{social} interdependent, and both are intimately linked to the ~~the~~ process of production. Indeed, organized social production is the foundation of all culture.

Culture is sometimes defined in ways that can be completely misleading. For example, it is often equated with ~~literature~~ literature and art: to be a "cultured" person is to be familiar with the arts. This understanding of culture is exceedingly narrow and class-biased. Literature and art are ~~patterns of social behavior~~ ^{conscious} ~~expressions~~ ^{social} expressions of social behavior. As such they are certainly a part of culture, but not its totality. Moreover, culture is not the exclusive property of certain privileged classes which patronize or produce art; cultural development depends on the organized labor of all the people. Even the solitary artist working alone must rely on others to ^{provide} ~~build his~~ ^{material conditions} studio, manufacture his paints and brushes, grow and process his food, and, most importantly, furnish him ^{with a symbolizing community which provides} ~~through social interaction with the~~ values and raw idea-materials that go into his art. Without these

(e.g. basic

3/3/3/3/3/3

(attempts to define whole by looking at only one of the parts, would be like trying to define an automobile by only looking at the upholstery or body styling and totally ignoring the engine)

essentials he could not produce any art. Therefore, "his" art is in reality the ~~end result~~ of a social process.

Today the term "youth culture" has come into popular usage. This is another misleading view of culture. Youth culture refers primarily to personal life-styles; that is, living arrangements, modes of dress and speech, different forms of music and entertainment. Although youth culture is often hailed as "revolutionary," it frequently boils down to changes in styles and patterns of consumption behavior that have little if any revolutionary content. In what way is it more revolutionary to wear Levis and collect Rolling Stone albums than to wear three-button suits and attend the opera? Obviously this question oversimplifies the problem, but the point is that if we restrict culture to mean personal life-styles, then revolution is reduced to exchanging one style for another. Clearly, such a "revolution" would have little meaning or value for most of the world's peoples.

so much

Why does the youth culture focus on life-styles? The idea of a

youth culture originated in the rebellion of discontented middle-class white

A major reason for this rebellion was that thousands of white youth were being prevented from

were being ~~prevented from~~ entering productive roles in American society by the stagnating economy of the Sixties. Excluded from meaningful productive roles, these alienated youth proceeded to make a virtue of necessity by ostensibly rejecting what they considered to be the bourgeois values and life-styles of their parents. Many of them rejected the capitalist work ethic and ^{instead} withdrew into communes to create new life-styles. Unfortunately the life-styles created were often little more than the inverse of the bourgeois life-style, since they were done in a social vacuum and were unrelated to the relations of production, the process of meeting basic human needs. Thus, youth culture offered a dramatically "new" way of "relating" and consuming in a society that remained basically unchanged.

Changing life-styles without changing social system is like trying to make broken automobile run better by giving it a new paint job

It must be admitted that youth culture has made a positive ^{destructive} contribution to the political movement by raising questions about social values, and by pointing out the ways in which capitalist society dehumanizes even those who are not victims of brutal economic or racial oppression. However, it has misled some people into thinking that by changing their personal life-styles they can somehow change the social system. This faulty line of thinking ignores the fact that personal life-styles simply reflect the possibilities inherent in the existing social system, not vice versa. (Youth culture represents alienation from the urban rat-race and suburban status seeking, but it does not transcend or overturn the social realities.) Also, this kind of reasoning tends to foster selfish-individualism -- "doing your own thing" -- at the expense of collective action. Youth culture thus becomes an expression of individual privilege that runs directly counter to the collective social needs of the poor and working classes. For the bulk of the population individual liberation can come only as the result of uniting to overthrow the entire oppressive system, not by seeking out a protected niche within it for individual salvation. Thus we can now see that youth culture is tolerated as a "liberated" island within capitalist America because (1) it does not threaten basic production relations, (2) it has nothing to offer the poor or discontent^{ed} workers, and (3) it is a fertile hunting ground for hip capitalists looking to hustle new styles of ~~music~~ music, clothes, health foods, etc. (Discussion question: what has happened with youth culture today?)

Culture is often regarded as an independent thing-in-itself. Each nation is said to have its own peculiar culture which develops according to its own internal rules and laws without regard to any external factors. Before the advent of European colonialism and the diffusion of capitalist culture to almost all parts of the world this view of culture had much validity. But in the world as it has existed since about

5/5/5/5/5/5

1700 the subordination of traditional cultures to capitalist penetration is the outstanding feature. The result has been a globalized capitalist culture. Capitalism destroyed the the basis of traditional cultures by imposing capitalist property and work relations. Capitalism thus swept away the old cultures or reconstructed them in its own image. At the same time, however, the development of capitalism from the commercial to the industrial stage was made possible by Europe's contact with and exploitation of the colonial world. Thus capitalist culture, too, must be examined from an international rather than a national perspective.

CHANGES IN CULTURAL LIFE UNDER CAPITALISM

From the standpoint of culture capitalism has been a revolutionary force. It has provided the driving power for drastic changes in all aspects of social life. In Europe this process occurred ~~gradual~~ gradually and was spread over several centuries. This is not to imply that no hardship accompanied the transition from feudalism to capitalism. The enclosure movement in England for example, in which peasants were forced off their communal lands in order to facilitate the commercialization of agriculture, caused much strife and hardship for the peasantry. But this probably was not as severe as the wholesale social disruption spawned by the relatively sudden imposition of capitalist colonialism on non-European societies. The spread of the market (with its definition of land and labor as commodities) tore Third World peoples up by their roots and shook them loose from social relationships that had existed for centuries. By radically transforming the economies and social structures of colonized nations, capitalism forcibly shut the door on the past and made any kind of real "return" to the old way of life impossible.

6/6/6/6/6/6

Wherever it has penetrated capitalism has brought about basic changes in social life. To begin with, it completely altered the process of production. Capitalism "socialized" the production process by (1) replacing the individual producer of pre-capitalist societies with an organized social workforce, and (2) it replaced individual tools with social tools (e.g., plantations, factories, etc.) However, the developing capitalist classes assured their control over this social process by imposing the concept of ^{capitalist (ownership is separated from creation)} private property. Thus all "things", including labor power, were reduced to commodities that could be bought and sold as property on the market. This in turn stimulated a tremendous circulation of money and commodities as a subsidiary aspect of capitalism. More importantly, however, capitalist production revolutionized work relations. The alienation of the worker from the land and the means of production combined with the money-wage system made the capitalist class (and not the workers) the controller of the quantity and type of work performed by the workers. The worker, compelled to sell his labor power (in order to live) to the owner of the means of production (the capitalist), was thereby reduced to a mere cog in the capitalist social order. The puritan work ethic -- extolling the virtues of hard labor -- sprang forth as part of the ideology to justify this social relationship.

On the world scale the emergence of capitalism resulted in the concentration of ~~the~~ capital (the means of production) in a small part of the world -- western Europe. The early colonial plunder of the non-European world combined with the capitalist slave trade provided a global base for the accumulation of capital in Europe. Moreover, by breaking up the age-old patterns of their agricultural economy, and by forcing shifts to exportable crops, colonialism destroyed the self-sufficiency of the colonized societies. ~~By concentrating the means of production in a small part of the world, colonialism destroyed the self-sufficiency of the colonized societies.~~ Instead, these societies were brought into the world-wide system of commodity circulation, contributing

7/7/7/7/7

their economic "surplus" to the growing capital of Europe. Colonialism ^{also} created a vast pool of pauperized labor as it seized peasant-occupied lands for plantation purposes and other uses by foreign enterprise. Traditional craftsmen were reduced to common wage laborers as ancient handicrafts were exposed to withering competition from European industrial exports.

cf "underdevelopment" paper

This process of capital accumulation in the industrially advanced capitalist nations -- and consequent "underdevelopment" of much of the rest of the world -- was frozen in place with the advent of imperialism. Where colonialism plundered nations, imperialism sought to block their ~~entire~~ economic development by preventing the accumulation of capital and the creation of an industrial base. Although the expansion of commodity circulation, the pauperization of large numbers of peasants and artisans, the contact with advanced technology, provided a powerful impetus to the development of capitalism in the colonized world, this development was forcibly shunted from its normal course, distorted and crippled to suit the purposes of Western imperialism.

The emergence of ~~the~~ the capitalist mode of production and capitalist property relations affected other basic areas of social life. Traditional family structures were radically transformed and disorganized. ^{became the} For the capitalist bourgeoisie the monogamous, nuclear family ~~became~~ new social ideal. This family structure provided a convenient social instrument for transmitting property from father to son (with the mother as a subordinate intermediary). For workers a different dynamic was ~~at~~ involved. As capitalism developed and the peasants were wranched from the land by the commercialization of agriculture, the traditional large, extended family structure started to disintegrate. The move from the rural areas to towns and cities in search of work broke up old family life patterns. Further, socialized production under capitalism required a large highly mobile labor force that ^{could} migrate easily from one workplace to another

8/8/8/8/8

in accordance with cyclical variations in labor requirements. Consequently, the extended family was fragmented into the close-knit nuclear family: husband, wife and a few children. But the pressure of capitalist work relations made any form of stable family life impossible for many workers, especially among those in the reserve army of ~~labor~~ unskilled labor who are compelled to migrate in search of work even more frequently than the more "secure" sections of the working class. Thus, the family tended to break up into smaller units or fall apart altogether under the impact of capitalism.

*l.g. cities
of W. Africa*

The institution of education gives us another vantage point from which to examine cultural changes under capitalism. In pre-capitalist societies formal education was virtually non-existent for the masses (except for religious indoctrination). ^{Formal} ~~Formal~~ education was reserved for those aspiring to enter the governing bureaucracy (as in ancient China) or it served as a method of class differentiation (as in medieval Europe). Individual skills were passed on from craftsman to apprentice, but this too affected only a small part of the population.

With the development of social production under capitalism education became "democratized." Public educational systems were established to provide rudimentary training for the masses. Social production requires the deffimination of generalized education among the workers who must be prepared to perform a wide range of jobs and to move easily from one job to another as technological changes bring about changes in production. Hence capitalist production demands widespread general knowledge, not the ossified skills of the artisan.

At the same time, college and university education is structured to provide the capitalist system with an elite of managers, scientists, engineers, teachers and other professionals to run the private and public bureacracies that dominate ~~the~~ the society. (Colleges also serve as a

9/9/9/9/9/9

cf
ultra-democracy
paper

way of controlling the labor supply by withdrawing students -- 8 million at present -- from the active labor force.)

Capitalism has also had great impact on the political organization of human societies. Specifically, capitalism prompted the development of the modern nation-state. Capitalism needed the nation-state because the state provides a rational legal framework with laws which define and protect property, enforce contracts, settle disputes, and prevent arbitrary interference in private business relationships by the sovereign power. Furthermore the ~~modern~~ modern state also establishes a uniform marketing system, develops a communication and transportation network, and collects taxes that can be used to underwrite businesses and industries (e.g., the military-industrial complex). In general, the modern nation-state acts as a "hot ~~house~~ house" to accelerate capitalist development.

While the state served as a catalyst and referee for competitors within its own borders, it also served to stimulate competition between its own traders and industrialists and those of other countries. The capitalist world was thus divided into aggressive nation-states that sought to parcel out the rest of the world between them.

The form of the nation-state varies greatly; from monarchies to republics, from liberal ~~Welfare~~ welfare states to openly fascist states. But in every case the state apparatus serves as a political bureau for the capitalist classes. It is the emergence of capitalism that creates the need and material basis for the nation-state; while at the same time the nation-state is a prerequisite for the further maturation of capitalism.

(Science, Religion and technology section - p. 6 in first draft -- still must be re-written)

8.9A

10/10/10

Literature and art are expressions of the human desire to understand the world by projecting images of it. However, since literature and art are not in themselves directly productive of food, clothing and shelter, the great majority of writers and artists throughout history have been dependent for their survival upon the patronage of the dominant classes. Consequently the dominant art of any society tends to reflect the interests and pre-occupations of the dominant classes. This dominant art is usually referred to as "high culture." "Folk culture," on the other hand, refers to the art and music of the masses. It reflects their needs and pre-occupations. Running through folk culture are themes of hardship, discontent, desire to escape from or struggle against oppression, joy with small victories, etc.

0-7.7.V.
Capitalism seeks to replace high culture and folk culture with "mass culture." It does this by turning the production of literature, drama, art and music into commercial operations aimed at making money. Mass culture is therefore the end product of "packaging" that part of culture that can be commercialized. It is really little more than advertising which pretends to be "cultural," since its chief function is to promote the life-styles and consumption habits of the capitalist status quo. Mass culture thus is a propaganda medium for capitalism. Moreover, the aggressive promotion of mass culture around the world is an example of cultural imperialism, since the purpose is to break down what remains of national cultures, and to make other nations more dependent on the commodities and "cultural products" of the imperialist countries.

High culture remains as an artistic ideal under capitalism, and upper class but it is largely drained of content, being more concerned with form and technique -- "art for art's sake." Folk culture is suppressed or co-opted -- as happened with jazz, blues and hillbilly music. Folk culture must be destroyed or transformed because its content represents a protest against oppression.

11/11/11/11

This review of some of the changes in culture under capitalism gives us a basis for understanding cultural chauvinism.

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM In General

It is a characteristic of the capitalist political-economy that it gives rise to the illusion that all directly coercive relations between men are swept away clean. Indeed, slavery and serfdom are no longer "compatible" with the unhindered development of the capitalist mode of production. Instead, the coercive relations become indirect, based on "natural" property rights and the operation of the "free" market. Thus, bourgeois "freedom" means the unlimited access to an unrestricted market, "freedom" built on the "solid" rock of private property. Given this fact, the wage laborer is "free" in two senses: free of direct coercion and free of all property. The worker's alienation thus takes the form in which his labor of yesterday, capital, confronts him today as an impersonal master and compels him to subjugate his labor ~~power~~ power to the accumulation of more capital for his class enemy. The only way he can survive is by making his oppressor stronger. This is the unfreedom of capitalism disguised as bourgeois "freedom."

With the rise of imperialism this unfreedom operates on a global scale. Thus, the massive human suffering over the last four centuries because of merciless plunder and inhuman slavery gave birth to the highly developed industry concentrated in a small corner of the globe. In turn, the imperialist nations, through the economic shackles they have constructed, demand stepped up services and raw materials to facilitate the further accumulation of monopoly capital.

As part of its global strategy, imperialism promotes the internationalization of ^{"natural"} capitalist property rights. It violently rejects the suggestion that its developed industry might be the work of, and belong to, mankind as a whole. On the contrary it promotes the idea that its

12/12/12

industrial prowess is the "natural" right of "western man."

Cultural chauvinism is derived from this inherent chauvinism of imperialism. Cultural chauvinism is based on the myth that a unique and independent cultural heritage and development accounts for the greater material advancement of western Europe and North America when compared with other areas of the world. By separating culture from economics and history, cultural chauvinism treats culture as a metaphysical attribute of a people or nation. Culture is made to appear as a natural or divine endowment of a "superior" people. As such cultural chauvinism is a variation on the older idea of racial chauvinism. At one time the material advancement of Europe was attributed to white racial "superiority." However, as the 19th Century social Darwinist idea of the inherent inferiority of non-white peoples was discredited, the new rhetoric of cultural "backwardness" was advanced as the ideology of imperialism.

Several factors account for this change in ideology. Unlike colonial plunder and slavery, imperialism requires the "cooperation" of those whom it exploits. Specifically, it requires the aid of comprador ^{within the neo-colonies} classes which act as liason between the imperialists and the exploited. Ideologically, the "right" of these comprador classes to rule could not be based on racial "superiority" since they were drawn from the same racial stock as the native masses. Hence, assimilation to "western culture" (westernization) replaced race as the yardstick for privilege in the neo-colonial world. Secondly, the increasingly frequency of national wars of liberation and the wholesale "independence" of Asia and Africa after World War II discredited the old mythology of racism. Thirdly, the development of Marxism and the world socialist movement challenged the very foundations of capitalism and all of its ideological pretensions. Fourthly, the rise of fascism as the logical consequence of old-style racial chauvinism unsettled liberal capitalists who sought to equate capitalism with progressive social forces.

13/13/13

Finally, on the domestic scene, the massive northward migration and integration of black workers into the lowest ^{levels of monopoly capitalism} ~~runge of the economic ladder~~ required modifications in ideology. Black people were no longer inferior, merely "culturally deprived."

The end result of these changes was the elevation of the idea of "western culture" to a mystical category that somehow "explains" the material advancement of Europe and North America. At the same time, non-white nations are advised to "westernize" themselves if they want to "catch up." The western culture concept is thereby imbued with a distinct ideological role in the spread of imperialism. By identifying political modernization and economic development with "westernization", imperialism is disguised as a beneficial cultural force. (insert 13A)

We have suggested that "western culture" and "westernization" are examples of cultural chauvinism. Why is this so? To begin with many cultural characteristics of western nations are treated as though they are unique and could not have developed elsewhere. For example, the "western" work ethic is often contrasted with the supposed laziness and indolence of non-western peoples. Concern for general public education is also said to be a unique western characteristic. The same goes for political organization: the nation-state as contrasted with tribal or other "primitive" forms of organization. Of course, the west's scientific and technological advancement are lauded as the crowning glory of "western culture." This list could be extended, but it is apparent that the alleged unique qualities of "western culture" are nothing more than the general attributes of capitalist culture. And capitalist culture is inherently universal; its characteristic forms are not restricted to any particular race, nation or region. On the contrary, capitalism takes all feudal or traditional cultures and reconstructs them according to universal patterns that best serve its own needs. True, capitalist culture developed first in Europe,

examples
of cc

Cultural imperialism (sometimes termed cultural colonialism) refers to specific tactics used in this process. Cultural imperialism attempts to facilitate capitalist penetration/exploitation of a nation by breaking down its particular cultural forms and actively preventing the independent development of new ~~forms~~ forms. Thus, the intelligentsia of an underdeveloped nation may be encouraged to assimilate the cultural values and standards of the imperialist power -- ~~in~~ i.e., to become "westernized" -- in the name of cultural "liberation" from the shackles of pre-capitalist traditions. Most recently the tactics of cultural imperialism have included the use of mass media, "cultural congresses," bourgeois professors, Peace Corps volunteers, U.S. Information Agency, etc. to spread capitalist propaganda in underdeveloped nations. U.S. foundations, such as the ~~Ford~~ Ford Foundation, are heavily involved in higher education and the cultural institutions of these nations in an effort to "integrate" them into the capitalist culture of the imperialist countries. Such tactics serve to demoralize and confuse the peoples in/ these nations, making effective resistance to imperialism more difficult to organize. Cultural imperialism has been quite clever in disguising its ~~intent~~ intentions. In fact, it is characteristic of cultural ~~imperialism~~ imperialism that it claims to be interested in improving the welfare of the people it is in reality destroying.

11/11/11

but it is not unique to Europe. That would be like saying that because geometry developed first in Egypt it is unique to Egypt.

Sometimes the "uniqueness" argument is used in other ways. For example it may be contended that without Europeans, contemporary cultural development would have been impossible,; or that only the European "mental frame" is capable of ~~xxx~~ sustaining and developing capitalist culture. These arguments ignore the objective historical reality, and try to mystify Europe by implying that capitalist culture is some kind of ethnic secret of Europeans.

This brings us to the second element of chauvinism in "western culture" concept: that is the idea that it developed independently of the rest of the world. This is a total deception. We have already indicated that colonial plunder and the slave trade provided much of the capital that made European industrial and cultural development possible. (See Eric Williams, Capitalism and Slavery) The development of the steam engine, heavy industry, ship-building and many modern financial institutions were all financed directly or indirectly by the slave trade and other forms of colonial exploitation. In fact, it is no exaggeration to ~~xxx~~ suggest that the Industrial Revolution, which enabled Europe and North America to leap far ahead of the rest of the world in the production of material goods, would have been delayed by several centuries if not for the capital provided by colonialism. Furthermore, today this state of "overdevelopment" can be maintained only by actively preventing ~~xxxxx~~ "underdeveloped" nations from reorganizing their political economy and using their resources to ~~develop~~ develop themselves. This is the chief function of modern imperialism.

Therefore, we need only consider the question of why the capitalist culture developed first in Europe. Was this the result of European cultural "superiority" or were other factors at work? Three basic pre-conditions are requisite for ~~the development of~~ capitalist development: (1) a slow but

an
study

15/15/15

increased in agricultural output accompanied by massive displacement of the peasant population (creating a potential industrial labor force); (2) Society-wide propagation of a division of labor resulting in emergence of a class of merchants and traders; and (3) massive accumulation of capital in the hands of the developing merchant class. It is the convergence of these historically conditioned processes that signals the development of capitalism. The first two processes were maturing in many parts of the world during the pre-capitalist era, but it was the spectacular development of the third process in Europe that shaped all subsequent history. Mercantile accumulations were large and rapidly acquired in western Europe because (1) the geographical location of many European countries gave them the opportunity to develop maritime and river trade at an early date, and (2) such trade was ^{paradoxically} stimulated by Europe's relative underdevelopment & valued paucity of natural resources. Thus, European traders travelled to the tropics in search of spices, tea, ivory, indigo, etc.; to Asia seeking high quality cloth, ornaments, pottery, etc; and finally the wild scramble to bring back precious metals and stones that were in short supply in Europe.

Europe's location on a cross-roads of trade routes between more economically developed civilizations and/or countries more richly endowed with natural resources, stimulated an explosive advance of trade and capitalist accumulation by the European merchants. The requirements of navigation and trade in turn fostered the rapidly development of scientific knowledge and weapons technology that enabled Europe to begin the colonial plunder of other areas, thereby throwing them onto the course of underdevelopment.

We may conclude, therefore, that capitalist culture is more highly advanced in the West, not because of pre-existing psychological or cultural traits of Europeans, but because (1) capitalist culture arose first in Europe for specific historical reasons, and (2) its rapid advancement in the 18th and 19th centuries was made possible by colonialist exploitation of much of the world. Thus, Europe and North America reached great material and cultural heights not because white people were cultural giants but because they were standing on the shoulders of the world's colonized peoples.

(Remaining sections still to be revised.)

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM *in the Left*

Because cultural chauvinism, the ^{ideological component} ~~emerging ideology~~ of modern imperialism, is so widespread in Western societies ^{its poison} ~~it~~ has also seeped into parts of ^{what is} ~~the movement~~ broadly referred to as the Left. Cultural arrogance in the movements ~~for~~ for social change is largely a reflection of the cultural chauvinism rampant in ^{imperialist} ~~capitalist~~ nations. While the negative effects of cultural chauvinism have not been of the same magnitude inside the Left as compared with the general ^{society,} ~~population~~, nevertheless it has been an enduring source of friction and conflict, thereby undermining unity on the one hand and promoting opportunism on the other. Clearly, the struggle against cultural chauvinism within the Left must have top priority if a true revolutionary unity is to be forged on a world scale.

If we observe the Left in Western nations it will be seen that the primary way in which cultural chauvinism manifests itself is the attempt to picture the world socialist movement as nothing more than a continuation and extension of the "European political tradition." Under this rubric socialism is reduced to a mere projection of the progressive ideas of ^{probably} "Western culture". It is ~~undeniably~~ true that socialist thought had to emerge first among those intellectuals located in the very ~~heart~~ center of the most advanced sector of world capitalism, ^{They were in the best} ~~and therefore~~ position to observe the overall workings of capitalism, and therefore could formulate theories relating to its development and eventual disintegration. But it is chauvinist to picture Marxian socialism as understandable only within the cultural milieu of Europe and the U.S. The origins of authorship should not be confused with the areas of relevance. Marxism is a set of theories and methods of analysis which apply to the global capitalist system as a whole. Unlike capitalist trade secrets, Marxism is not a commodity; hence no private ownership of it can be claimed. Yet, ~~this~~

17/17/17/17

this is precisely what ^{some} the radicalized intellectuals of the West have done. In effect, they have claimed ^{their private ideological property,} Marxism as ~~the ideology of the national bourgeoisie~~ and this claim has then been ~~used to elevate alienated intellectuals to the~~ used to elevate alienated intellectuals to the role of guardians of the ideological purity of the socialist movement. ~~For these armchair coaches of revolution, theory and practice are separated by continental boundaries, and "their" Marxism is reduced to an intellectual game resulting in the production of lengthy theoretical treatises and "definitive" critiques of those engaged in actual struggle. Needless to say the audience for such caricatures of Marxism is chiefly other alienated intellectuals and the more sophisticated members of the bourgeoisie who are titillated by such intellectual games.~~

Two corollaries stem from this kind of chauvinism. First, some socialist left-wing chauvinists create the illusion that revolutions in Russia, China, Cuba, Vietnam, etc., are somehow "distortions" of the basic Marxist vision. This chauvinist assertion ~~is~~ ^{correct} should not be confused with the attempt to account for the additional ^{confronting} problems ~~facing~~ revolutionary governments in these countries: ^{these} problems of overcoming underdevelopment in the face of capitalist encirclement. Rather the essential argument of the left-wing chauvinists is that "true" socialism can emerge only out of the "progressive political tradition" of the advanced capitalist nations. It is the ^{underlies} dialectical nature of such thinking that ~~underlies~~ ^{is} chauvinism. It conveniently ignores the dialectical relationship between the rise of imperialism and the encrusting of underdevelopment, and the consequent vanguard role played by national liberation movements in the world socialist struggle. The rise of socialism in the underdeveloped world is no "distortion;" it is the dialectical result of the globalization of monopoly capital.

A second corollary of this chauvinist line reluctantly admits the validity of socialist revolutions in the underdeveloped world, but it

continues to cling to the notion that Europe is the "philosophical ~~center~~ ^{and theoretical} center" of Marxism. For these armchair coaches of revolution, theory and practice are separated by continental boundaries, and "their" Marxism is reduced to an intellectual ~~game~~ exercise resulting in the proliferation of lengthy theoretical treatises and "definitive" critiques of those engaged in actual struggle. Of course, the audience for such caricatures of Marxism is chiefly other alienated intellectuals and the more "sophisticated" members of the bourgeoisie who are titillated by these intellectual games.

Occasionally, ~~this chauvinism~~ left-wing chauvinism becomes a virtual ally of ~~imperialism~~ cultural imperialism. Thus we recently saw a group of leftist intellectuals of ~~the~~ Europe and the U.S., along with their Latin American disciples, spring up in defense of "cultural freedom" which the revolutionary government of Cuba supposedly trampled upon when it criticized the parasitical mode of life of a Cuban poet. The poet, Herberto Padilla, was criticized because some of his poetry ~~was~~ glorified the very values the revolution was trying to change in Cuban life. ^{But on the other hand} ~~and~~ he was disciplined because ^{the bourgeois press} ~~he provided information to Cuba's enemies~~. However, with their insistent demands for "freedom of expression" the Western intellectuals completely ^{separate} confused these two issues in the "Padilla affair." Moreover, by elevating themselves to universal critics on the grounds that they are the true carriers of Marxist tradition, they confused their privileged position in bourgeois society with the objective needs of the Cuban revolution to defend itself. Their reaction to the criticism of Padilla indicated that they feared a revolution that insisted that intellectuals and artists cannot stand above the revolution but must be transformed by it. In sum, their attempt to "channel" the Cuban revolution along what they subjectively considered to be the correct path was hardly distinguishable from the cultural imperialism of the capitalist nations. Their criticisms showed little understanding of Cuba's desire to build a culture based on the masses, instead of the kind of elite and cynical "culture" that is characteristic of alienated intellectuals.

19/19/19

in bourgeois societies.

These "leftist" versions of cultural chauvinism have provoked
among
corresponding reactions ~~among~~ sincere revolutionaries, but not all
of these have been positive. For example, some non-white revolutionaries
react to left-wing chauvinism by rejecting Marxism on the grounds that
it is a racist European ideology. This line of reasoning confuses the
subjective claims of left-wing chauvinists with objective social reality.

in history
It is like ~~refusing~~ ^{refusing} to study mathematics on the grounds that since *at the time*
~~most~~ ^{most} 90 percent of mathematicians are Europeans, then mathematics must be some
kind of racist European thought-pattern. Of course many chauvinists would
believe
like us to ~~believe~~ precisely that, but we must avoid falling into such
traps. Marxism is an analytical tool, and ~~its usefulness~~ ^{like mathematics or any other}
science, its usefulness does not depend on the race of the person employing
it.

Some white revolutionaries react to left-wing chauvinism by becoming
professional "supporters" of Third World revolutions. This sometimes happens
with revolutionary journalists who spend all of their time traveling from
one country to another in the role of revolutionary press agents. The ~~danger~~
danger here is that they may adopt a cosmopolitan rather than an international
view of revolution; they may come to regard world revolution as a single,
monolithic process rather than a collection of interrelated but distinct
national struggles, and they may forget that international solidarity does
not simply mean "supporting" the struggles of others, but also working for
change in your own country.

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM *in U.S. movement*

Looking specifically at the United States we can see that cultural
~~chauvinism~~ chauvinism has precipitated much ideological confusion and organizational
havoc in the movement. For example, ^{many people} we are in the habit of judging ~~people~~ ^{others}
according to how well they measure up to the "standards" of "Western culture."

20/20/20

become
This leads to a kind of cultural absolutism that can ~~become~~ a severe problem, especially in movement organizations where people from different classes and ethnic backgrounds come into close contact. Thus ~~we tend to~~ ^{have a tendency} ~~they tend~~ approve of people who approach problems in a superficially intellectual manner, while ^{they're} ~~we're~~ suspicious of people who seem to rely on ~~instinct~~ intuition. ~~they~~ ^{we} approve of people who handle language according to the standard rules of grammar, and ~~we~~ ^{they} react against people who seem to invent words and rules as they go along. Over the years we have become accustomed to certain cultural styles and ~~we tend to~~ ^{many of us} reject people who follow different styles: intellectualism vs. intuition; verbal dexterity vs. verbal inventiveness. Unfortunately, the chauvinist habit of judging ~~things~~ people according to arbitrary and abstract cultural "norms" (divorced from social history) means that we get hung up on style and lose sight of content. We alienate each other by becoming self-righteous about styles, forgetting that the real problem is not how we communicate but what we communicate.

Some movement people react against cultural absolutism by adopting a kind of cultural romanticism. This is particularly true among "life-style revolutionaries" who have rejected the overt trappings of capitalist culture. Everyone who has been through the usual public educational system is programmed to dislike authentic folk culture because it is "primitive" and "undignified." We are taught instead to regard "classic" literature, symphonic music and the fine arts as the highest cultural ideals. People who reject this kind of programming often simply invert it. Instead of being condescending toward folk culture they become romantically infatuated with it, and paternalistically demand that folk culture keep itself "pure" ^{deprive it of its developmental possibilities.} and ~~untainted by the commercialization of the bourgeois world.~~ All this does is replace condescension with paternalism, but both are cut from the same cloth. Cultural romanticism totally ignores the fact that folk culture is an expression of people who are oppressed, and that for folk culture

to remain unchanged means that its creators must remain oppressed. Cultural romanticists therefore become accomplices in the bourgeois devastation of folk culture by playing the complementary ~~task~~ role of scavengers and parasites.

As a reaction against the cultural chauvinism of the dominant society the movement sometimes indulges in what might be called left-wing tokenism. There are two subtypes of this tokenism; one directed outward, the other directed inward. The outward type puts a non-white person in a tokenist position as window dressing for non-chauvinism. We all know of movement groups that have non-white people fronting for what is basically a white organization. We must take care, however, to distinguish when it is tokenism and when not, lest we fall into the trap of assuming that all multiracial situations are only masks for chauvinism. A crude but useful test is to ask the question: Are the non-white members of the organization hindered ^{or} aided by it in their effort to build a people's movement that cuts across ethnic lines?

The inward type of tokenism occurs when there is an obsessive pre-occupations with creating small islands of racial harmony. This can happen solely if a multiracial group starts functioning as ~~a refuge~~ a refuge for people who are ~~alienated~~ alienated by the racial and cultural strife of the dominant society. In this case maintenance of the inner racial harmony of the ~~group~~ group becomes a substitute for struggle against the racial and cultural chauvinism of the outer society. This is similar to the individual escapism inherent in youth culture. It tries to cure a disease by treating the symptoms ~~in isolation~~ in isolation and completely overlooking the underlying causes.

Perhaps the most confusing reaction to chauvinism ~~in the U.S.~~ is the notion of cultural nationalism. In general, cultural nationalism refers to the idea that the road to revolution lies in developing the national culture of a particular colonized people. Specifically, cultural

22/22/22

~~nationalism asserts that a colonized people must free themselves culturally~~
~~before they can free themselves politically.~~ Reduced to its essentials,
cultural nationalism is an intellectual reaction to the cultural chauvinism
of the dominant society. It is an attempt to restore a traditional culture
or to create new cultural values as a defense against the destructive en-
croachments of capitalist culture.

The problem is that cultural nationalism tries to restore the old
or create ~~new~~ a new culture without regard to the changed political and
economic situation of colonized people. As we have seen, culture grows
out of the organization of human labor, which is a political and economic
process. Cultural nationalism puts the cart before the horse by trying to
change culture before there is any change in the underlying political-
economy. Hence, cultural nationalism, when separated from political struggle,
runs into the same problems as youth culture. It often degenerates into
a passive retreat into cultural mysticism. In addition, its pre-occupation
with new (or old) forms of cultural expression -- music, art, ^{clothing,} ~~architecture~~
hair styles, etc. -- makes it a bonanza for capitalists seeking new markets
to exploit. At its worst cultural nationalism also fosters cultural arrogance
between different but equally ~~exploited~~ oppressed ethnic groups. It there-
fore hinders the development of a unified struggle of all colonized peoples
against capitalist oppression.

We must not make the mistake, however, of concluding that cultural
nationalism is totally negative. Like youth culture, cultural nationalism
is an expression of genuine alienation from the dominant capitalist culture.
If incorporated into the struggle for revolutionary political change, cultural
nationalism can make a positive contribution by awakening racial-national
consciousness to the need for change; but this can occur only if cultural
nationalism becomes an avenue for creating socialist consciousness and
culture rather than looking to restore traditions from the long dead past.

SOCIALIST CULTURE

It is appropriate to close this paper with some comments on socialist culture. First, however, a distinction should be made between communist culture and socialist culture. Communist ~~culture~~ culture can develop only after the completion of the world socialist revolution. It would be a reflection of the cultural possibilities inherent in a classless society, a world community free of all forms of human exploitation. At this stage in history we cannot draw ~~even~~ even a crude outline of communist culture because it is almost impossible for us to conceive of a world in which economic necessities and compulsions are no longer the driving forces of history. Presumably, as the socialist revolution advances the basic features of the future communist society will slowly emerge. Socialist culture, on the other hand, is present today. We can see it all around us in those countries that have taken the road to socialist construction while waging an intense and continuing class struggle. Socialist culture is a culture in struggle against capitalist and imperialist domination.

We may observe that in its non-material aspect socialist culture around the world has a common content, although it takes different national forms. In content socialist culture affirms the struggle against class and national oppression. This is true whether one is talking about opera in China, music in Vietnam, or posters in Cuba. ~~Inform~~ As to forms, each socialist country attempts to make use of those traditional forms that are part of its national heritage. This sometimes results, for example, in a merging of the technically more elaborate forms of high culture with the revolutionary content of folk culture. It should be noted though that socialist countries seek to avoid chauvinism. They do not hesitate to "borrow" cultural forms from other nations, including capitalist nations, if this can serve a useful purpose. This is because in socialist culture the primary element is content. As Fidel has pointed out: "For us, a

revolutionary people in a revolutionary process, the value of cultural and artistic creations is determined by their usefulness for the people, by what they contribute ~~to man, by what they contribute~~ to the liberation and happiness of man. ^{kind.} Our standards are political. There cannot be aesthetic value...in opposition to man, justice, welfare, liberation and the happiness of man." Socialist culture also aims to make creators out of the entire ~~human~~ people, instead of ^{ascribing} ~~assigning~~ the creative process to an elite of intellectuals and artists.

As for material culture, it should be noted that under socialism the quantity and types of production would be determined not by the market mechanism, but by rational planning based on the social needs of the masses. This does not mean that all problems are solved overnight. In fact, for underdeveloped countries it means that highest priority will be placed on industrial development and economic self-sufficiency, for it is precisely in these two areas that undeveloped nations have been crippled by imperialism. This is why in many socialist countries there is a lack of many consumer commodities. The available economic surplus is being channeled into long-term industrial development as the only sure route out of the backwardness imposed by imperialism.

In terms of specific cultural features, under socialism work relations undergo considerable change. Workers themselves are brought into the decision-making process, while managers are relegated to the role of administrators carrying out decisions made by the workers. At the same time labor is no longer a commodity. Under socialism people no longer ~~live only in order to~~ ^{work only in order to} live, but live in order to do work that is socially meaningful. Labor becomes the measure of life instead of an unwanted burden. Consequently, as workers become production-oriented under socialism, the correlation between wages and work ^{beginning to} breaks down to be replaced by a more equal distribution of income based on social need.

The family unit remains under socialism but it is no longer tied to property relations or economic compulsion. Instead the family becomes a voluntary unit based on equality among its members. Still, it should be observed that most socialist countries have adopted measures to strengthen family life, which was often severely disrupted under the impact of imperialism.

Since socialized production reaches its apex under socialism it follows that the dissemination of general public education is an urgent necessity. In order to overcome backwardness most socialist countries have adopted crash programs aimed at eliminating illiteracy and ignorance among the masses. They have also opened the doors of higher education to the workers. Simultaneously, socialist countries have tried to break down the capitalist distinction between an elite of thinkers on one hand versus a mass of doers on the other. Under socialist culture education is intimately linked to production: colleges for factory workers, work brigades for college students.

As far as political organization is concerned, the nation-state continues to exist under socialism but its class nature is fundamentally altered. Instead of being a political bureau of the capitalist classes the state becomes the political instrument of the working class, and serves the interests of that class. Consequently, workers' committees become more important than parliament or congress; the people speak for themselves at their places of work, rather than being "represented" by self-seeking politicians in the capital city.

Of course science and technology are vigorously promoted under socialism as vehicles for advancing economic and cultural development. However, science is divorced from the capitalist profit motive and is tied instead to the social needs of the nation as a whole. As in other areas, rational planning replaces the social anarchy of the market, and technology is made ~~xxx~~ a servant of the people instead of being a mad juggernaut before which people feel helpless.

26/26/26

As for the role of art and literature in socialist culture, we close with an extract from ^{Cuba's} ~~the~~ First National Congress on Education and Culture:

"We are a blockaded nation. We are building socialism only a few steps away from the center of world imperialism, on a continent where until very recently it held absolute power. The danger of military aggression by Yankee imperialism against Cuba is no speculation; it has been present throughout our revolutionary process.

"Art is a weapon of the Revolution. A product of the fighting spirit of our people. A weapon against the penetration of the enemy. Our art and literature will be a valuable tool for the formation of our young people in the spirit of revolutionary morals, excluding the selfishness and other aberrations typical of bourgeois culture.

"A new society cannot pay homage to the filth of capitalism. Socialism cannot begin where Rome ended. Our artistic works will heighten man's sensitivity and culture, creating in him a collectivist conscience and leaving no room for enemy diversionism in any of its forms."

How to handle group discussions

Discussion leaders should not simply summarize; instead stress central ideas, concepts; perhaps re-read key sentences.

Cultural Chauvinism

Discuss method of presentation: i) formal presentation with limited discussion, ii) cadre group discussion sessions

Intro-

Reasons for studying (similar to racism)

- a) must learn to combat it because (1) is emerging ideology of modern imperialism (as ~~the~~ old-style racism discredited), and (2) it has had a negative influence on the progressive forces in the imperialist nations.

- b) Note that material is difficult and requires careful study

~~Read 2 intro paras.~~

- c) Main point is not to memorize material or to become "experts" at identifying C. & C., but to gain some understanding of C.C. as an ideological force grounded in imperialism, not to be confused with cultural intolerance of ancient Greece

Paper divided into seven parts (not all of which will be read)

I Introduction

II Culture - Definitions and misconceptions (directly)

III Changes, etc. -- How capitalism as an economic system shapes ~~all~~ major aspects of social and cultural life.

IV C.C. in General -- historical origins of C.C. and some of its ~~contemporary~~ forms

V C.C. in the Left -- Some ways in which C.C. is reflected in Left.

VI C.C. in U.S. mmmt -- This really a sub-section of V. (factors peculiar to U.S.)

VII Socialist culture -- culture in struggle against imperialism.

Bob I READ Intro 2 paras. (^{skip} Summarize)

Smoky II CULTURE section: Definitions and misconceptions about culture. Can't talk about C.C. without understanding culture.

First 2 paras define two aspects of culture -- non-material and material -- and show how they are linked together through the social process of production.

Harry III READ 2 paras. (these not only ones)

Next section discusses three ^{common} misleading ideas about culture. The first of these is the idea that culture refers only to the fine arts. (In summaries discussion leaders should stress why these ideas are misleading)

Kathy Read 1 para.

Second misleading defn. talks about culture in terms of personal life-styles without reference to production.

Ric READ 3 paras.

Third misleading defn treats culture as a mysterious thing-in-itself, culture as the maker of history, rather than culture as made by history.

Bob READ 1 para.

III CHANGES IN CULTURAL LIFE UNDER CAPITALISM (Summarize)

Capitalism has revolutionized virtually all major aspects of social life.

- a) it socialized production (workforce and tools). This was progressive since it tremendously increased the possible output of human production (e.g., making clothing from scratch). Was ~~restricted~~ restricted, however, by capitalist property relations which made control of production private (and irrational) rather than social, and allowed for private appropriation of surplus.

- b) On world scale capitalist growth lead to a great imbalance, with Europe (and later N. America) becoming imperial headquarters of a vast economic empire - the colonial world.

Thus cultural history of whole world shaped by capitalist growth (cf. "Underdevelopment" paper)

2 very general broad effects

[2 contradictions]

Don't simply summarize; stress ^{central} ~~key~~ ideas, concepts;
perhaps re-read key sentences

Chauvinism -- militant glorification of one's country, race, group.

Point of paper is to show how CC is ideology of ~~imperialism~~ imperialism;
how it is a sophisticated version of racial ~~chauvinism~~ chauvinism.
(because latter was discredited to some extent.)

In past racial "superiority" used to explain ~~advanced~~ advanced
development of capitalist countries.
Today it is the western culture or cultural superiority that
is supposed to explain it.

Fundamental problem¹ with this approach is that it separates
development from history, and² it serves imperialism by fostering
the idea that only by westernizing or imitating the western
capitalist countries is it possible for TW countries to become
developed. Equates economic development with capitalist route.

Like racism, CC serves to confuse people about why the western
capitalist nations are more advanced

We should try to bring out main
points in each section through discussion
& conclusions

relate paper to Cuba — trying to give
brigades a good basis for struggling against
CC by understanding where it comes from and
how it is reflected in progressive movements

e.g. "backward" housing construction technology
in Cuba
role of imperialism ignored

- Five more specific cultural changes
- c) Traditional family structure disrupted and replaced by nuclear family, or none at all.
 - d) Education "democratized" to meet needs of social production.
 - e) Capitalism fostered growth of nation state to establish (1) a national legal system to define and protect property, (2) a uniform monetary and marketing system (e.g. weights and measures) (3) ~~develop~~ system of taxation which can be used to develop communication and transportation networks, and underwrite industry ~~tax~~ through govt. contracts and subsidies (welfare for the rich)
 - f) Nation-state thus serves as ~~is~~ "hot house" for capitalist development, and to stimulate competition with capitalists of other nations.
 - g) Science and technology made subservient to needs of capitalist class
 - h) Literature, art and music commercialized and made into commodities. (Mass culture replaces high and folk culture)
- [Religion another example - Protestantism]

These usually considered uniquely western cultural qualities

IV CULTURAL CHAUVINISM IN GENERAL (Read)

Discusses historical origins and some forms of C.C. First 3 paras attempt to show that as capitalist system developed it created an ideology to conceal its true nature. The main ingredient of this ideology was the idea that capitalist private property was somehow a "natural" phenomenon. Out of this idea came the myth of bourgeois "freedom" and law discovered by culturally superior "western man." Out of this idea developed the myth of bourgeois "freedom" and cultural chauvinism within the capitalist nations, and the cultural chauvinism of the capitalist nations toward the underdeveloped world.

Marian

READ 3 paras.

Next 3 paras define cultural chauvinism and discuss why it arose at a particular time in history.

Suekey

READ 3 paras.

(out of place)

This next para. looks at one of the cultural tactics used by imperialism both in the past and today.

Kathy

READ 1 para.

Next 3 paras explain why the notion of "western culture" is an example of cultural chauvinism. The main argument is that so-called "western culture" is not an inherent or unique feature of western society, nor did it develop independently of the rest of the world.

Bob

READ 3 paras.

The next para. discusses the geographic and historical factors that caused capitalism to develop first in Europe, and points out that this was not a result of Euro. "cultural superiority." Also two concluding paras.

Marian

READ 3 paras.

V CULTURAL CHAUVINISM IN THE LEFT

Main point of this section is to show that even the progressive and radical forces are not immune to the cultural chauvinism of the imperialist nations. This has tended to undermine international unity and promote opportunism.

~~READ 1 para.~~

Uniqueness

Example of (1) science as "western"; ^{the people "don't} think scientifically"
or (2) present high advancement of science as
attributable to qualities of "western culture" civilization

The next 3 paras talk about one form of cultural chauvinism in the left. This form occurs when people try to claim that socialism and Marxism are simply an extension of the European cultural heritage, and therefore "true" socialism can only develop in Europe and the world socialist movement must be controlled by Europeans.

Smully
Harry READ 4 paras.

The next para gives a specific example of how left-wing chauvinism can become a virtual ally of cultural imperialism, and therefore opposed to the socialist struggle going on in Cuba.

Kathy READ 1 para.

The last two paras. in this section discuss two incorrect responses to left-wing chauvinism

Ric READ 2 paras.

VI CULTURAL CHAUVINISM IN U.S. MOVEMENT

This section should be regarded as a continuation of cultural chauvinism in the left, except that now we are emphasizing some chauvinist features that are peculiar to the U.S. movement.

The first two paras discuss cultural ~~romanticism~~ absolutism, which is simply a form of chauvinism, and cultural romanticism, which is an incorrect reaction against chauvinism and absolutism.

Smully
Harry READ 2 paras.

The next two paras. look ~~at another incorrect reaction~~ ~~to chauvinism~~ at another incorrect reaction to chauvinism; what we have called left-wing tokenism.

Harry READ 2 paras.

Finally, we conclude this section with a discussion of cultural nationalism, which is still another reaction against chauvinism. As we will see, cultural nationalism has both ~~positive~~ negative and positive qualities.

Kathy READ 3 paras.

VII SOCIALIST CULTURE -- a culture in struggle to free itself from the shackles of underdevelopment.

The first 3 paras draw a distinction between communist culture and socialist culture, and then talk about the non-material and material aspects of socialist culture in general terms.

Ric READ 3 paras.

The next ^{Section} ~~five~~ paras. outline very briefly how socialism shapes culture in the areas of work relations, family life, education, political organization of the state, and science and technology.

Bob READ 5 paras.

The last part of the ~~next~~ paper gives us some idea of how the Cubans see the role of art and literature in the struggle to achieve socialism.

Harry READ to END.

Questions :

what do you consider to be essential points?

1. What is culture?
2. What is cultural chauvinism? Its relation to racism?
3. Is capitalist culture completely reactionary?
4. Can Third World people be cultural chauvinists? (examples?) Africans
5. What has happened to youth culture today?
6. Why did capitalism develop first in Europe?
7. Examples of cultural imperialism? (from previous brigade)
8. Cultural chauvinism between North American and Cuban women
9. What are differences between Cap. culture & socialist culture.
10. Relationship between Cultural Revolution (in China) and cultural nationalism

~~Definition~~ chauvinism —
militant glorification of
one's country, race, group, etc

Culture vs society -- former is analogous to a game board and the rules by which game is played; latter is like an actual game in process with concrete players.

Cultural Accumulation

Dilemma of the Church', in L. Von Wiese & H. Becker, *Systematic Sociology*, New York: Wiley, 1932, pp. 624-42, esp. pp. 627-8).

2. J. M. Yinger, following Becker, stresses the criteria for defining a cult: 'The term cult is used in many different ways, usually with the connotations of small size, search for a mystical experience, lack of an organizational structure, and presence of a charismatic leader' (*Religion, Society and the Individual*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957, p. 154). He describes it as being at the extreme of personal non-institutionalized religious experience. In a more highly organized and self-conscious form it becomes a sect (q.v.) (*Religion in the Struggle for Power*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1946, p. 22).

William L. Kolb

See also: CARGO CULT
PEYOTISM
RELIGION
SECT

Cultural Accumulation

A. *Cultural accumulation* denotes a process of cultural growth whereby new cultural elements or traits are added by invention, discovery, and borrowing to those already present, with a resultant increase in the total number of traits or elements.

B. Cultural accumulation and its synonyms are widely employed by anthropologists to characterize the incremental nature of cultural growth and development. Thus L. A. White describes culture as '... a symbolic, continuous, cumulative, and progressive process' (*The Science of Culture*, New York: Farrar, Straus, 1949, p. 140). A. L. Kroeber writes that '... broadly speaking, the process of cultural development is an additive and therefore accumulative one, whereas the process of organic evolution is primarily a substitutive one' (*Anthropology*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948, p. 297).

C. The usage exemplified by White and Kroeber stresses the progressive and developmental nature of culture and thus implies more than a simple increase in the total number of traits and elements. At the same time it must be recognized that culture can accumulate in a simple numerical way without creating progress as measured by any useable criteria.

1. Thus while Kroeber (*The Nature of Culture*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952, p. 152) later offered a more restrictive

formulation, i.e. ... the property of accumulativeness is characteristic not of the whole of culture but chiefly of its scientific-technological component', this is true only if cultural accumulation is restricted to incremental development and progress measured by the criterion of instrumental efficiency.

2. Cultural additions can be made in the realm of religion and art, for example, without superseding other items and traits, thus increasing the total number of items and traits in the culture.

3. Whether or not there can and does occur progressive, incremental development in cultural realms other than those of science and technology cannot be determined unless other criteria of progress than those of instrumental efficiency are employed. That an aesthetic or religious belief system can and does unfold and occasions developmental cultural accumulation in such realms, seems obvious.

D. Attempts have been made to specify the processes of cultural accumulation. Thus H. C. Moore ('Cumulation and Cultural Processes', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 56, 1954, pp. 347-57) distinguishes three types of cultural accumulation.

1. The development of more complex cultural patterns out of simpler antecedent forms, Moore calls 'progressive cumulation'.

2. The introduction of novel elements or cultural alternatives of about the same level of complexity he terms 'agglutinative accumulations'.

3. A third type in which an incremental change leads to the eventual replacement of a trait is called by Moore 'cumulation-becoming-substitution'.

Joseph B. Casagrande

See also: CULTURAL SUBSTITUTION

Cultural Alternative

A. *Cultural alternative* is used to denote those different traits and patterns in culture offering choice to the individual in meeting comparable situations, achieving similar ends through varying means, or of achieving varying ends for the satisfaction of similar needs.

B. The term *cultural alternative* together with the companion terms *cultural speciality* (q.v.) and *cultural universal* (q.v.) give recognition to the fact of variability in the degree to which individuals participate in, and control knowledge of, the different aspects of their culture.

While the meaning of these terms is implicit in their ordinary usage, they were first defined as anthropological terms by R. Linton in 1936 (*The Study of Man*, New York: Appleton-Century, 1936, pp. 272-4). He also included a fourth, residual category of extra-cultural behaviour, 'individual peculiarities'.

C. R. Redfield has pointed out that Linton used the term *cultural alternative* for culture traits or patterns of two different types (*The Folk Culture of Yucatan*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. 347-8): (a) those traits or patterns shared by some but not all members of a society or even by all members of its sub-groups; (b) those known to all normal adult members of a society or to all members of particular socially recognized sub-groups, but among which the individual may exercise choice.

It is important to note that this ambiguity actually points to overlappings that can be eliminated only by using the terms in an analytic and abstract way rather than as complete concrete descriptions. Thus a given occupation (q.v.) in a particular culture may as a concrete phenomenon be designated by all three terms, which point analytically to three different aspects of occupation:

1. As a body of knowledge and skills known only to the members of the occupational group, the occupation can be regarded as a *speciality*.

2. In so far as the occupation is recognized by all the sane adult members of the society as a legitimate mode of activity contributing certain services to the society, it can be considered a *cultural universal*.

3. If the society is a society of achieved rather than ascribed occupational statuses, then the occupation can be regarded as a *cultural alternative*.

Joseph B. Casagrande

See also: CULTURAL SPECIALTY
CULTURAL UNIVERSAL
CULTURE

Cultural Anthropology
(See Social Anthropology)

Cultural Configuration

It is impossible to give a single definition of the term *cultural configuration* although it is closely related to the concept *culture pattern* (q.v.).

1. C. Kluckhohn has proposed that *configuration* be applied to patterning in the *covert culture* (q.v.), while *culture pattern* be reserved for the patterning of *overt culture*: 'A pattern is

Cultural Convergence

a generalization of behavior or of ideals for behavior. A configuration is a generalization from behavior. Both patterns and configurations are thus abstractions. ... Configurations ... tend to be purely inferential constructs. Configuration looks to an inner coherence in terms of the larger structuralizing principles which prevail in the *covert culture*. Patterns are forms: configurations are, so to speak, inter-relationships between forms' ('Patterning as Exemplified in Navaho Culture', in L. Spier (ed.), *Language, Culture, and Personality*, Menasha, Wis.: Sapir Memorial Publication Fund, 1941, p. 126).

2. A. L. Kroeber, however, uses *configuration* to mean a set of relationships in space, time, and achievement among historical phenomena; and often appears to treat *cultural configuration* and *culture pattern* as synonyms (*Configurations of Culture Growth*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1944, esp. p. 844). His usage of *configuration* is distinct from, though related to, that of the Gestalt psychologists. Referring to culture, Kroeber's *configuration* is linked more directly with the style of the art historians and notions of pattern-style-configuration as employed by Spengler and other general historians. Although P. A. Sorokin uses *configuration*, as well as *pattern*, infrequently and unsystematically, his distinction between the 'internal and external aspects of culture' and his characterization of cultural 'mentalities' as *ideational*, *sensate*, and *idealistic* belong in the same broad tradition which stresses cultural configuration (*Social and Cultural Dynamics*, Boston: Porter Sargent, 1957, pp. 20 ff.).

Clyde Kluckhohn

See also: CULTURE
CULTURE PATTERN

Cultural Convergence

A. *Cultural convergence* is a process of change by which heterogeneous features in the cultures of geographically separated peoples grow more and more alike with the passage of time until they reach a relatively high degree of similarity, or identity, without any historical factor such as diffusion (q.v.) or acculturation (q.v.) having contributed to the likeness. The nature of the theoretical interest in culture growth determines the degree and kind of similarity which must be present in the end products in order to class them as examples of convergence.

1. *Convergence* is to be understood only in conjunction with the associated concept of *parallelism*. In both cases, the phenomena

Cultural Convergence

are cultural features in geographically separate places which exhibit a sufficient degree of similarity to suggest a common origin, but for which no historical connection and no evidence of diffusion can be found to account for the resemblance.

2. *Convergence* has come to be applied to those instances of resemblance where the evidence indicates that antecedent forms were more and more different as viewed in reverse time sequence. Thus, the contemporary resemblance is spurious so far as what it suggests about history is concerned. Like results have grown from unlike origins.

B. The interpretation of particular phenomena of resemblance as convergence rather than simple parallelism can only rationally be made if there be evidence of unlike origins. The nature of this evidence and the scientific predilections of the investigator generally result in an hypothesis, if not a theory, to account for the process.

1. P. Ehrenreich, who, although he credited Thilenius and von Luschan with the earliest use of the term, first gave it a solid theoretical basis, proposed three explanatory factors: similar environment, similar psychology, and similar cultural conditions, with the first being of relatively small importance ('Zur Frage der Beurteilung und Bewertung ethnographischer Analogien', *Correspondenzblatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1903, pp. 176-80).

2. F. Graebner, leader of the *Kulturkreis* (q.v.) group, insisted, on the other hand, that likeness in the natural environment was the only important factor in the independent development of similar culture features, if it is granted that such independence exists at all. This latter qualification indicates his fundamental opposition, as a diffusionist, to the ideas of parallelism and convergence (*Methode der Ethnologie*, Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1911).

C. Graebner's opposition to the ideas of parallelism and convergence stimulated rejoinders from the American anthropologists, R. H. Lowie and A. A. Goldenweiser, which are perhaps the most important statements made on convergence, and in Goldenweiser's case, on the ancillary principle of *limited possibilities* (R. H. Lowie, 'On the Principle of Convergence in Ethnology', *Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 25, 1912, pp. 24-42; A. A. Goldenweiser, 'The Principle of Limited Possibilities in the Development of Culture', *Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 26, 1913, pp. 259-90).

1. In Lowie's discussion the methodologically distinct concepts of convergence and independent development are confused, and he uses the term *convergent evolution*. In agreement with F. Boas, Lowie denies the principle of complete convergence: '... if we found exact parallels of very complicated phenomena, their occurrence in two areas, no matter how widely separated, could not reasonably be explained by convergence' ('On the Principle of Convergence in Ethnology', p. 30). Boas's phrasing is: 'Nobody claims that convergence means an absolute identity of phenomena derived from heterogeneous sources; but we think we have ample proof to show that the most diverse ethnic phenomena, when subject to similar psychical conditions, or when referring to similar activities, will give similar results (not equal results) which we group naturally under the same category when viewed, not from an historical standpoint, but from that of psychology, technology or other similar standpoints. The problem of convergence lies in the correct interpretation of the significance of ethnic phenomena that are apparently identical, but in many respects distinct ...' ('Review of Graebner, *Methode der Ethnologie*', *Science*, vol. 34, 1911, p. 807).

The antagonism of Boas and Lowie to the recognition of great likeness as constituting identity, blinded them to the significance of reasonable likenesses, so that neither capitalized upon the interpretational possibilities of the concept of convergence. Indeed, Lowie even doubted that genuine convergence was anything more than an unlikely theoretical possibility.

2. Goldenweiser rejects the term *convergent evolution*, declaring that nothing comparable to the organically unified process of biological evolution is involved in cultural convergence; rather convergence is '... merely a term for certain cultural similarities brought about by processes that are neither historically connected nor parallel' ('The Principle of Limited Possibilities in the Development of Culture', p. 263). He distinguishes *genuine* convergence as that which involves psychologically similar cultural traits, in contrast to *false* convergence in which the similarities are not psychological but merely objective or classificatory. He applies the separate term *dependent convergence* to those similarities which develop from different sources but under the influence of a common cultural medium.

Every instance of parallelism involves, of necessity, a convergence according to Golden-

weiser. He reaches this conclusion on the basis of the principle that the probability of a parallel series is roughly inversely proportional to the length of the series. Goldenweiser does not consider the equally likely process of divergence. The latter would seem to require historical data which are not available, but other possible solutions are not ruled out—the question has simply been neglected by all save the linguists.

Goldenweiser refined and expanded the theory of *limited possibilities* and integrated it with his analysis of convergence as the principal explanatory factor: '... every culture is characterized by a limited number of culture traits. ... This limitation in number and character of cultural traits, when compared to the multiplicity of possible historical and psychological sources, constitutes a limitation in the possibilities of development, and necessitates convergence. The principle of limited possibilities in cultural development is thus constituted an a priori argument in favor of convergence' ('The Principle of Limited Possibilities in the Development of Culture', p. 290).

D. Much recent discussion has centred on the issues raised by Goldenweiser.

1. J. J. Honigmann has stated that: 'Convergence is based on the limited possibilities governing change in a given situation' (*The World of Man*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959, p. 206). This generalization is difficult if not impossible to defend. Limited possibilities may be the most frequently operating mechanism but certainly not the only one. As one example from many, the whole field of *psychic unity* would be eliminated. In literature, language, and ceremonial life, as G. P. Murdock has pointed out, limitations are slight and variation may be enormous ('The Common Denominators of Cultures', in R. Linton (ed.), *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, p. 139).

2. In an important paper treating of convergence, C. Erasmus states that: 'It would seem that the differences between the "psychic unity" and the "limited possibilities" types of explanation is one of degree rather than kind' ('Patolli, Pachisi, and the Limitation of Possibilities', *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, vol. 6, 1950, p. 386). However, his statement is categorical rather than supported and undoubtedly is thrown out principally to give impetus to further research.

Verne F. Ray

See also: CULTURAL PARALLELISM

Cultural Determinism

Cultural Determinism

A. *Cultural determinism* is the conception that a cultural system or way of life exerts or is capable of exerting a determining influence upon other aspects of human behaviour, i.e. that the influence is such that these aspects are what they are because of such influence. In some forms it holds that cultural factors determine cultural factors: that a cultural system is its own invariable predictor—the expression 'invariable predictor' being used to retain the stress on invariance while avoiding controversy on the nature of 'cause'. This stress itself can be lightened, but the term would then more properly become *cultural influence* or *cultural conditioning*. Sometimes it is used in a weaker sense simply to denote the view that cultural systems are themselves determined—without specifying that they are determined culturally.

B. There can be little doubt that culture influences culture, but to extend this to mean that culture determines culture without reference to other elements of behaviour and of the situation seems illegitimate.

1. Nineteenth-century speculative evolutionary anthropologists called attention to the regular growth of culture in which, e.g. one form of marriage, mode of subsistence, or religious belief succeeded another in regular fashion (L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, London: Macmillan, 1877). Presumably some form of cultural determinism or conditioning was at work but its nature remained unclarified. While speculative evolutionary theory was abandoned in the 20th century, archaeological data concerning successive phases of culture permitted formulation of a more explicit theory of culture growth, in which a subsequent phase of culture could be shown to be rooted in and dependent upon earlier developments. For example, in many parts of the world the development of agriculture in place of food gathering encouraged population growth, sedentary village life, complex forms of administration, increase of trade, and division of labour by skill. Among exponents of this way of viewing culture are V. G. Childe and J. Steward (V. G. Childe, *What Happened in History*, New York: Penguin Books, 1942, p. 22; J. Steward, 'Cultural Causality and Law', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 51, 1946, pp. 1-27).

2. Not only historically but synchronically, as functionalists have pointed out, a culture at any moment is, at least in part, the product of all its components. Thus if the shift from hoe to

Cultural Drift

plough cultivation is likely to be followed by a shift from matrilineal to patrilineal residence, then it follows that at any moment matrilineal residence is supported by hoe cultivation and patrilineal residence by plough cultivation (G. P. Murdock, *Social Structure*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949, p. 206).

3. Yet culture is not to be explained solely in its own terms. One area of socially shared behaviour is not simply determined by the other parts of the cultural system. Every cultural system exists in a larger context, 'the situation', by which it is also influenced. The situation includes the human component, i.e. biological organisms with certain limits and potentialities; the environmental component, including all features except the human organism and artifacts; and, finally, the demographic component, 'the population ... served by a culture' (J. P. Gillin, *The Ways of Men*, New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1948, ch. 10, pp. 198-208).

C. Again there can be little doubt that culture is a pervasive influence in all of human behaviour, but it is doubtful that the relationship is invariant.

1. Culture consists of socially created and shared patterns of human behaviour which are to some degree symbolically formulated. Since any item of motivated human behaviour is seldom totally separated from behaviour that can be defined as culture, it follows that such an item of behaviour is substantially influenced by culture. This idea is expressed in phrases like 'culture determines human behaviour', a position sometimes assumed to combat racism and other organic theories of culture. '...those explanations of custom which derive our economic scheme from human competitiveness, ... and all the rest of the ready explanations that we meet in every magazine ... have for the anthropologist a hollow ring' (R. Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1935, p. 232).

2. It is possible, however, to interpret too literally the term *cultural determinism* in this context. L. White, for example, argues that slavery, war, race prejudice, and other elements of culture can be explained better by the assumption that it is not people who possess preferences for such custom: '... they do not "have them" at all; rather it is the cultures which possess the people who have been born into them' (*The Science of Culture*, New York: Farrar, Straus, 1949, p. 126). Culture may even be described as possessing an extrasomatic character and to be subject to laws of its own.

It cannot be explained by the laws which explain individual behaviour.

3. Such ways of speaking, however, obscure the fact that culture basically is behaviour and exists only in persons, in their physiological, biochemical, and psychological reactions. Only for convenience are cultural phenomena frozen on the cultural level and culture treated as though it were an autonomous realm (A. L. Kroeber, 'White's View of Culture', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 50, 1948, pp. 405-14). It is necessary to guard against the culturalistic fallacy, which claims that culture is all and ignores the role of the individual, and the biologicistic fallacy, that would derive culture solely from organismic factors.

John J. Honigsmann

See also: DETERMINISM
SOCIAL CAUSATION

Cultural Drift

A. *Cultural drift* denotes a process of internal change in a cultural system (q.v.) constituted by the unconscious selection of small changes in culture, such changes being cumulative and tending in some special direction. It imposes certain limits on the possibilities of further alteration, and consequently provides a basis for assessing the significance of particular cultural variants, and for understanding differential resistance or receptivity to internal or external innovation. Denoting direction, the concept is compatible with unilinear or multilinear theories of change.

B. The term is important but it has not been used widely even by anthropologists, who are responsible for its introduction and elaboration. The term was first used with respect to language and was then extended to other areas of culture.

1. Probably the earliest use was that of E. Sapir who said, 'The drift of a language is constituted by the unconscious selection on the part of its speakers of those individual variations that are cumulative in some special direction' (*Language*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1921, pp. 165-6).

2. F. Eggan adapted the concept from Sapir and applied it to the study of a series of changes in northern Philippine culture which appeared to have a particular direction. He remarked, 'Changes, which on the surface seemed to be the result of Spanish or American contacts, turned out on closer inspection to be native cultural changes. Resistance to change, on the

one hand, or rapid acceptance, on the other, seemed explicable in many cases in terms of this "drift" ('Some Aspects of Culture Change in the Northern Philippines', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 43, 1941, p. 13).

3. M. J. Herskovits views *drift* as a major process in cultural change, defining the process as '... those changes that represent the accumulation of small variations, whose total effect, over a period of time, is to bring about alterations that, viewed from day to day, are scarcely noticeable' (*Man and His Works*, New York: Knopf, 1948, p. 580). In Herskovits's interpretation, cultural drift explains direction of change, why some variations are important and others not, and why some culture traits are accepted and others rejected.

4. A process of change analogous to 'linguistic drift' is stressed by G. P. Murdock in his theory of the evolution of social organization. Both processes possess the following features: 'limitation in the possibilities of change, a strain toward consistency, shifts from one to another relatively stable equilibrium, compensatory internal readjustments, resistance to any influence from diffusion that is not in accord with the drift' (*Social Structure*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949, p. 199).

C. Among sociologists concerned with problems of long-term change, the concept of *immanent change* although broader, seems to be the closest approach to *cultural drift* (cf. P. A. Sorokin, *Society, Culture and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947, pp. 154-5).

Harry W. Basehart

See also: CULTURE
CULTURE CHANGE

Cultural Evolution

A. *Cultural evolution* denotes a temporal-formal process, continuous and usually accumulative and progressive, by which cultural phenomena, systemically organized, undergo change, one form or stage succeeding another. Cultural evolutionism is the application of the general theory of evolution to cultural phenomena as distinguished from biological or physical phenomena. In the latter half of the 19th century cultural evolution was frequently termed *development* and the same equivalence is common today. The essentials of the theory of cultural evolution were set forth by E. B. Tylor in 1881: '... it appears that wherever there are found elaborate arts, abstruse knowledge, complex institu-

Cultural Evolution

tions, these are the results of gradual development from an earlier, simpler, and ruder stage of life. No stage of civilization comes into existence spontaneously, but grows or is developed out of the stage before it' (*Anthropology*, London: Murray, 1881, p. 20).

B. Theories of cultural evolution may be unilinear, in which one treats the culture of mankind as a unity; or they may be multilinear, in which one treats the culture of mankind as consisting of parts. Both views are valid; the one implies the other. One can trace the course of the evolution of culture of mankind as a whole, or any portion of the cultural totality that can be treated as a unit or a system. One can work out the evolution, or evolutions, of writing, currency, clan organization, or the plough. But one cannot work out the evolution of the human family, as L. H. Morgan tried to do, because the family cannot be treated as a closed system; it is always and everywhere merely a part of a larger social configuration. One can speak of the evolution of the culture of a people, such as the Chinese, or of an area, such as the Andean highlands, only in so far as it can be considered as a closed system; otherwise the occurrence of diffusion would make the establishment of stages impossible. Some theorists hold that multilinear theories of cultural evolution enable one to reconstruct the culture history of specific areas or peoples, but they are confusing the evolution of culture with the culture history of peoples or areas. Cultural evolutionism is concerned only with cultural phenomena as such—with tools, implements, customs, institutions, ideologies—and not with the cultural historical experiences of a people—a tribe or nation: '... this scheme [of the early evolutionists] purports, not to unravel the history of given cultures or peoples, but only to sum up the evolution of culture as such. It is the evolution of culture that is being summed, not the history of a culture or of a people' (R. L. Beals & H. Hoijer, *An Introduction to Anthropology*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953, p. 606).

Cultural evolution is not synonymous with progress, but on the whole it has been progressive. Nor is the direction invariably from the simple to the complex; it may be just the reverse.

The validity of theories of cultural evolution has been much debated in anthropological circles. After having been rejected by many anthropologists, they are currently being revived and refined and tested (see L. A. White, *The*

Cultural Integration

Evolution of Culture, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959; J. H. Steward, *Theory of Culture Change*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955; V. Gordon Childe, *Social Evolution*, New York: H. Schuman, 1951).

Leslie A. White

See also: CULTURE
CULTURE CHANGE
EVOLUTION
SUPERORGANIC

Cultural Integration

A. *Cultural integration* may be defined as (a) the processes whereby a culture becomes whole or entire or (b) the state wherein a culture is whole or entire. The state is recognized or the process realized in (a) a logical, emotional, or aesthetic consistency among cultural meanings; (b) a congruence of cultural norms with behaviour; and (c) the critical or functional interdependence and reinforcement of the different component customs and institutions of the system. There is considerable overlap if not complete identity with the term social integration (q.v.).

B. In every instance of its use the term *cultural integration* recognizably shares the sense of 'wholeness' and of the whole as greater than the sum of its parts. There are, however, at least three somewhat distinct senses of *cultural integration* in anthropology, the field of its primary relevance.

1. It is used to refer to 'the strain of consistency' and the relative consistency present in cultural systems among objects and meanings, customs and beliefs, norms and actions (W. G. Sumner, *Folkways*, Boston: Ginn, 1906, p. 5). 'If the elements of a culture require, for its full exposition, exposition of other elements, this aspect of culture organization exists' (R. Redfield, *The Folk Culture of Yucatan*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. 350-1). 'Functionalism' of any variety, essentially an emphasis upon the study of the interrelatedness of different parts of culture or social behaviour, derives from the basic postulate of cultural integration, in contrast to the various historical approaches which '... tend to view single cultures as congeries of disconnected traits, disparate in origin and history ...' (R. L. Beals & H. Hoijer, *An Introduction to Anthropology*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953, p. 617).

2. A special sense of *cultural integration*, not contradictory to the first, is that of R. Benedict. For her the integration of a culture is 'patterning' which can be expressed in some,

though not all, cultures as a master principle or *culture pattern* (q.v.). 'A culture, like an individual, is a more or less consistent pattern of thought and action. Within each culture there come into being characteristic purposes not necessarily shared by other types of society. In obedience to these purposes each people further and further consolidates its experience, and in proportion to the urgency of these drives the heterogeneous items of behaviour take more and more congruous shape' (*Patterns of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1935, p. 46). In seeming contradiction, however, Benedict also refers to a '... lack of integration ... as characteristic of certain cultures as extreme integration is of others' (ibid., p. 223).

3. For many writers, often the same ones who use the term in one of the foregoing senses, *cultural integration* is the process whereby the cultural system, as it undergoes change through time, maintains an approximation of such order as is implied in the foregoing (R. Linton, *The Study of Man*, New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936, p. 348). This usage of the term is especially applicable to the incorporation of new customs or beliefs into a culture and is commonly said to be reflected in three ways: (a) the selectivity of innovation; (b) the modification of the form, function, meaning, or use of a borrowed item to bring it into fuller harmony with the culture (ibid., pp. 401-21); (c) the adaptation of the cultural system itself to fit the new usage at any point of stress. *Cultural lag* (q.v.) is, for example, a temporary disharmony due to failure to adapt in this fashion (W. F. Ogburn, *Social Change*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1923, pp. 200-13).

C. Since it is a standard assumption of cultural anthropology and sociology that cultures differ in the completeness of their integration, a measure whereby the degree of integration in different cultures might be compared is felt by some to be an important methodological need of these disciplines.

James B. Watson

See also: CULTURAL PATTERN
CULTURAL SYSTEM
FUNCTION
SOCIAL INTEGRATION
SOCIAL SYSTEM

Cultural Lag

A. *Cultural lag* is a term employed in the study either of culture change (q.v.) or of social dis-

organization (q.v.) (cf. e.g. A. Boskoff, 'Social Change', in H. Becker & A. Boskoff (eds.), *Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change*, New York: The Dryden Press, 1957, pp. 299-301; and also D. Martindale, 'Social Disorganization', in ibid., pp. 349-54). It may be defined as the period between that point in time at which one cultural element approximates a cultural goal, valued by the society or by the observer, and that point at which another element or other elements achieve such a degree of approximation; or, as the difference in the rate of change of two or more cultural elements about whose inter-relationships the observer makes no normative predication or claim either explicitly or implicitly. It is treated as a major aspect of social change, and as a causal factor in social disorganization.

B. The term was coined by W. F. Ogburn who used it to designate the time which passes between a change in 'material' culture (e.g. the supply of forests) and the adjustive change in 'adaptive' culture (e.g. policy of using the forests), without excluding the possibility of adaptive culture changing before material culture or non-material culture changing without the material culture changing likewise (*Social Change*, New York: Viking Press, 1922, pp. 200-13).

C. With the gradual disappearance of the use of the term 'material culture' to designate technological objects, and the increasing emphasis on the symbolic aspects of even technological culture, it was necessary to redefine *cultural lag*. Thus T. Parsons considers Ogburn's use of the term to be a variant of Veblen's proposition that 'pragmatic' or 'predatory' actions and institutions lag behind 'workmanlike' or technological ones ('Sociological Elements in Economic Thought', in H. E. Barnes, H. Becker & F. B. Becker, *Contemporary Social Theory*, New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1940, p. 618). The restriction of the term to a time gap between the development of technological and non-technological culture as such is abandoned in H. Hart's conception of cultural lag as the 'time interval between two phases in the development of a culture complex or of two different culture complexes, where the length of the interval requires shortening in order better to promote generally accepted social ends and where such shortening is regarded as potentially possible through social planning' ('The Hypothesis of Cultural Lag: A Present-

Cultural Parallelism

Day View', in F. R. Allen, et al., *Technology and Social Change*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957, p. 424).

D. J. H. Mueller distinguishes between 'spurious lag' where because the two categories of culture examined are incommensurable, the lag cannot be established but only proclaimed and where it may disappear on redefinition; and 'true lag' where the lagging element is either an effect of another element which precedes it in time or not a time-lag at all but a 'measure of the qualitative disparity between a norm and a given achievement', 'Present Status of the Cultural Lag Hypothesis', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 3, 1938, pp. 320-7).

Kurt H. Wolff

See also: SOCIAL CHANGE
SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION

Cultural Parallelism

A. *Cultural parallelism* is the presence in two or more places of a feature of culture which, in its geographically separate manifestations, is sufficiently similar in significant aspects to justify its being treated as one for purposes of theoretical interpretation; and for which the available evidence indicates no historically common origin nor diffusion which could account for the presence of the feature in the separate places.

B. When unadorned by a distinct theoretical interpretation or specific historical reference, parallelism merely refers to the presence of a particular feature of culture among two or more peoples geographically distinct one from the other. The geographical distance may be great or small, the cultural feature may be a vast complex or a mere element, the degree of similarity may be virtual identity or may be so slight as to be apparent only to an observer with a lively imagination. Only when theoretical considerations are brought to bear do these differences become critical, and only in connection with such theories does the term have significance.

C. Theoretical usage falls into several broad categories which, while not mutually exclusive, are different in kind.

1. The first broad category of theoretical interpretation of cultural parallels is that espoused by A. Bastian (1826-1905). He held that all mankind shares elementary ideas—*Elementargedanken*—which make for similar

Cultural Relativity

responses modified only moderately by environmental conditions and historical factors. This *psychic unity* of mankind naturally resulted in the constant repetition of *inventions* among peoples despite isolation. Thus parallelism for Bastian was merely the evidence which proved psychic unity. His influence was great both in Europe and America. His American follower, D. Brinton, explained even the similarities of adjacent tribes as due to psychic unity. Perhaps the best-known English exponent was Sir James G. Frazer whose *Golden Bough* (London: Macmillan, 3rd edn., 1922-6) is a twelve-volume monument to psychic unity.

2. The second category is that of *cultural evolution* (q.v.) where the assumption is that all societies proceed through the same or closely similar stages of development. This is not the same as *psychic unity*, although the two are not necessarily antagonistic. Nevertheless, as R. H. Lowie properly points out, the *concept* of biological evolution, from which the idea of cultural evolution derives, does not suggest parallelism, although the facts provide numerous *examples*. The *principle* is one of unique events producing discrete results. Lowie recognizes this but does not dispose of the theoretical implications of the facts. He concludes that 'Parallelism was possible only on the principle that the psychic unity of mankind constantly impelled societies to duplicate one another's ideas' (*The History of Ethnological Theory*, New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937, p. 29). Lowie characteristically uses the terms parallelism and *psychic unity* almost interchangeably.

3. A third type of explanation for parallels involves simply recognition of the fact that man is far more inventive than would appear from the reasoning of Bastian and his followers, the cultural evolutionists, and a majority of the diffusionists. E. Nordenskiöld repeatedly made this point (e.g. in his 'The American Indian as Inventor', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. 59, 1929, pp. 273-309). That we cannot deny resourcefulness to any people, and that we must recognize the magnitude of the small changes that characterize the daily workings of culture as well as the revolutionary changes that follow upon major innovations, are points appropriately emphasized by M. Herskovits (*Man and His Works*, New York: Knopf, 1948, pp. 499-500). This being the case, numerous 'accidental' examples of parallelism are bound to emerge, given the limitations of human cultural life. F. Boas was impressed by man's inventiveness, too, but he did not proceed

from the facts to theory. His conclusion was that 'the distribution of isolated customs in regions far apart hardly admits of the argument that they were transmitted from tribe to tribe and lost in intervening territory' ('The Aims of Anthropological Research', *Science*, n.s., vol. 76, 1932, p. 610).

4. Anthropologists have placed considerable emphasis on a more particularistic phrasing, *the principle of limited possibilities*. It is concerned with the technological or structural limitations inherent in an aspect of culture. For example, the nuclear family (q.v.) admits of but a small number of fundamental variants. Hence parallels are inevitable since the family as a generic form is universal. G. P. Murdock subscribes enthusiastically to the idea of man's inventiveness, and to the principle of limited possibilities. He observes that 'parallelism or independent invention is relatively easy and common in the field of social organization, and that any structural form can be developed anywhere if conditions are propitious. The explanation seems to lie in the principle of limited possibilities' (*Social Structure*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949, p. 200). He goes further to conclude that 'the search for the source of change must be shifted from the external factors to the social structure itself' (ibid.).

D. The amount of attention given to parallelism and its theoretical counterparts has gradually lessened with the passing of years. This has been due in part to the discrediting of simplistic and non-empirical theories such as the early interpretations of 'psychic unity'. Equally important has been the recognition that most of the phenomena which earlier appeared to call for a simple determination of diffusion vs. independent invention are now recognized as 'a series of special problems, each of which has to be answered on its own merits. ... The quarrel, except for amateurs and extremists, is not about which principle is the only one or the dominant one. ... Rather, the problem is: What happened in such and such particular case ...' (A. L. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948, pp. 540-1).

Verne F. Ray

See also: CULTURAL CONVERGENCE
CULTURAL EVOLUTION

Cultural Relativity

A. *Cultural relativity* designates the idea that any item of behaviour must be judged *first* in

relation to its place in the unique structure of the culture in which it occurs and in terms of the particular value system of that culture. Thus it embodies a *principle of contextualism*. The term has, on occasion, been used to suggest that cultural items (such as ethical norms) may only be judged within their context or are so unique that comparative appraisals are ruled out; but this need not be the case.

B. During the 19th century, anthropologists tended to stress the unity of mankind and the diversity of the inanimate environment. At about the turn of the century, however, this emphasis came to be largely reversed. This was due in considerable part to F. Boas. He stated explicitly and repeatedly that anthropology was interested in historically created diversities, leaving to psychology the exploration of common human nature. He also stressed the position that every aspect of a culture from the sounds of speech to the forms of marriage must be considered in the *total context in which it occurred*. This is essentially the doctrine of cultural relativity. Cultural relativity need not be taken in an extreme sense but it is so taken by a considerable number of anthropologists.

1. For example, one of the best known and extreme statements was made by Boas's pupil, R. Benedict, when she spoke of '... the co-existing and equally valid patterns of life which mankind has created for itself from the raw materials of existence' (*Patterns of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1935, p. 278).

2. Such extreme emphasis on the principle of contextualism has led many to believe the emphasis is intrinsic to the concept. Thus C. Winick defines *cultural relativism* as: 'The principle that experience is interpreted by each person in terms of his own background, frame of reference, and social norms, and that these factors will influence perception and evaluations, so that there is no single scale of values applicable to all societies' (*Dictionary of Anthropology*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1956, p. 454).

C. There has, however, been a recent counter-current in anthropological thought—one stressing *cultural universals* brought about by the similarities in the human situation throughout time and space.

1. F. Boas himself wrote: 'The dynamic forces that mould social life are the same now as those that moulded life thousands of years ago'

Cultural Relativity

(*The Mind of Primitive Man*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938, p. 195).

2. But R. Linton is squarely in the mainstream of contemporary anthropological opinion when he writes: 'Behind the seemingly endless diversity of culture patterns there is a fundamental uniformity' ('Universal Ethical Principles: An Anthropological View', in R. N. Anshen (ed.), *Moral Principles of Action*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952, p. 646).

3. Similarly C. Kluckhohn has indicated that while 'there are ... few genuine uniformities in culture content unless one states the content in extremely general form ... there are a considerable number of categories and of structural principles found in all cultures' ('Universal Categories of Culture', in A. L. Kroeber (ed.), *Anthropology Today*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, pp. 519-20).

D. The reaction against radical relativity, the restress upon universals, likewise appears frequently in recent sociological and psychological writing.

1. W. L. Kolb observes: 'The basic field conditions for the emergence of the human psyche have been relatively the same since man has been man: society, culture, symbolic interaction, and the potentialities of the biological organism interacting in the basic progress of socialization. All social psychologists recognize these universal conditions and processes. Yet, impressed by the facts of social and cultural differences among societies, they have failed to inquire into the qualities of the universal emergent: human nature' ('A Social-Psychological Conception of Human Freedom', *Ethics*, vol. LXIII, 1953, p. 185).

2. T. Parsons and E. A. Shils comment on ethical relativity: '... the proponents of this view have even asserted that every moral standard is necessarily unique. There is much aesthetic sensibility underlying and justifying this contention, but it is neither convincing logically nor fruitful scientifically' ('Values, Motives, and Systems of Action', in T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (eds.), *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951, p. 171).

3. The British psychoanalysts H. V. Dicks and R. Money-Kyrle are convinced that there is a universal and natural morality. The latter says: 'The basis of morality is therefore neither a priori and universal as the metaphysicians have claimed, nor empirical and relative as critical philosophers and anthropologists maintain, but

Cultural Specialty

empirical and universal in the sense that it is a quality, like binocular vision or an articulated thumb, which is found to be common to all mankind' (R. E. Money-Kyrle, 'Towards a Common Aim—A Psycho-Analytical Contribution to Ethics', *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, vol. XX, 1944, p. 111; see also H. V. Dicks, 'In Search of Our Proper Ethic', *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, vol. XXIII, 1950, pp. 1-14).

Clyde Kluckhohn

See also: CULTURAL VARIATION
CULTURE

Cultural Specialty

Cultural specialty is a term designating one category of a three-fold classification of culture by R. Linton, based on the recognition of variability in the degree to which individuals participate in, and control knowledge of, the different aspects of their culture (see *cultural alternative*). It may be defined as a culture trait or pattern shared by the members of a socially recognized category of individuals but not shared by the total population. It usually refers to skills and more or less technical forms of knowledge and practice (*The Study of Man*, New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936, pp. 272-3).

Joseph B. Casagrande

See also: CULTURAL ALTERNATIVE
CULTURAL UNIVERSAL
CULTURE

Cultural Substitution

A. *Cultural substitution* denotes the process in which one element of culture takes the place of another, wholly or partially.

B. Cultural substitution is a process of cultural change. In the analysis of change the focus of interest is usually the way in which new items come about rather than the relation between the new and the old. Thus discussions of change treat invention, diffusion (q.v.), and acculturation (q.v.), more frequently than substitution. A. L. Kroeber (*Anthropology*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948, p. 381) suggests that this emphasis reflects a basic principle of change: 'Replacements, modifications, and substitutions are, broadly speaking, more characteristic of the changes of organic evolution; additive increments are more typical of the changes of human culture'.

Kroeber treats substitution as an elementary

concept which does not require definition, and uses 'replacement' and 'displacement' as synonyms. He does not deny that cultural substitution takes place, for it is clear that new elements of culture sometimes take the place of older ones. But he maintains that '... the displacement is often only partial ... the older elements survive, though with diminished or specialized scope' (ibid., p. 378). Candles are cited as an example.

H. G. Barnett (*Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Change*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953, p. 16) discusses substitution in the terms of his view that 'every innovation is a combination of ideas. ... The only bonds between its parts in a cultural setting are mental connections ...'. Substitution, for Barnett, is a psychological rather than a cultural process. This view is considered here because the process is concerned with culture conceived as ideas rather than as actions or things. One merit of Barnett's approach is his precise definition of substitution. It is through assimilation or projection that one configuration or set of elements is substituted for another. (a) Given two configurations (CAB and CXY) with a common element, and assuming that CAB serves as the reference point for the innovator, assimilation occurs when CX is substituted for CA to give a new configuration CXB. In other words, '... we may speak of CAB assimilating CX ...' (ibid., p. 208). (b) Projection occurs when CA is substituted for CX to yield another new configuration CAY. 'CA is, after a manner of speaking, projected upon the stimulus field' (ibid., p. 210). Thus substitution is not a unitary process; rather it takes the form of one of these two alternatives.

P. Sorokin (*Social and Cultural Dynamics*, New York: American Book Company, 1937, vol. 4, p. 727) maintains that the idea of substitution is appropriate only when there is 'total change of the total system or of all its essential components ...'. Substitution is not modification or development in which something is added and something else subtracted, but rather total replacement. This restricted view clearly conflicts with Kroeber's more widely accepted usage.

Frank Miller

See also: ACCULTURATION
DIFFUSION
INNOVATION

Cultural System

A. *Cultural system* is used to designate a culture when the observer asserts at a minimum that its

parts are unified by some kind and degree of interdependence, and that its internal connections define the limits of, and give a character to, the whole. The nature of the relationships of the components of a cultural system depends upon the definition of culture (q.v.) employed. The more culture is abstracted from the social system the more it is conceived as consisting of ideas and its systematic qualities to lie in logical and aesthetic consistency. The less it is abstracted, the more its systematic properties are seen as similar to those of the social system, namely functional interdependence and normative conformity.

B. The use of the term *cultural system* in referring to a culture is relatively recent. The several historical schools of anthropology have tended to view cultures as '... congeries of disconnected traits, disparate in origin and history ...' (R. L. Beals & H. Hoijer, *An Introduction to Anthropology*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1953, p. 617). *Cultural system*, on the other hand, focuses attention on the interrelatedness of the elements of a culture. Order, linkage, cultural integration (q.v.), and culture pattern (q.v.) are the key words. 'All nature consists of materials. But the manner in which matter is organized into entities is as significant as the substance or the function served within a given system' (A. L. Kroeber & C. Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 1952, p. 63).

C. The main properties of a cultural system have been variously conceived. Mostly the formulations stress one or another property, thus constituting complementary emphases rather than contradictory ones.

1. Some conceptions stress the patterning of culture, the *culture pattern*.

2. Overlapping the concept of culture pattern is that of *cultural integration* referring usually to the consistency and interdependency of the elements of a cultural system.

3. Stress is frequently placed on the 'boundary-maintaining' character of the cultural system, its ability to maintain its distinctness as a system over against the environment.

4. Closely related to boundary-maintenance is the concept of system autonomy. 'An autonomous cultural system is one which is self-sustaining—that is, it does not need to be maintained by a complementary, reciprocal,

subordinate, or other indispensable connection with a second system' (*The Social Science Seminar on Acculturation*, 'Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 56, 1954, p. 974).

5. Occasionally the concept of a guide or plan is added to the idea of a system. 'A culture is a historically derived system of explicit and implicit designs for living, which tends to be shared by all or specially designated members of a group' (C. Kluckhohn & W. H. Kelly, 'The Concept of Culture', in R. Linton (ed.), *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, p. 98).

H. G. Barnett

See also: CULTURAL CONFIGURATION
CULTURAL INTEGRATION
CULTURE
CULTURE PATTERN
FUNCTION
SOCIAL SYSTEM

Cultural Theme

A. *Cultural theme* may be defined as '... a postulate or position, declared or implied, and usually controlling behavior or stimulating activity, which is tacitly approved or openly promoted in a society' (M. E. Opler, 'Themes as Dynamic Forces in Culture', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. LI, 1945-6, p. 198).

B. The search for significant categories, objective and unbound by the observer's culture, which will both sharpen the description of given cultures and facilitate their comparison, has led in anthropology to the development of a surprising number of concepts, among them *cultural theme*. The cultural comparisons so far envisaged in the use of the concept *theme*, as well as the descriptive purpose to which it has been applied, are essentially qualitative. It aims at characterizing cultural content by means of invariant criteria.

1. Such qualitative, content categories as *theme* are to be distinguished from what G. P. Murdock calls '... the true *universals* of culture ... not identities in habit, in definable behavior' but 'similarities in classification ...' like families, marriage, education, medicine, etc. ('The Common Denominator of Cultures', in R. Linton (ed.), *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, p. 125). Themes are universal only in the sense that every culture has them or in the sense that R. Linton uses universal as a unit of culture shared by every sane adult

Cultural Universal

member of a particular society. Every society does not have the same themes, of course; nor even themes which cover—though differently—the same universal purposive categories of behaviour, such as education, medicine, etc.

2. Rather than being universals in Murdock's sense, cultural themes represent the effort of the observer '... to develop relatively uniform criteria for describing a culture in terms of its own values on the basis of inductive, objective evidence' (M. E. Opler, 'Rejoinder to Albert K. Cohen', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. LII, 1946-47, p. 43). Viewed in such a perspective the following general statements can be made about themes: (a) Every culture has multiple themes; (b) while there is necessarily some harmony among the themes of a given culture, there is no assumption of a complete lack of conflict; (c) each theme is likely to have multiple expressions; (d) a theme may find its expressions in one or several parts of the institutional structure; (e) a theme in one culture can presumably be similar to that in another regardless of whether their expressions occur in all the same parts of the institutional structure; (f) themes may be a part of implicit or explicit culture.

James B. Watson

See also: CULTURAL UNIVERSAL
CULTURE
CULTURE PATTERN

Cultural Universal

Cultural universal has two separate and distinct usages which cannot be reconciled.

1. *Cultural universal* is used as a term designating one category of a three-fold classification of culture by R. Linton, based on the recognition of variability in the degree to which individuals participate in, and control knowledge of, the different aspects of their culture (see *cultural alternative*). It may be defined as an element of culture '... common to all sane, adult members of the society' (*The Study of Man*, New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936, p. 272).

Joseph B. Casagrande

2. *Cultural universal* is one of several terms used to denote aspects of culture believed to exist among all men and attributed in most cases to the necessity of meeting needs common to all men. The other term most commonly used is *universal pattern of culture* (see *culture pattern*).

Clyde Kluckhohn

See also: CULTURAL ALTERNATIVE
CULTURAL SPECIALTY
CULTURE
CULTURE PATTERN

Cultural Variation

A. *Cultural variation* generally refers to the differences in culture (q.v.) among the different communities of mankind, and, on a larger scale, among the different regions of the occupied globe. In a stricter sense it may be used to denote those human differences of belief and behaviour which are learnt through processes of symbolic interaction as distinct from features of human life which are biopsychic in origin or which arise simply and on a non-symbolizing level from the elemental conditions of hominid social life.

B. There are a number of different classes of problems in connection with cultural variation, and anthropologists are not all agreed as to their relative importance.

1. Perhaps of first importance is the problem of the magnitude of cultural variation.

(a) Theoretical positions on this issue run from the extremes of the polygenists and racists, on the one hand, who take different 'racial psychologies' or 'folk souls' each as sui generis; and the doctrinaire culture relativists who—though for other reasons—closely follow them in the pluralistic treatment of cultures; to the opposite monistic pole of the sentimental pan-humanist, for whom the lives of all men are basically the same, the variations being largely incidental.

(b) Differences with respect to the importance of cultural variation have had a bearing upon the sorts of studies attempted. According to C. Kluckhohn, '... in general, from about this time on [1911], the attention of anthropologists throughout the world appears to have been directed overwhelmingly to the distinctiveness of each culture and to the differences in human custom as opposed to the similarities. The latter, where recognized, were explained historically rather than in terms of the common nature of man and certain invariant properties of the human situation' ('Universal Categories of Culture', in A. L. Kroeber (ed.), *Anthropology Today*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, p. 511).

2. Second only to the problem of the magnitude of variability is the question of the correlates, or causes of comparable differences or similarities of various cultural systems. Here the

range of theories has moved from that of unique historical causes to those which insist on structural-functional studies into the whole range of custom and its corollaries; and from single-factor determinisms, whether racial, geographic, or economic, through sometimes rather vague multi-factor analyses, to stress on the free, though conditioned, response of human creativity.

3. Closely related to the problem of causation is the problem of the growth and developmental processes in the emergence of given cultural varieties or of cultural variation generally. Here the stress has been on the problems of cultural evolution (q.v.), equilibrium and cultural determinism (q.v.).

4. For those concerned with history, there has been the problem of the history and historical interconnections of local and regional cultural varieties, leading ultimately, through archaeology and ethnology, to an inclusive culture history (q.v.).

5. Finally there has been the task of delineating major types of cultures with the eventual aim of an exhaustive typology.

James B. Watson

See also: CULTURAL RELATIVITY
CULTURE

Culture

A. It is difficult to settle upon a single definition of this complex and extremely important term, but the following definitions may each be useful for somewhat different purposes.

1. A. L. Kroeber and C. Kluckhohn present a synthesis that embodies the elements positively accepted by most contemporary social scientists: 'Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action' (*Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1952, p. 181).

2. A biologist, G. E. Hutchinson, gives a brief definition: 'The class of all the behavior exhibited by the group is called the culture of the group' ('Marginalia', *American Scientist*, vol. 38, 1950, p. 283). But some purists would

Culture

find this definition unacceptable on the ground that the differentiae of culture are comprised of only that behaviour which is distinctive of a group. This purist view premises that we are talking about culture only when a people shows a stylized preference for one path to a goal when—from the observer's perspective—two or more are equally open, physically possible, and functionally effective. It would insist, for example, that to enumerate 'fishing' as an aspect of a maritime culture would be meaningless unless the way or style of fishing were specified in detail. On the other hand, if a people who had access to fish failed to utilize them, such a datum would be significant in defining the culture.

3. A serious lack in the foregoing definitions is the absence of an operational dimension. Hutchinson approaches this in the following: 'Given a group and a newborn spatiotemporal individual, if the individual is placed in the group and later observed, it will exhibit behavior which cannot be distinguished from that constituting the culture of the group in which it has developed. If the individual should actually be moved at birth from a second group having a different culture, then its behavior would be sharply distinguishable from that constituting this second culture. There will usually be difficulty in obtaining cases of quite the sharpness used in stating the generalization, but anyone who wishes to examine its validity can easily do so in contemporary North America. ... The operational method of stating this generalization indicates that the *culture* of the anthropologist has the same degree of abstraction as the *field* of the physicist' (G. E. Hutchinson, 'Marginalia', p. 283).

This line of thinking coincides with the recent stress laid by social scientists upon 'significant discontinuities' as the crucial criterion for isolating cultural units. Upon this basis C. Lévi-Strauss ('Social Structure', in A. L. Kroeber (ed.), *Anthropology Today*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, p. 536) may be paraphrased so as to offer the following as a relatively compact and somewhat operational definition which adheres closely to what most social scientists say and to how they actually practice field work and analysis: 'A culture is a set of patterns, of and for behavior, prevalent among a group of human beings at a specified time period and which, from the point of view of the research at hand and of the scale on which it is being carried out, presents, in relation to other such sets, observable and sharp discontinuities'.

Culture

The words 'set' and 'sets' are to be understood as referring in a quasi-technical sense to the 'set theory' branch of topological mathematics.

B. Culture signifying husbandry appears in English as early as 1420. The technical term in anthropology was introduced into English by E. B. Tylor (*Researches into the Early History and Development of Civilization*, London: John Murray, 1865, pp. 4, 369) in 1865 and systematically defined and made a central concept by the same author six years later: 'Culture ... taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society' (*Primitive Culture*, London: John Murray, 1871, p. 1).

C. Through the years definitions of culture as a central concept of anthropology and the other social sciences have proliferated. A. L. Kroeber & C. Kluckhohn (*Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*) have analysed 160 definitions in English by anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, and others. These appeared, as judged by principal emphasis, to fall into six major groups which were labelled as follows: (1) enumeratively descriptive, (2) historical, (3) normative, (4) psychological, (5) structural, (6) genetic.

1. Tylor's classic definition is echoed in that of F. Boas, representative of the enumeratively descriptive definition: 'Culture embraces all the manifestations of social habits of a community, the reactions of the individual as affected by the habits of the group in which he lives, and the products of human activities as determined by these habits' (F. Boas, 'Anthropology', in E. R. A. Seligman (ed.) *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930, vol. 2, p. 79). The distinctive criteria of this group of definitions are: (a) culture as a comprehensive totality, and (b) enumeration of aspects of culture content.

2. The definitions of the second group, the historical, select one feature of culture, social inheritance or social tradition, rather than define culture substantively: '... the social heredity is called culture. As a general term, culture means the total social heredity of mankind, while as a specific term, a culture means a particular strain of social heredity' (R. Linton, *The Study of Man*, New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936, p. 78).

3. The third group emphasizes culture either as a distinctive way of life or as dynamically forceful normative ideas and their consequences. O. Klineberg, for example, defines culture simply as '... that whole "way of life" which is determined by the social environment' (*Race Differences*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935, p. 255); while P. Sorokin says: 'The cultural aspect of the superorganic universe consists of meanings, values, norms, their interaction and relationships, their integrated and unintegrated groups ... as they are objectified through overt actions and other vehicles in the empirical socio-cultural universe' (*Society, Culture, and Personality*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947, p. 313).

4. The fourth group is 'psychological' in the sense that processes such as adjustment, learning, and habit are singled out. Culture is seen primarily as a set of techniques for satisfying needs, for solving problems, and for adjusting both to the external environment and to other men. C. S. Ford, for example, says: 'Culture consists of traditional ways of solving problems. ... Culture ... is composed of responses which have been accepted because they have met with success; in brief, culture consists of learned problem-solutions' ('Culture and Human Behavior', *Scientific Monthly*, vol. 55, 1942, pp. 555, 557). A few definitions in this group attempt to reduce culture to the concepts of one psychological school: 'By culture we shall understand the sum of all sublimations, all substitutes, or reaction formations, in short, everything in society that inhibits impulses or permits their distorted satisfaction' (G. Roheim, *The Riddle of the Sphinx*, London: Hogarth Press, 1934, p. 216).

5. Only four of the definitions in the fifth, structural, group antedate 1945 and only one was published prior to 1939. These definitions make central the systematic quality of each culture, the organized interrelation of the isolable aspects of culture. Culture becomes abstract, a conceptual model that must be based on and interpret behaviour but which is not behaviour itself. For example, C. Kluckhohn and W. H. Kelly assert that: 'A culture is an historically derived system of explicit and implicit designs for living, which tends to be shared by all or specially designated members of a group' ('The Concept of Culture', in R. Linton (ed.), *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, p. 98). Not all anthropologists accept the notion of culture as a logical construct—a

'model' based on abstractions from behaviour. However, while on occasion such anthropologists, e.g. R. Linton, D. Bidney, and, in part, L. White, insist that culture comprises actual behaviour, they nevertheless tend to use such expressions as 'patterned ways of behaviour', 'forms of behaviour', and the like.

6. The sixth, genetic, group focuses on the questions: How has culture come to be? What are the factors that have made culture possible or caused it to come into existence? Other properties are mentioned, but the stress is on the genetic side. L. J. Carr puts much content into nine words: 'The accumulated transmissible results of past behavior in association' ('Situational Psychology', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. LI, 1945-6, p. 137).

D. Since roughly 1935, many British social anthropologists have tended to use *social structure* (q.v.) rather than culture as a core concept. While there has been this tendency to deprecate the concept of culture and to avoid its use, such British definitions as have appeared fall well within the range of variation of American definition. As illustration, R. Firth's synthetic statement could equally well have been written by an American: 'If ... society is taken to be an organized set of individuals with a given way of life, culture is that way of life. If society is taken to be an aggregate of social relations, then culture is the content of those relations. Society emphasizes the human component, the aggregate of people and the relations between them. Culture emphasizes the component of accumulated resources, immaterial as well as material, which the people inherit, employ, transmute, add to, and transmit. Having substance, if in part only ideational, this component acts as a regulator to action. From the behavioural aspect, culture is all learned behaviour which has been socially acquired. It includes the residual effects of social action. It is necessarily also an incentive to action' (*Elements of Social Organization*, London: Watts, 1951, p. 27).

1. The only striking British innovation is M. Fortes's proposal that culture designate the qualitative aspect of social facts, whereas the term *structure* be applied '... to those features of social events which are actually or ideally susceptible of quantitative description and analysis' ('Time and Social Structure', in M. Fortes (ed.), *Social Structure*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949, p. 57).

2. Firth expresses surprise that Kroeber and Kluckhohn in their treatment of culture devote

so little attention to the concept of function, and this remark presumably reflects a view held by many British social anthropologists ('Function', in W. L. Thomas, Jr. (ed.), *Current Anthropology*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956, p. 246).

E. There are no genuinely consistent tendencies characteristic of the various academic disciplines. Definitions by psychologists, for instance, appear in each of the six major groups of definitions. Indeed, leaving occasional eccentric definitions aside, it may be said that all social scientists using the term *culture* in its anthropological sense differ only in what points they choose to emphasize and how much they feel it necessary to make explicit.

1. Archaeologists have often emphasized artifacts in their definitions, yet statements like the following are becoming more frequent: 'Everything acquired by man after birth, a product of nurture within society, a purely sociological grouping' (A. J. N. Goodwin, *Method in Prehistory*, Cape Town: South African Archaeological Society, 1953, p. 21).

2. A few American sociologists, e.g. R. M. MacIver, have shown some disposition to follow German authors such as A. Weber by identifying culture with subjective religion, philosophy, and art, while using *civilization* to designate the objective technological and informational activities of society. This position takes civilization as accumulative and irreversible with the cultural component seen as highly variable, unique, and non-additive.

F. It is recognized as proper to speak of culture in general—whether in a descriptive or explanatory way—and of particular cultures.

1. The lines of demarcation of any cultural unit chosen for description and analysis are in large part a matter of level of abstraction and convenience for the problem at hand. Occidental culture, Graeco-Roman culture, 19th century European culture, German culture, Swabian culture, the peasant culture of the Black Forest in 1900—these are all equally legitimate abstractions if carefully defined.

2. The term *sub-culture* is often used. M. M. Gordon defines it as follows: '... a subdivision of a national culture, composed of a combination of factorable social situations such as class status, ethnic background, regional and rural or urban residence, and religious affiliation, but forming in their combination a functioning unity which has an integrated impact on the

Culture

Culture Area

participating individual' ('The Concept of the Sub-Culture and its Application', *Social Forces*, vol. 26, 1947, p. 40).

Clyde Kluckhohn

See also: CIVILIZATION
SOCIETY

Culture Area

A. A culture area is a unit of geographic space in which similar culture or cultures are found. Thus it is simply a mode of the 'spatial classification' of culture (A. L. Kroeber, *Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America*, University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939, p. 1). The term is equivalent to the term *culture province* as used by Ratzel and more recently by H. Baumann (*Völkerkunde von Afrika*, Essen: Essener, 1939). It should however, be distinguished from *Kulturkreis* (q.v.).

The classical image of a culture area, as exemplified by such areas as the Northwest coast and the Plains of North America, and expounded by Wissler, Kroeber, and Herskovits, is of a clearly defined geographical area with a characteristic ecology, economy, material culture, art style, and set of social values. The characteristic traits of the area are most clearly exemplified in its cultural—not necessarily geographic—centre and thin out toward the edges; along the boundaries between two areas are found marginal tribes with some of the characteristics of each area.

B. One of the earliest uses of the term was that by O. T. Mason, who, evidently influenced by Ratzel's concept of 'culture provinces'—*Kulturprovinzen*, divided the native cultures of the New World into eighteen 'environments or culture areas' ('Influence of Environment on Human Industries or Arts', *Smithsonian Institution, Annual Report*, 1895, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1896, p. 646). Thus the culture area concept began as a museum classification category, when curators wished to arrange ethnological specimens for display by geographic area of origin rather than by taxonomic type or place in some supposed evolutionary scheme. A culture area was simply some region, defined by a map, whose cultures were considered a significant group in contrast to those of neighbouring regions.

C. The first attempt at a formal theoretical definition of the term was made by C. Wissler

and reflects the empirical origin of the concept: '... we saw that the natives of the New World could be grouped according to single culture traits, giving us food areas, textile areas, ceramic areas, etc. If, however, we take all the traits into simultaneous consideration and shift our point of view to the social, or tribal units, we are able to form fairly definite groups. This will give us culture areas, or classification of culture groups according to their culture traits' (*The American Indian*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn., 1922, pp. 217–18).

M. J. Herskovits has also contributed to the sharpening of the concept: '... it has been found that when a large region, such as a continent, is surveyed for any particular culture trait or group of traits, the distribution of those traits will be such that they can be plotted on a map in continuous areas' ('Preliminary Consideration of the Culture Areas of Africa', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 26, 1924, p. 50). Much later he wrote: '... when cultures are viewed objectively, they are seen to form clusters, so to speak, sufficiently homogeneous that the regions in which they occur can be delimited on a map. The area in which similar cultures are found is called a culture area' (*Man and His Works*, New York: Knopf, 1948, p. 183).

The primary weakness of the culture area concept is that no clear agreement can be found on principles of classification which will permit the drawing of comparable area boundaries. It is impossible to resolve, for example, the gross differences between Herskovits's culture areas of Africa and Baumann's 'culture-provinces' of Africa, though both are 'spatial classifications' which claim to map areas 'in which similar cultures are found'.

Raoul Naroll

See also: AGE AND AREA HYPOTHESIS
AREA CO-TRADITION
REGION

Culture Case Study

A. Culture is taken in a sense closely related to that of J. L. Myres: '... "culture" is not a state or a condition only, but a process; as in *agriculture* or *horticulture* we mean not the condition of the land but the whole round of the farmer's year, and all that he does in it; "culture", then, is what remains of men's past, working on their present, to shape their future' (*The Political Ideas of the Greeks*, London: Edward Arnold, 1927, p. 2). As used in the combination, the stress is strongly on non-material

culture, and especially on the normative aspect thereof.

Case refers to a 'whole' that has social-scientific relevance. It is defined as a whole by the social-scientific problem for which a solution is being sought. Thus it is viewed as 'a whole by interrogation' rather than as a 'whole by intuition'.

Study has to do with the investigation of the case as a relatively unique whole, with the intention of generating from it a tentative answer to the problem initially posed; which answer, stripped of its unique elements, is then to be used in the development of a hypothesis applicable to other cases, considered comparable or identical for the purposes in hand. Through any or all appropriate social-scientific procedures and techniques, this hypothesis is then to be subjected to tests leading to its acceptance or rejection. (For further definition less compressed, see H. Becker, 'Culture Case Study and Greek History: Comparison Viewed Sociologically', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 23, 1958, pp. 489–504).

B. These three words in combination apparently were first used in the lectures of R. E. Park in discussing certain works by E. Durkheim and M. Weber, but occur nowhere in Park's published writings. The combination seems first to have appeared in print in articles by H. Becker, in 1930 and 1931 ('Forms of Population Movement', *Social Forces*, vol. IX, 1930–31, pp. 147–60 and pp. 351–61). Thereafter its use has been largely restricted to Becker's writings and those of students working with him.

Howard Becker

See also: CASE STUDY METHOD

Culture Change

A. Substantively *culture change* may be defined as the modification of culture (q.v.) through time. This definition becomes more precise only when the situations and processes of such modification are fully analysed. Such analysis depends upon the varying definitions of culture (q.v.), society (q.v.), and personality. It is closely related to the term social change (q.v.).

1. The term is often used interchangeably with 'cultural dynamics'.

2. Culture change has been most used by American anthropologists. Social change has been stressed by sociologists and social psycho-

Culture Change

logists, and also has been favoured by British social anthropologists.

3. Many American anthropologists and sociologists now speak of *cultural and social change* together, and sometimes use *socio-cultural change* to cover the full range of phenomena concerned.

B. Studies of culture change have been a dominant anthropological interest from the beginnings of the science, but through the years have been given different theoretical emphases.

1. In the middle 19th century when cultural anthropology and sociology were becoming differentiated from history and social philosophy, the initial concern was to explain 'progress' from savagery to civilization. Beginning in the 1860s the dominant task of theory was to uncover grand laws of the evolution of culture and society, as in the works of Morgan and Spencer.

2. From 1896 on Rivers, Boas, and others attacked over-simple evolutionary generalization, and shifted attention to specific culture history (q.v.). So-called historical and diffusionist theories of growth and change held the stage, with their often unduly atomistic and mechanistic reconstructions of the invention and diffusion (q.v.) of trait elements, together with distributional studies of the placement of elements in cultures and culture areas (q.v.).

3. In the 1920s, although the stress on function (q.v.) and functionalism tended to distract attention from culture change, so-called culture-contact and acculturation (q.v.) studies were gaining momentum. From initially studying the impact of Western influences so as to be able to discard intrusive elements and reconstruct traditional cultures, anthropologists came to recognize that an understanding of the events and processes of change could be of vital importance. By the 1930s acculturation studies became the major approach in the time-dimensional analysis of culture. This period was also marked by a strong growth of applied anthropology (q.v.) providing in a broad sense laboratory-like experiments for the further understanding of change.

C. Both basic and applied studies of culture change underwent great expansion during World War II; and subsequently the whole front of the subject has been actively worked. In anthropology alone some three hundred books and papers are currently being published

Culture Complex

yearly in the culture change field (see, for example, F. M. Keesing, *Culture Change: A Survey and Bibliography of Anthropological Sources to 1952*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1953). Sociology and social psychology also have their growing literature on related problems, usually dealt with under *social change*.

1. The study of long-term historical process, generally in eclipse since the breakdown of the older evolutionist and diffusionist systems of thought, has been revived, as in the works of L. White, V. G. Childe, and J. Steward. Even the term *social evolution* as applied to generalized processes of cultural growth has been considerably rehabilitated.

2. Acculturation studies have been placed in their proper perspective as one broad type of culture change marked by interaction and culture transfer between two or more cultural systems (q.v.). Other types have also been taken into account, such as changes in a single system, urbanization, change in complex systems such as a large national society, innovation, transfer, reformulation, and forced change through outside intervention. Among other notable problems of contemporary interest in culture change are rates of change, disorganization and reorganization, the role of cults and other dynamic movements, the role of the individual in change, the relation of change to stability, and resistance to change.

Felix M. Keesing

See also: CULTURE
SOCIAL CHANGE

Culture Complex

A. A *culture complex* may be defined as a functionally integrated grouping of culture traits (q.v.) which persists as a unit in space and time, is cross-culturally diffusible, and is restricted to one aspect of a total culture (q.v.). The term is sometimes loosely and derivatively used, as by some archaeologists, to designate a category of traits associated in space and time whose functional interdependence has not yet been established, or exists only ex hypothesi.

B. The term was first used and developed in the historical analysis of the growth and spread of culture, and was intimately related to the conceptions of the culture trait (q.v.), the cultural configuration (q.v.), the culture pattern (q.v.), and the culture area (q.v.). Although the term was originally used within the theoretical framework of culture history, it has quite obvious

functional implications, and has served as one of the bridge terms for those who believe that the study of culture requires both an historical and a functional approach.

1. The early development of the concept is seen in the writings of C. Wissler and R. B. Dixon (C. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1923; R. B. Dixon, *The Building of Cultures*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928).

2. Perhaps the best recent statement concerning *culture complex* is that of A. L. Kroeber in defining the essentially synonymous term, *systemic culture pattern* (cf. *culture pattern*): 'A second kind of pattern consists of a system or complex of cultural material that has proved its utility as a system and therefore tends to cohere and persist as a unit; it is modifiable superficially, but modifiable only with difficulty as to its underlying plan. Any one such systemic pattern is limited primarily to one aspect of culture, such as subsistence, religion, or economics; ... it can be diffused cross-culturally from one people to another' (*Anthropology*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948, p. 312).

C. A somewhat less precise conception of *culture complex* is associated with archaeology as it has developed in the United States. Although much of this conception of the term lies in the incompleteness of archaeological materials there has been little attempt to achieve more than a list of archaeological culture traits which occur together as an assemblage and to compare these assemblages of culture traits from one site or area to another. There is little emphasis on the integrative or functional attributes of these materials, and in contradistinction to the previously mentioned usage the total cultural remains in a specific site are termed a culture complex. The most notable development of this view is found in the writings of W. C. McKern on the Midwestern Taxonomic Method ('The Midwestern Taxonomic Method as an Aid to Archeological Culture Study', *American Antiquity*, vol. 4, 1939, pp. 301-13).

A similar view is expressed by R. K. Beardsley, et al., when they define a 'community pattern' which 'is the organization of economic, socio-political, and ceremonial inter-relationships within a community, and is largely synonymous with culture complex' ('Functional and Evolutionary Implications of Community Patterning', in R. Wauchope (ed.), *Seminars in Archeology: 1955, Memoirs of the Society for American Archeology*, vol. 11, 1956, p. 134).

This view more successfully approximates that of other usages of the term.

Arden R. King

See also: CULTURE
CULTURE PATTERN

Culture History

A. *Culture history* may be defined as an integrated picture of cultural events as they occur diachronically—i.e. through time—constructed from materials selected from the totality of known cultural data. The methodology of historiography dictates the selection of data and provides the means for interpretation and integration. Historiography in anthropology, as contrasted with document-based history, characteristically involves the derivation of the time element from synchronic data. Numerous techniques are employed in this method, prominent among which is the turning of spatial relationships of cultural interaction or geographical distribution into time relationships or sequences.

B. In the 20th century the term *culture history* has appeared with great frequency in the writings of anthropologists in the sub-fields of ethnology and archaeology. Indeed, the usage is so common that a definition is seldom deemed necessary. Upon analysis, however, it becomes clear that the two sub-disciplines characteristically use these words with significantly different, though not necessarily contradictory meanings.

1. In the archaeologist's routine use of the term, the emphasis is upon the word *culture*. History is taken for granted since archaeology, by its very nature, is predominantly concerned with the recreating of the time sequence, at least as a first step. However, time sequence as represented by stratigraphic succession is of no interest unless cultural materials are involved; hence the emphasis upon culture.

(a) In practice, archaeologists frequently use *culture history* as synonymous with archaeology. For example, the subject of the 75th Anniversary Volume of the Anthropological Society of Washington is *New World archaeology*, as stated by M. T. Newman in the preface, but the title is *New Interpretations of Aboriginal American Culture History* (Washington, 1955, p. vii). In *Anthropology Today* (A. L. Kroeber (ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953) five prominent archaeologists write under the heading 'Problems of the Historical Approach' and three of these employ the term *culture history* in their titles.

Culture History

(b) The relative importance of ethnology in culture history has sometimes been called into question (without assuming that ethnologists may not, nevertheless, be culture historians). I. Rouse, for example, recognizes that 'Some have argued that archaeology deserves to be regarded as the central discipline for culture-historical research, since it deals with a much longer time perspective than ethnology and has developed sounder techniques for establishing chronology'. However, Rouse goes on to say that 'In the Americas, at least, archaeologists are coming to recognize that their studies of culture history must take into consideration the pertinent ethnological data, and vice versa ... [Archaeology's] descriptive data are so fragmentary that it must yield to ethnology with respect to matters of content, particularly of nonmaterial culture' ('The Strategy of Culture History', in A. L. Kroeber (ed.), *Anthropology Today*, p. 57. See also G. F. Ekholm, 'New World Culture History', in *Yearbook of Anthropology*, New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1955, p. 99).

2. In ethnology—in contrast to the archaeological view—the emphasis with respect to *culture history* is upon *history*. Stress upon culture can be taken for granted. Because there are other methods of interpreting culture—e.g. functional and evolutionary—the object is to call attention to the chronological dimension, either for its own sake or for purposes of interpretation or integration. Documentary evidence is not demanded nor even expected, but will be used in those rare instances where available. The methodology of ethnology provides the means for ascertaining history from cultural data as they appear in spatial distribution.

(a) Consistent with the general recognition in ethnology of *culture history* as but one of several methods or approaches in the discipline, there are few ethnologists who employ this method alone and none who equates the terms ethnology and culture history.

(b) Some strong expressions of opinion as to the importance of culture history in anthropology include F. W. Maitland's declaration that 'By and by anthropology will have the choice of being history or nothing' and P. Radin's repetition of the statement as an introductory dictum in his book *The Method and Theory of Ethnology* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933, p. vii). K. Birket-Smith observes that 'The present is not understood except as a result of the past, and therefore the vital problem of ethnology, as I understand it, must be a

Culture History

historical one' (in S. Tax et al. (eds.), *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, p. 68). E. Sapir opened his classical Time Perspective paper by stating that 'Cultural anthropology is more and more rapidly getting to realize itself as a strictly historical science. Its data cannot be understood, either in themselves or in relation to one another, except as the end points of specific sequences of events reaching back into the remote past ... it is highly important that an historical understanding of the facts be held up as the properly ethnological goal of the student' (*Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture, a Study in Method*, Ottawa: Canada Geological Survey, Memoir 90, 1916, pp. 1-2).

(c) The relative importance of ethnology and archaeology in culture history has called forth a few strongly worded opinions from ethnologists. W. Schmidt is convinced that 'The specific task of ethnology in history is something exceedingly valuable, in fact something absolutely necessary, which no other science can accomplish in such vivid fullness. ... Ethnology shares this privilege with pre-history; but it surpasses the latter through the incomparable richness ... it presents to us, while pre-history can but offer the Lifeless and the Maimed data, which become all the more rare the farther back the people go and the older they are' (*The Culture Historical Method of Ethnology*, New York: Fortuny, 1939, pp. 9-10). Schmidt, of course, speaks only for adherents of the *Kulturkreis-lehre*. Others see the matter differently. C. von Füller-Haimendorf, for example, states that 'The most significant trend in the anthropological approach to culture history during the years 1952-54 has been the increasing dependence of ethnologists on the findings of prehistoric archaeology' ('Culture History and Cultural Development', in W. L. Thomas, Jr. (ed.), *Current Anthropology*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956, p. 149).

C. The culture history concept is meaningful and significant only in terms of methodology. This methodology is two-dimensional: anthropological and historiographic. Anthropology provides the approaches by which time considerations are revealed and conceptualized in otherwise static cultural data. Historiography provides the means by which such findings are turned into valid and useful historical perspectives of the peoples concerned. The result is culture history, a theoretically distinct and uniquely useful aspect of anthropology, serving

alongside social anthropology, cultural psychology, and other methodologically distinct approaches, to give us the answers we seek with respect to man.

1. The methodological contribution of anthropology involves 'the translation of a two-dimensional photographic picture of reality into the three-dimensional picture which lies back of it ... the arrangement in an as orderly temporal sequence as possible, within as definitely circumscribed absolute time limits as circumstances will allow of the processes studied by our science' (E. Sapir, *Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture*, p. 4). The ethnological approach falls into the general classification of scientific methodology since an ordering of natural phenomena is involved. Kroeber observed that 'Every sound "natural" classification of culture is also inevitably a sound genetic history of culture, as in biology it yields a history of life. We even possess in archaeology a factual partial check on our inferences from cultural pattern to cultural history—a sort of life-line—a counterpart of the substantiation which paleontology gives to classificatory and evolutionary biology' (in 'Concluding Review', S. Tax et al. (eds.), *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*, p. 367).

2. Ethnology and archaeology play complementary roles in their utilization and advancement of anthropological methods. Both are concerned with turning space relationships into time relationships. In ethnology the space is lateral, that is, geographic; in archaeology more often vertical, that is, stratigraphic.

3. Valid culture history emerges when the facts and time relationships brought to light by archaeology and ethnology are soundly integrated and evaluated by the methods of historiography. C. D. Forde calls this the achievement of 'conceptual integration of individual phenomena ("facts" or "events") in terms of specified time and place' ('Human Geography, History and Sociology', in *The Scottish Geographical Magazine*, vol. 55, 1939, p. 224).

(a) Historiography is lucidly defined by W. W. Taylor, Jr. as 'the discipline characterized by the construction of cultural contexts abstracted from the totality of past actuality. More specifically, it is projected contemporary thought about past actuality, integrated and synthesized into contexts in terms of cultural man and sequential time' (*The Study of Archeology*, American Anthropological Association, Mem. 79, 1948, pp. 34-5). So far as culture history is concerned, the 'totality of past actuality' is limited to facts

revealed by archaeological and ethnological researches, a selective inventory limited by theoretical interest and the fortunes of recovery.

(b) Historiography is concerned with time and period incidentally, not centrally. 'Being "historical" does not mean having a concern merely with time; to have that is being "chronological" ... being "historical" does not mean having a concern merely with the past; to have that is being "antiquarian"' (*The Study of Archeology*, p. 35). A. L. Kroeber, likewise, cautions against equating history and chronology. He states that he does not want to belittle the time factor but that 'Space relations can and sometimes must take its place' ('History in Science', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 37, 1935, p. 547).

(c) 'Real history' and 'historical reconstruction' have sometimes been fallaciously contrasted in the context of culture history. Taylor's admirable statement succinctly disposes of the matter: 'The words *reconstruction* and *resynthesis* are fundamentally erroneous and have been responsible for much loss of confidence, particularly among the anthropologists. ... The work of all historical disciplines really leads to construction and synthesis, not reconstruction and *resynthesis*' (*The Study of Archeology*, p. 35).

D. Finally, a 'definition' of culture history is incomplete if it does not take into account the fact that all culture historians of breadth and insight look to a use of their materials beyond the purely historical, if not now and by themselves, then later and by others. 'When we once have enough sound classification and history of cultures, we should be able to take the next step and, with some genuine solidity, to extricate the processes at work, to generalize the story of culture into its causal factors' (A. L. Kroeber, 'Concluding Review', p. 367).

Verne F. Ray

See also: CULTURAL EVOLUTION
FUNCTION

Culture Pattern

A. Culture pattern may be defined as a determinate organization of cultural features—an exactness and constancy of relationship irrespective of content and dimensions. (This definition paraphrases and extends a statement by B. L. Whorf, 'Linguistics as an Exact Science', *Technology Review*, vol. 43, 1940, p. 82).

Culture Pattern

B. Pattern has been used by anthropologists as a portmanteau word since at least as early as 1871 (E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, London: John Murray, 1871, vol. 2, p. 246). This loose usage continued. An example is C. Wissler's reference to 'the following of existing patterns' ('The Functions of Primitive Ritualistic Ceremonies', *Popular Science Monthly*, vol. 87, 1915, p. 202). Increasingly since the 1920s the term has been used—usually without precise definition—by sociologists, psychologists, and other social scientists.

C. The exploration of the nuances of pattern, the attempt to differentiate it with precise meanings, has been an American rather than a British venture, and has been carried out almost exclusively by anthropologists.

1. Particularly important in this undertaking was the linguist-anthropologist, E. Sapir. He defined a culture pattern as '... a generalized mode of conduct that is imputed to society rather than to the individual ...' ('The Unconscious Patterning of Behavior in Society', in E. S. Dummer (ed.), *The Unconscious*, New York: Knopf, 1927, pp. 114-42, esp. pp. 118-19. See also E. Sapir, 'Sound Patterns in Language', *Language*, vol. 1, 1925, pp. 37-51). Sapir constantly insisted that cultures could be understood only if as much analysis were given to their constituent forms as to the content embodied in these forms. In particular, he urged that one look at the forms that are, as it were, beneath the surface of the culture [*covert culture* (q.v.)] '... culture ... cannot be adequately defined by a description of those more colorful patterns of behavior in society which lie open to observation' ('Language' in E. R. A. Seligman (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933, vol. IX, p. 157).

2. R. Benedict did not give a systematic definition of culture patterns but indicated that they were equivalent to 'characteristic purposes' or to the 'motives, and emotions and values that are institutionalized in that culture' (*Patterns of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1935, pp. 46, 49). Benedict's usage is equivocal. Sometimes she appears to be referring to modalities for behaviour ('ideal' or 'regulatory' patterns) and of behaviour (behavioural patterns); at other points her attention appears to be upon the values central to the implicit culture or to the outstanding emotional principle or principles of particular cultures.

3. C. Kluckhohn tried to define the conceptual core of the phenomenon of patterning in

Culture Trait

general as follows: 'Structure ... is the foremost constituent in the nuclear idea of pattern. The reference is predominantly to form, not content. But a cultural pattern is not merely a structure—it is a structure to which there is some degree of conformance on the part of a number of persons. "Pattern" preserves what is ... historically its dominant meaning: "something to be copied". Pattern, then, in its most general meaning is a structural regularity' ('Patterning as Exemplified in Navaho Culture', in L. Spier (ed.), *Language, Culture and Personality*, Menasha, Wis.: Sapir Memorial Publication Fund, 1941, p. 112).

4. Another specific definition of *culture pattern* is that of A. L. Kroeber: '... basic patterns are nexuses of culture traits which have assumed a definite and coherent structure, which function successfully, and which acquire major historic weight and persistence' ('Structure, Function, and Pattern in Biology and Anthropology', *Scientific Monthly*, vol. LVI, 1943, p. 112). Building upon the content of this article, he has distinguished universal, systematic, societal or whole-culture, and style patterns (A. L. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1948, pp. 311–43). (a) The concept of the universal pattern of culture comes from C. Wissler (*Man and Culture*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1923, p. 74). It consists of a series of nine categories: speech, material traits, art, knowledge, religion, society, property, government, and war. 'It is a general outline that will more or less fit all cultures' (A. L. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, p. 311). (b) The systematic pattern '... consists of a system or complex of cultural material that has proved its utility as a system and therefore tends to cohere and persist as a unit; it is modifiable superficially, but modifiable only with difficulty as to its underlying plan' (ibid., p. 313). (c) The whole-culture pattern is the concept referring to the systematization and coherence found in a total culture. (d) A style pattern is the result of '... choosing or evolving one line of procedure out of several possible ones, and sticking to it' (ibid., p. 329).

Clyde Kluckhohn

See also: CULTURAL CONFIGURATION
CULTURAL THEME
CULTURE

Culture Trait

A. *Culture trait* may be defined as 'the smallest identifiable unit in a given culture' (M. J.

Herskovits, *Man and His Works*, New York: Knopf, 1948, p. 170).

B. *Culture trait*, together with culture complex (q.v.), cultural configuration (q.v.), culture pattern (q.v.), and culture area (q.v.), was one of the concepts employed by C. Wissler and others in the historical analysis of cultural data during the 1920s (C. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1923). The *trait* concept has made it possible to draw up listings of the elements of a culture, and has also permitted the functional analysis of larger organizations of culture. The major conceptual problem with regard to the *culture trait* has been that of ascertaining in operational terms what 'the smallest identifiable unit' may be. It has become increasingly apparent that this will vary according to context.

Arden R. King

See also: CULTURAL CONFIGURATION
CULTURE
CULTURE AREA
CULTURE PATTERN

Culturology

A. *Culturology* may be defined as the scientific study and interpretation of cultural phenomena per se.

B. The term *culturology* was first used by the eminent German chemist and philosopher, W. Ostwald; it appeared, as *kulturologie*, in his writings as early as 1909, and was employed in many of his writings thereafter ('Das System der Wissenschaften', in *Die Forderung des Tages*, Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1910, p. 129; see also 'The System of the Sciences', *Rice Institute Pamphlet*, vol. II, no. 3, 1915, pp. 101–90). Ostwald distinguished *culturology* from sociology. The latter term is too broad, he said, since its focus upon social interaction would include all living species; 'social' and 'cultural' are not synonymous. And the focus upon interaction excludes, or admits only incidentally, tools, utensils, dwellings, philosophies, art, and other elements of culture. The term was not borrowed and used by social scientists at this time, however.

C. L. A. White invented the term independently of Ostwald and introduced it into anthropological literature in 1939, after having used it for years in his lectures ('A Problem of Kinship Terminology', *American Anthropologist*, vol. 41,

1939, p. 571). White has used *culturology* to designate that which E. B. Tylor defined as 'the science of culture'. In the perspective of *culturology*, *culture* (q.v.) is an organization of things and events dependent upon symbols—language, custom, tools, beliefs, etc.—considered in an extra-somatic context, and further considered as a process sui generis, quite apart from its human carriers. *Culturology*, therefore, is the scientific study and interpretation of cultural phenomena per se. 'During the last hundred years', says R. H. Lowie ('Cultural Anthropology: A Science', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. XLII, 1936–37, p. 301), 'it has become increasingly clear that culture ... represents ... a distinct domain'. Such a domain demands for its investigation a distinct science and *culturology* fulfils this need.

Objection to *culturology* and to separating the science of the social—social anthropology and sociology—from this science of culture generally takes the two-fold position that culture is not a reality sui generis, i.e. it cannot be understood as a super-organic, super-psychic phenomenon, and that social and cultural phenomena must be studied as functional wholes (see D. Bidney, *Theoretical Anthropology*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1953, pp. 96–106).

Leslie A. White

See also: SUPERORGANIC

Currency (See Money)

Currency Reform (Also Monetary Reform)

A. In economics *currency* or *monetary reform* is generally used to refer not so much to any legislative or administrative change in the monetary and banking system as to governmental action to effect rapid reduction in the claims against the economy which individuals and business firms hold in the form of money and time and savings deposits. Some economists think the term ought also apply to removal of deflationary restraints upon the monetary system (J. M. Keynes, *A Tract on Monetary Reform*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1924). For example such reform may involve abandonment and modification of the Gold Standard.

B. *Currency* (now more usually styled *monetary*) *reform* is usually regarded as a step in terminating hyperinflation or toward preventing inflation which impends. Successful reform usually requires reduction in or removal of governmental deficits, a major source of inflation under

Currency Reform

modern circumstances. Ends generally secondary, but sometimes of primary importance, may be to facilitate termination of price and ration controls, to permit elimination of black markets in democratic countries or free markets in totalitarian countries, to trap tax evaders, to constitute a part of a more comprehensive capital levy, to reallocate current output by reducing claims of holders of previously accumulated cash balances, and in non-democratic countries to reduce the stake of some in a free market system in order to speed up adjustment to totalitarian regimes. The reform itself involves the use of one or more of the following techniques which are designed to reduce claims against society held by individuals and private business firms in the form of monetary balances and time and savings deposits.

1. Holders of money—currency and demand deposits—and savings deposits may be required to exchange them for fewer units, say 10 old for 1 new as in the 1947 monetary reform in Western Germany (F. H. Klopstock, 'Monetary Reform in Western Germany', *The Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 57, 1949, p. 282; H. C. Wallich, *Mainsprings of the German Revival*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955, p. 69). This step reduced the aggregates affected by 90 per cent, the equivalent of moving the decimal one point to the left. It must not be assumed that a uniform conversion ratio is always applied. During the monetary reform of 1947 in the U.S.S.R. the ratio 10 : 1 was applied for currency, but for bank deposits the conversion ratios were 1 : 1 up to 3,000 roubles, 3 : 2 for balances in the range 3,000–10,000, and 2 : 1 for balances above 10,000 (M. V. Condoide, *The Soviet Financial System*, Columbus: Ohio State University, The Bureau of Business Research, 1951, p. 69; J. G. Gurley, 'Excess Liquidity and European Monetary Reforms, 1944–1952', *The American Economic Review*, vol. XLIII, 1953, p. 81). The employment of this device in varying degrees is a feature common to most if not all monetary reforms. Professor J. G. Gurley records 24 separate European monetary reforms during the period 1944–52 in which this technique was employed (ibid., pp. 79–80).

2. The holders of money may be required or induced to purchase non-negotiable government bonds, bonds which cannot be converted into money until governmental permission is granted. In 1919 Czechoslovakia and, after liberation from Germany during World War II, several countries, including Czechoslovakia,

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM -- OUTLINE

I a. Introduction

- b. Definition of Culture (emphasis on production aspect)
- c. Misleading concepts of culture

II Changes in cultural life under Capitalism

- a. Work life (land, labor as commodities;; money-wage system)
- b. Family life (structure & function)
- c. Education (elite vs. mass)
- d. Political organization (feudal fief to nation-state)
- e. Science (fundamentally democratic, but harnessed to capitalist class)
- f. Literature and Art (high vs. folk vs. mass culture)

III Cultural Chauvinism I (General -- Seeks to equate ^{universal} capitalist culture with mystical category, "Western Culture.")

- a. "Western Culture" treated as "cause" of Western material advancement.
- b. "Western Culture" regarded as independent of rest of world
- c. "Western Culture" as ideological tool in world class struggle (Asserts that modernizing nations must "imitate" West)
- d. Cultural imperialism as specific strategy (Attempts to facilitate capitalist penetration/exploitation of a nation by breaking down its particular cultural adaptations, such as traditional family structure (Algeria). May also take form of "friends" seeking to impose their ideas without regard for level of economic development or class-cultural context in which they are to operate.)
- e. Cultural relativism as false concept since it divorces culture from class basis and production process.

IV ~~III~~ Cultural Chauvinism II (In the Movement) (Operates as a reflection of general cultural chauvinism)

- a. Within Movement organizations
 - 1. Romantic, paternal infatuation with folk culture
 - 2. intellectualism vs. intuition as modes of understanding
 - 3. Verbal dexterity vs. inventiveness as modes of coping
 - 4. Need for leadership which is sensitive to different communication styles, but which can separate style from content, emphasizing the latter.
- b. Toward other countries (Cultural arrogance)
 - 1. Assumption that because you came from highly developed country you know which course development will or should take elsewhere (ignores predatory relation between development and underdevelopment in capitalist system. Ignores social needs and functions in other country.)
 - 2. Assumption that because you have rejected bourgeois values you can "advise" socialist countries. (Confuses personal stance with social needs.) e.g. western

By intellectuals criticizing (attacking) Cuban Rev. because it criticizes (attacks) Radilla's pre-occupation with form. This is cult. imperialism at the personal level

CULTURAL CHAUVINISM OUTLINE (Continued)

V Cultural Nationalism ("cultural ~~ism~~ autonomy," "cultural democracy")

also
chauvinist term
often

1. As intellectual reactive defense against cultural Chauvinism. (Restoration of traditional culture, whether real or imaginary)
2. Becomes mystical retreat when separated from production process -- class base.
3. Can be positive awakening of racial-national consciousness to need for unified struggle against oppression when combined with political analysis and content.

VI Revolutionary Socialist Culture

1. Transitional stage -- harness cultural apparatus to class struggle. (Socialist in content, national in form)
2. Ultimate Goal (an ideal not yet achieved) -- free expression of human potentials made possible by full democratization of political economy and resolution of class struggle.

international
Democracy

Cultural Chauvinism I

line

2

heritage and development accounts for ...
instead of heritage accounts for ...

9

Japan did not face the transition from racial to cultural chauvinism, though Japan did provide a "hole in the argument" we have a contemporary analogy. Japanese in South Africa are "honorary whites". Japan was used always as "exception" rather than the breaching agent. Also note Nazi-Japan Pact.

I think the change came over a long period, very much coinciding with the development of liberalism. Hence following could be cited as some of the major causes:

1. transition to imperialism from colonial penetration
2. the rise of socialist thought, especially Marxism
3. increasing frequency of national wars of liberation
4. October revolution, Lenin, association of world socialist movement and national liberation movement
5. fascism as the logical consequence of old style racial chauvinism
6. wholesale "independence" of Asia and Africa after WWII
7. Northern migration

13-15

This example of Japan is an illustration of exception rather than changing mode of chauvinism. Ideologies have a great integrating capacity of incorporating apparent anomalies.

18-23

I think we should distinguish the rhetorics of "imitation" and "westernization". This seems to be the key verbalization in the transition from racial to cultural chauvinism.

25-27

This seems to be very weak, too much emphasis on "break down of old". There is the element of "prevention of new". Padilla case illustrates this very well.

lines

27-40

This example of Algeria is only "apparently convincing". The "context" argument sounds very artificial rather than objective. In a way you are describing the colonial destruction of the old, not the imperialist prevention of the new. I think we should use the word imperialism in a very specific historical sense.

41

"western culture" or "westernization" is an ...

44

"Unique" with respect to race and geography

60-62

Another useful analogy would be: a capitalist is a capitalist because he is an owner of capital, not because of his peculiar qualities inherited from the line of "distinguished families".

In general (on "uniqueness" thesis)

I think there are several points to this thesis

1. unique in the sense without Europeans, contemporary cultural development would have been impossible
2. unique in the sense of Toynbee: pre-capitalist culture of Europe not the condition for but the direct precursor of the present capitalist culture. (same way as Christianity is claimed to be revealed religion unlike other "natural" religions)
3. unique in the sense only the European "mental frame" is capable of sustaining it and developing it
4. unique in the sense no higher form can exist (much like Hegelian idealism of state as the highest form of organization).

The point is all these ignore the objective historical reality but tries to mystify Europe and "western culture" (as ethnic secret?)

lines

63-71

"borrowing" cannot be called a relation of dependency. Two nations can trade with each other without developing dependency. Only certain developmental history has to go on to congeal the incidental relation to a relation of dependency. Without knowing it, we are using a metaphysical distinction here.

78-92

This is only one half of the emergence of capitalist culture and its relation to the Third World. (I want to talk this over)

100

(3) The preservation of its supremacy in the 20th century presupposes active effort to preventing the non-European people to realize their cultural potential (via "ghettoization", "neo-colonization", "cultural imperialism" etc.).

102

Furthermore, today these heights can be maintained only if imperialist concentration of the productive facilities is maintained, only if others were actively prevented from seeking a new life unaffected by this concentration.

In general (on "dependency thesis").

there seems to be two phases for this.

1. Primitive Accumulation of Capital phase — plunder, enslavement, genocide — this accounts for the rapidity of development, if not the development itself, of West European capitalism.
2. Imperialist phase — "freezing" the status quo of monopolized means of production on worldwide scale — definite dependency

The first breeds racial chauvinism, the latter cultural chauvinism. The first is incidental, the latter "permanent" dependency.

"Borrowing" couldn't be used here since every culture borrows. (India from Greece, Greece from Egypt, China from India, Japan from China, etc.) In fact, this way of looking can lead to the view culture as

artifact, culture as museum, culture as cumulation. Culture seems to be the very "life process" of praxis determined by the mode of production.

Using analogy, a man is no vegetable because he is nourished by salads, grains, etc. But a man is a man because he is a product of social life of production (division of labor!) where vegetable might come in as a factor.

Hence, there is the question where the raw material and labor comes from in building Empire State Building. But that it remains as all what the name implies requires active social force. To build it one thing, to have it permanently in one hand is another.

Alternate Structure?

1. definition of cultural chauvinism
mention that cultural chauvinism is a variation on racial chauvinism
2. concomitant concept: cultural imperialism
how we wish to distinguish cultural chauvinism from cultural imperialism
3. from "imitation" to "westernization": racial to cultural
what caused it: plunder to incorporation.
4. Example of U.S. — KKK to Moynihan ("culture of destroyed family thesis")

5.

Chauvinism - II

Cultural Chauvinism, as we have defined it, being so rampant in this age of imperialism, it is inevitable that some of its poison has seeped into what is broadly called the Left. Its effect is ^{by} no means of the same magnitude as "outside" of the Left, but it has been an enduring source of friction and conflict, thereby undermining the unity on one hand promoting opportunism on the other. It has become one of the major fronts of the ideological battles of all revolutionary movements. Behind the slogan "Workers of the World, Unite", the concrete work of forging this unity must go on and in this endeavor the struggle against cultural chauvinism within the movement occupies near the top of the list.

One way this cultural chauvinism appears in the Left is to picture the socialist movement nothing more than a continuation and an extension of the "European political tradition". It is undoubtedly true that socialist thought had to emerge among those intellectuals situated in the very womb of the most advanced sector of world capitalism, and it is no less true that the socialist movements

in Europe and the U.S. must be a continuation and extension of the most progressive political heritage there. But it is chauvinist to picture Marxism as understandable only within the cultural milieu of Europe and the U.S. The origin of authorship should not be confused with the areas of relevance. Theories, unlike capitalist trade secrets, cannot be commodities, hence no private ownership of it can be claimed. The experiences of the advanced capitalist countries are at least theoretically, even practically, available to all ~~the experiences of the mankind~~, given the globalized bourgeois culture with its networks of communication and transportation.

There is another variation on this kind of chauvinism. Halfway according to the naive bourgeois obfuscation that socialist revolutions are supposed to take place in the advanced capitalist countries first, some "left" wing chauvinists manage to create the imagery that revolutions in Russia, China, etc. are somehow distortions to basic Marxist visions. This is not the same as accounting, correctly, for the added tasks ^{on the part} of the revolutionary governments in the

once "backward capitalist" or "semi-capitalist" countries of the struggle to overcome underdevelopment, and in the case of Soviet Union, the struggle to survive in the midst of ^{the} imperialist encirclement. The essential point in the "socialist" arguments of these chauvinists is that only out of the "European tradition" a genuine "undistorted" socialism can emerge. It is chauvinist because the basic premise of this view is the implied discreteness of socio-economic development ^{marked off by} national or continental boundaries. The essential interdependence, if not uniformization, between the rise of imperialism and the encrusting of underdevelopment, hence corollarily the temporary dormancy of revolutionary forces in the imperialist metropolises and the rising tide of national liberation in the "overseas satellites", is lost in this fundamentally metaphysical view of the contemporary world.

Given this premise that last half century is a "distortion of history", the bourgeois dichotomy of thinker-doer is reproduced in the minds of these purportedly Marxist intellectuals:- Europe as the

depository of theoretical wisdom, the Third World as the arena of practical movements. In this dichotomy, Marxism ^{remains} implicitly as a philosophy in Europe and the U.S., and Marxism remains implicitly as a mask for nationalism in the Third World. That the real revolutionary content of Marxism is the end of philosophy and the beginning of science is lost in this bourgeois intellectual ^{Theory and Practice lost all its essential connections.} shuffle. (In all genuine Marxist-Leninist parties, the history of the movement, specifically the history of the party, plays the same instructional importance as the theory of socialism.)

There is a further inversion on this theme. In order to mask this chauvinism based on metaphysical dichotomy, certain "allowances" are made. The unity of the world capitalist development is superficially recognized ^{as giving} ~~to give~~ birth to cosmopolitanism in place of internationalism. Usually this is based on the non-sequitur: capital is globalized "therefore" labor mobility is also globalized.

This becomes the crux of the thesis denying the possibility of secession in our country. "I don't see it. The shuffle is the

most important distinction between the final worldwide triumph of socialism and the processes leading to that triumph, between the worldwide realization of socialism and the socialist construction leading to such realization, between the entry into socialism and the exit from capitalism.

This chauvinism of "Europe as the theoretical center of socialism" and its concomitant personal arrogance on the part of self-styled "Marxists" led to the mirror image of ideological confusion. We often hear some non-Europeans mouth the view that Marxism is a specific political solution to a specifically European and specifically 19th century problem. Just as (old style) racism created its mirror image "reverse racism", the world of bourgeois thought revolves around chasing ^{after} its tails. If specificity is required of Marxism, then it is the mankind's answer to specific social order called capitalism in the specific era of history characterized by the decay, and the final disintegration of that order.

Corollary to this variety of cultural chauvinism is the phenomenon of declassed bourgeois intellectuals elevating themselves as the intellectual and esthetic experts of the world, and specifically as guardians and mediators of the "cultural traditions" amidst revolutionary upheavals. Thus we see a group of "leftist" intellectuals of Europe, U.S. and their Latin American "disciples" springing up "in defence" of the mankind's valuable cultural heritage which the revolutionary government of Cuba is supposedly trampling when it rendered a criticism of the parasitical mode of life of a Cuban poet.*

It is important to realize what is the basis of "relevance" for these "experts". Though the revolutionary people render sympathetic ears to them as progressive intellectuals and artists for the sake of broad anti-imperialist alliance, the real audience is to be found in the peculiar cultural milieu of imperialism. With the

* They even did a "clever" detective work to reach absurd deduction that a torture was applied to the poet! It seems non-Europeans are guilty of barbarism until certified otherwise by these "guardians of culture."

decline of the bourgeois culture and the concomitant alienation of intellectuals and artists (their product must use the capitalist mediation - commodity), their "defence" largely constituted the zealous protection of that part of them which is not alienable: the technique of manipulating forms, or simply, skills. Thus, art-for-art's-sake stance of artists and the surrealist idealism of intellectuals. But then, no one except those in the dilettant chic circles of the "upper middle class" of imperialism is on the same social milieu to appreciate ^{their} "nothingness" and sacri-fied esthetic sensibilities, or their cheap psychedelic imitations. But then, to these "experts", we are all barbarian philistines.

Of course there is a whole spectrum to this "leftist" cultural chauvinism. From the armchair coaches of revolutions in Paris or New York, to the adventurers-missionaries to "help out" the revolutions; from the professional "anti-Stalinists" to petty bourgeois "researchers" of revolutions; from "life style" anarchists to dogmatic

syndicalists; anything to avoid the awesome historical task
of solidarity^{*} with the revolutionary tide of this century.

~~Chauvin~~

* Even solidarity becomes a bourgeois category in the hand of
these chauvinists, a kind of a studied poseur of tongue-clicking
concern and "tendency extrapolation".

Chauvinism III.

A mention should be made of the specific kind of cultural chauvinism within the black-white dynamics of the U.S. movement. Perhaps best crystallized is the circumstance in the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee in the eve of the emergence of "Black Power". But also in numerous organizations the basic dynamic is reproduced time and again. It has reached the point that this chauvinism-inspired malaise in the movement begins to cast a disturbing doubt if black-white unity is even possible in the U.S. In order not to be blinded by this devastated ideological landscape of the movement, we must begin to identify its chauvinistic causes. Three basic types can be discerned.

The first is the cultural chauvinism of elitist intellectual-to-be students. Not recognizing their own basic unfreedom or, if they do, interpreting the unfreedom purely existentially, these students were in search of "commitment", that bourgeois optimalist luxury. Once having accommodated themselves in the movement, their

bourgeois prejudice shows up in its search for visible results at the expense of the developmental imperative of the movement. Their work-style was often nothing more than a search for a new use for their imperialism-endowed "privileges" in the absence of basic solidarity. ^{PP} The point can best be explained by an analogy. Suppose a hungry group of multi-racial composition in search of food comes across a whites-only restaurant. The straight opportunistic way is to pose the solution: "at least half of the problem of hunger can be solved now, let's worry about the other half of the problem after solving this half." The mawkish ^{sentimentalist} bourgeois way is: "as a matter of individual conscience, no one goes in even if it means starvation for all." The more subtle chauvinistic way is: "since a white person can ^{best} solve the question on hand, let him be the leader and resolve this question". The first has reduced the present as blind necessity, the second as individual moral imperative, the third as pragmatic datum; all to skirt freedom as categorical imperative of the group.

There are varieties of cultural chauvinism since they are all manifestations of the subtle individuated assumption of cultural attributes in the milieu created by imperialism.

The second type of specific cultural chauvinism concerns what one might call "cultural relativism", often mouthed by so-called "life-style revolutionaries", but by no means limited to them. This type romanticizes the "backwoods", "archaic", or "ghetto" manifestations of bourgeois ^{"sub-}cultures, and entertains a pathological obsession to see them "preserved". This is one of the outcomes of defining culture solely in the sphere of consumption. Realizing the spiritual corruption inherent in the commercialization of culture, yet not realizing the basic dynamic of the bourgeois societies producing cultural parallelism, this type becomes ^{the} unwitting accomplices in the bourgeois devastation by playing the complementary role of scavengers.

Just as the imperialist "uncovers" for the old and encrusted cultures shows up ^{as} quaint artifacts "giving spice" to the internal decor (the "explorer" mentality - the vanguard of colonialism) of bourgeois bourgeois, this latter day "folksy" chauvinists laments

the passing of the old by confusing it with Paradise Lost, it reproduces in culture the ^{economic} phenomenon of the sweatshop fringe of monopoly capital. It is a form of cultural chauvinism because this déclassé mentality encourages the alibi of the bourgeois destruction, because it attempts to show a way to accommodation with the wreck created by cultural chauvinism. Relativism is almost always a silent partner on the oppressors' side.

The third type concerns what one might call leftwing tokenism. There are two subtypes; one directed outward, the other directed inward. The outward type puts a non-white on a tokenist position as a window dressing for non-chauvinism. Here we must take care when it is a token and when it is not lest we fall prey to automatic reflex of assuming all multiracial situation as a reproduction of chauvinism. A crude but servicable guide seems to be to ask the question: is the non-white hindered or aided by ^{in his effort to develop people's movement} the organizational association based not on the bourgeois demagogic

propaganda but on concrete developmental practices). There may be many causes to impugn tokenism. It may be that the organization is communist in rhetoric syndicalist in practice - syndicalism in the era of imperialism ^{is} almost indistinguishable from opportunism.

Or it may be that the revolutionary tasks of the non-white people are so incurably phrased in chauvinist terms and biases that they preclude the possibility of relevance in the light of practice. It could even be that real conditions created by imperialism and racism are preempted by rhetoric that they ~~do~~ reduce to "nothingness". ("We are all same, therefore...")

The inward form has to do with the sole preoccupation with creating islands of racial harmony. That such a harmony is short of being a solidarity is ^{rooted in} ~~based on~~ the truth that such preoccupation with small group mentality is the very negation of the outside reality, hence deprivation of practical imperative. The inward harmony is no longer capable of forging practical means of overcoming the given situation, the "raw material" of the revolutionary

task. Again this is an aspect of cultural chauvinism for it substitutes individual assimilation for the struggle against chauvinism. The thesis that individual experiential transformation is the building block for societal transformation is one of the palliatives of the cultural chauvinist "tradition" of capitalism. It provides individual escape from chauvinism (brain-drain!) but not a revolutionary struggle against chauvinism.

The theoretical basis for cultural chauvinism

It is the characteristic of capitalist economy that it gives rise to the illusion that all directly coercive relations between men are swept away clean. Indeed, slavery and serfdom are no longer "compatible" with unhindered development of the capitalist mode of production. Instead, the coercive relations become indirect through things, through free exchange of products in a free market, resting on State-imposed right of private property. Thus, the bourgeois "freedom" is the unlimited access to unrestricted market, "freedom" built on the "solid" rock of private property. ^{Given this,} Wage-labor is "free" in two senses: free of direct coercion and free of all property. The worker's alienation takes the form in which his labor of yesterday, capital, confronts him today as impersonal master and condemns him to subjugate his labor-power to the accumulation of his enemy's power, capital. The only way he can survive is by making his oppressor stronger. This is the unfreedom of capitalism hiding behind the bourgeois freedom.

With the rise of imperialism this unfreedom operates on a global scale. Thus the sufferings of ^{last four} centuries through merciless plunder and inhuman slavery gave birth to the highly developed industry concentrated in a small corner of the globe. This, in turn, shouts imperious commands thundering across oceans, and demands stepped-up worldwide services to facilitate the ^{further} accumulation of monopoly capital.

As part of its global strategies, imperialism promotes the internationalization of the capitalist property rights. It violently rejects the suggestion that its developed industry might be the work of mankind as a whole. On the contrary it promotes the idea that its capitalist industrial prowess is the natural right of the "Western Man".

Cultural chauvinism is derived from this ^{inherent} chauvinism ~~inherent~~ of imperialism. By separating culture from economics, as all ruling classes of all class societies do, culture is made to appear as natural or divine endowments of "superior" people which "inferior" people "failed" to be blessed with or "failed" to catch up with.

55

This is most ^{math}thoroughly widespread in the land of imperialism par excellence, the U.S. In terms of sheer expenditure of labor-power in the "necessary" labor, easily one third wears black skin. Yet the products of such gargantuan energy confront them as whiteman's property (This awesome ideological fraud generates the back-to-Africa movements among the black people: freedom as at least physical escape if not ideological.)

Individual attitudes and behaviors of cultural chauvinism are based on this hoax also. The Black Movement's hostility and contempt of "white liberals" or pseudo-radicals is in essence hostility and contempt for their incurable "habits" of failing to understand ~~where, for instance, no connections~~ ^{the} between the suburbanization of the "white middle class" and the decay of ghettoized urban cores, between the proliferation of freeways and dismemberment of urban public services, between the serene cultures of Vermont backwoods and the crime-dope-prostitution "cultures" of Harlem streets.

No, today's cultural chauvinists do more than "fail" to see. They publish "research papers", devise "assistance schemes", give "academic courses", show "grave concerns", to make sure that no one even attempt to make the necessary connections: "Culturally deprived", "less fortunate", "academically lagging", "savagely brutalized", etc., etc., ad nauseum, the language ^{itself} is polluted with categories prejudicial to ideological awakening of the people.

There is one more further inversion to this butchery of minds. Some even denies the existence of the putrid decaying life ^{altogether} of the ghettos. They romanticize it through some twisted existentialist logic: celebration of nothingness. They ossify it through some archaic primitivist logic: the noble savage (of "asphalt jungle").

The cultural chauvinist myths are infinitely richer than the mythologies of village priests of Hinduism.

Cultural Chauvinism I

line

2

heritage and development accounts for ...
instead of heritage accounts for ..

9

Japan did not force the transition from racial to cultural chauvinism, though Japan did provide a "hole in the argument" we have a contemporary analogy. Japanese in South Africa are "honorary whites". Japan was used always as "exception" rather than the breaching agent. Also note Nazi-Japan Pact.

I think the change came over a long period, very much coinciding with the development of liberalism. Hence following could be cited as some of the major "causes":

1. transition to imperialism from colonial penetration
2. the rise of socialist thought, especially Marxism
3. increasing frequency of national wars of liberation
4. October revolution, Lenin, association of world socialist movement and national liberation movement
5. fascism as the logical consequence of old style racial chauvinism
6. wholesale "independence" of Asia and Africa after WWII.
7. Northern migration

13-15

This example of Japan is an illustration of exception rather than changing mode of chauvinism. Ideologies have a great integrating capacity of incorporating apparent anomalies.

18-23

I think we should distinguish the rhetorics of "imitation" and "westernization". This seems to be the key verbalization in the transition from racial to cultural chauvinism.

25-27

This seems to be very weak, too much emphasis on "break down of old". There is the element of "prevention of new". Padilla case illustrates this very well.

lines

27-40

This example of Algeria is only "apparently convincing". The "context" argument sounds very artificial rather than objective. In a way you are describing the colonial destruction of the old, not the imperialist prevention of the new. I think we should use the word imperialism in a very specific historical sense.

41

"western culture" or "westernization" is an ...

44

"Unique" with respect to race and geography

60-62

Another useful analogy would be a capitalist is a capitalist because he is an owner of capital, not because of his peculiar qualities inherited from the line of "distinguished families".

In general (on "uniqueness" thesis)

I think there are several points to this thesis

1. unique in the sense without Europeans, contemporary cultural development would have been impossible
2. unique in the sense of Toynbee: pre-capitalist culture of Europe
3. not the condition for but the direct precursor of the present capitalist culture. (same way as Christianity is claimed to be revealed religion unlike other "natural" religions)
3. unique in the sense only the European "mental frame" is capable of sustaining it and developing it
4. unique in the sense no higher form can exist (much like Hegelian idealism of state as the highest form of organization).

The point is all these ignore the objective historical reality but tries to mystify Europe and "western culture" (as ethnic secret?)

Phines

63-77

"borrowing" cannot be called a relation of dependency. Two nations can trade with each other without developing dependency. Only certain developmental history has to go on to congeal the incidental relation to a relation of dependency. Without knowing it, we are using a metaphysical distinction here.

78-92

This is only one half of the emergence of capitalist culture and its relation to the Third World. (I want to talk this over)

100

(3) the preservation of its supremacy in the 20th century presupposes active effort to preventing the non-European people to realize their cultural potential (via "ghettoization", "neo-colonization", "cultural imperialism" etc).

102

Furthermore, today these heights can be maintained only if imperialist concentration of the productive facilities is maintained, only if others were actively prevented from seeking a new life, unaffected by this concentration.

In general (on "dependency thesis").

there seems to be two phases for this.

1. Primitive Accumulation of Capital phase — plunder, enslavement, genocide — this accounts for the rapidity of development, if not the development itself, of West European capitalism.
2. Imperialist phase — "freezing" the status quo of monopolized means of production on worldwide scale — definite dependency

The first breeds racial chauvinism, the latter cultural chauvinism. The first is incidental, the latter "permanent" dependency.

"Borrowing" couldn't be used here since every culture borrows. (India from Greece, Greece from Egypt, China from India, Japan from China, etc.) In fact, this way of looking can lead to the view culture as

artifact, culture as museum, culture as cumulation. Culture seems to be the very "life process" of praxis determined by the mode of production.

Using analogy, a man is no vegetable because he is nourished by salads, grains, etc. But a man is a man because he is a product of social life of production (division of labor!) where vegetable might come in as a factor.

Hence, there is the question where the raw material and labor comes from in building Empire State Building. But that it remain as all what the name implies requires active social force. To build it one thing, to have it permanently in one hand is another.

alternate structure?

1. definition of cultural chauvinism
mention that cultural chauvinism is a variation on racial chauvinism
2. concomitant concept: cultural imperialism
how we wish to distinguish cultural chauvinism from cultural imperialism
3. from "imitation" to "westernization": racial to cultural
what caused it: plunder to incorporation.
4. example of U.S. — KKK to Moynihan ("culture of destroyed family thesis")
- 5.

Suggestions on Cultural Life under Capitalism

1. Rewrite paragraph 1: emphasize the "socialization" of the means of production (individual tools vs social tools)

Marx: "... only the capitalist production of commodities has become an epoch-making mode of exploitation, which, in the course of its historical development, revolutionizes, through the organization of the labor-process and the enormous improvement of technique, the entire economic structure of society, in a manner eclipsing all former epochs."

Capital vol II p 34

See also around p 418 of Engels: Socialism, Utopian & Scientific (concerning "socialization of means of production")

The paragraph appears "tame" because only one aspect of capitalism — expansion of commodity production — is emphasized

If space permits, the genesis of capital and wage could be brought in in such a way as to make reader "appreciate" the epochal change

Marx: "The historical conditions of [the] existence [of capital] are by no means given with mere circulation of money and commodities. It can spring into life only when the owner of the means of production and subsistence meets in the market with the free laborer selling his labor power. And this one historical condition comprises a world's history. Capital, therefore, announces from its first appearance a new epoch in the process of social production."

Capital, vol I p 169.

2. If para 1 is rewritten, then a new paragraph can "concretize" the "abstraction" of paragraph 1, by mentioning the colonial plunder and capitalist slave trade (i.e. "global primitive accumulation of capital").
cf. p143-144 Baran: Political Economy of Growth

3. If para of above is written, a short paragraph dealing with imperialism can further congeal these ideas.

4. For the rest of this section, how about rearranging the order of paragraphs, so that we can go from "larger things to smaller things", i.e. from social to individual? I have the following order in mind. (within each, also further ordering of "bottom to top")

science and technology
art and literature
politics
education
family
consumption ("mass culture")

(paragraphs 2 and 3, on wage-labor and land, wouldn't be needed if suggestions 1, 2, 3 of above are used.)

5. On family: the reason for extended family. I don't think the reason was as simple. Extended families are the embodiment of what Engels calls "gentile constitution" prior to the rise of state (see Origin of family, private property, and state). Your description of pre-capitalist families are too "romantic" and "idyllic".

However, the basic reason for nuclear family seems sound, except

allowances must be made of the decline of family as property institutions and in some cases the breakup of nuclear families itself. Nuclear families are ideal of bourgeois family not necessarily the reality, especially among those in the reserve army of labor (which is integral part of bourgeois society!). This kind of unqualified use of nuclear family tends to degenerate into bourgeois radical version of "feminist" rhetoric.

6. Education: The need of "democratized education" under capitalism seem to be too mechanical. (e.g. arithmetic, written instructions, etc.).

It seems to be the era of "socialized" means of production requires "socialized" dissemination of knowledge. (e.g. research institutes rather than inventor's workshop) Also, the constantly revolutionizing capitalist production demands not ossified skills but "generalized knowledge". Especially for workers, their labor mobility, job-changing, function-redefinition requires rudimentary acquiring of "general education".

See Marx, Capital vol I Machinery and Modern Industry especially Section 9: The Factory Acts. Sanitary and Educational Clauses of the Same. Their general extension in England. Attention: p486 "modern Industry never ..."

You might also mention that college education of today (8 million students!) is not the same as college education of 50 years ago.

7. Political Structure

"Centralized government" is only one of the attributes of modern nation state. The latter also rationalizes uniform marketing, (develops the network of communication and transportation, uniformises languages, in general, accelerates the capitalist development in "hot house fashion" (Marx).

(I can't find the relevant passages in Marx, Engels or Lenin).

The history of rising bourgeoisie embracing the absolute monarchs invariably fascinates the readers. (It make sense why Shakespeare wrote about Hamlet, King Lear, etc. — Shakespeare as bourgeois artist!). But if, space is not permitting, this fascinating history could be "made short", like a passing mention? (I feel certain uneasiness about this because this is the way nation-states were born in Europe, but not everywhere. We are trying to imprint the implication why capitalism spells out nation states, even if the particular historical constellation may differ greatly, c.f. Europe vs Africa vs Latin America vs Asia! It may even create the impression nation-states are indeed European category rather than capitalist category. At least some readers will not be convinced of this if their attention is directed to Europe-specific events surrounding the rise of nation-states.)

A mention should be made of republicanism, parliamentarism, New Dealism, fascism, etc. Also colonialism of nation-states but crusades of feudal principalities!

8. Science and Technology + Literature and Art.

This part is far too simple, it seems to me. But right now I have no better ideas. I will work on this part of suggestion more fully.

9. "Mass culture".

Our criticism of "mass culture" should not be a criticism of its content but raising the question: should it be called culture to begin with. To me the primary function of "mass culture" is the end product of "packaging" of that part of culture which is commercializable.

I think we should distinguish between culture and "cultural products," between the painting and the artist's "skill," between concerts and music, between schools and education. If we do then we know "mass culture" is really advertising which pretends to be "cultural", capitalist product rather than capitalist facilitation, entertainment rather than culture, drug-effects rather than imagination.

I know this is a tricky subject but a correct criticism of this here can facilitate the exposition on Socialist Culture later. Otherwise we are undisquishable from the snobbish bourgeois "culture-critic" or the injured indignancy of cultural restorationists. What is more difficult is that in bourgeois condition, proletarian art is reduced to this (love stories, detective stories, rock music, etc)

CULTURE

Culture is the totality of valuable wealth created by the masses in all progressions of the historical development. Culture is a social phenomenon formed through the social practice of the masses. Culture can be divided into material and spiritual. Material culture refers to the means of production and other valuable wealth created in each stage of the historical development. * The spiritual culture, its character and content, is determined by the material culture. However it can happen that spiritual culture may be ahead of the level of the material culture. In class societies, culture has its class character. In capitalism, there are bourgeois culture and proletarian culture. Under socialism there can develop genuine people's culture where the national form and the socialist content are unified.

CULTURALITY(?)

Culturality is the communist character equipped with deep knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, high level of scientific and technical knowledge, accomplishedness in the national art, and voluntary adherence to various moral conduct. Therefore, this culturality is same as the culturality of communism. This is the highest culturality since communism is the highest stage in social development. Culturality is the necessary element in the partisan character of the working class and the humanistic character of communism. At the same time, culturality can become thorough only when it rests on high partisan character and humanist character and the latter is in turn firmly anchored onto high culturality. One can become true communist only when these are carried out.

CULTURAL HERITAGE

Cultural heritage refers to the valuable and positive wealth among the culture created by human society which are handed down to later generations. Cultural heritage is characterized by strict class principles. For, in societies with antagonistic classes, there is the reactionary culture reflecting the interest of the exploiters, and there is the progressive culture reflecting the interest of the exploited working masses. Thus, it is imperative for us to inherit the progressive culture correctly in our creation of culture, since it is possible to create higher culture only if one has inherited the progressive culture of the previous stage. However, the inheritance of the cultural heritage must be a critical one in light of the new age and new circumstances.

CULTURAL REVOLUTION

Cultural revolution refers to the general transformation in the various areas of cultural life in order to endow the working masses with high technological knowledge and to create and develop a new socialist culture. Cultural revolution constitutes a part of the socialist revolution and an indispensable element in the socialist construction. The basic tasks of cultural revolution are : to enable the working masses to possess general knowledge and high technical knowledge, to enable them to absorb critically the progressive cultural heritage and insure the further inheritance and development, to practice people's education within the socialist principles, to educate new cadres from the working class and enable the working masses to come out of all old way of life and custom and to establish the new socialist moral environment.

* Spiritual culture refers to the valuable accomplishments formed by science and art, social life and custom in each stage of the historical development.

CULTURAL AUTONOMY OF NATIONS

Cultural autonomy of nations refers to the anti-Marxist line on the nationality question adopted by the Austrian Social Democratic Party, various opportunistic parties belonging to the Second International, and the Mesheviks of the Russian Social Democratic Party. The basic content of this line is to give autonomy only in constructing and maintaining cultural organs (schools, churches, etc.) but under the condition of political and economic subservience of the oppressed nations. The line makes the national oppression and subservience permanent, denies the right of self-determination of nations, destroys the unity of the labor movement, and attempts to destroy the international unity of the working class by dividing them along national lines. This is a form of bourgeois nationalism.

from:

Koreas

Marxist-Leninist Dictionary

Culture as manifestation of level of
economic organization

Education

family life

work life - economic organization (wage-money system)

Science + Tech.

Literature + Art.

Philosophy + Religion

political organization (nation-state)