

## Society and Mind in Marxian Philosophy

Marx's theory of social development is known as "Materialistic Conception of History" or "Historical Materialism". This name materialism was used in opposition to idealism; whereas idealistic philosophical systems ~~assumed~~ considered some spiritual principle, ~~and~~ some "Absolute Idea" as the primary basis of the world, the materialistic philosophy proceeded from the real material world. Afterwards, in the middle of the 19. century another kind of materialism arose among scientists and middle class men, considering physical matter as the primary basis, from which all spiritual and mental phenomena must be derived. Most of the objections raised against Marxism are due to the fact, that it was not distinguished from this middle class materialism.

A well known sentence of Marx, in which his philosophy is condensed, is this: it is not consciousness (Bewusstsein) ~~which~~ determines the real world (das Sein), but it is the ~~real~~ ~~world~~ of society (das gesellschaftliche Sein) ~~which~~ determines consciousness. ~~The~~ ~~Marxism~~ is not concerned with the ~~antithesis~~ matter-mind ~~but~~ ~~does not concern Marxism~~; ~~but~~ ~~the~~ ~~real~~ world ~~therefrom~~. ~~ideas~~ and the ideas derived ~~from it~~. This real world comprises everything ~~that~~ is observable, i.e. ~~all~~ that by observation may be stated as an objective fact. The wage-relation between workman and employer, the Constitution of the U. S., the science of mathematics, ~~though not being physical matter,~~ are quite as real and objective as the factory machine, the Capitol, or the Ohio river. Middle class materialism ~~considered~~ our thoughts to be determined by the motions of atoms ~~in our brains~~; Marxism considers our thoughts to be determined by ~~our experience~~ ~~of the world~~, observed through the senses or ~~immediately~~ felt as direct bodily needs.

The world for man is society. Of course the wider world is nature, and society is nature transformed by man. But in the course of history this transformation was so thorough ~~and went so deep~~ that now society is the <sup>most important</sup> chief part of our world. Society is not simply an aggregate of men; these men are connected by relations, not chosen at will ~~by them~~ but <sup>imposed upon them</sup> given by the economic system, <sup>under they live and in which</sup> each takes his place.

Society is an economic system, ~~as~~ an organization for production; its ~~aim~~ object is to produce for mankind everything that is necessary for life, of whatever ~~nature~~ <sup>nature</sup> may be ~~these necessities~~. First of all mankind has to live; ~~itself~~ self-preservation ~~is~~, the dominant aim in every living being, is <sup>also</sup> dominant in man. Hence the ~~economic~~ organism that secures ~~all~~ this life, <sup>imposes itself as</sup> ~~the feature for mankind.~~ The relations which it establishes between men have the same stringent necessity as life itself; ~~they~~ <sup>These relations form constitute</sup> ~~are~~ the contents of their life and determine their consciousness with supreme force. ~~always~~ Hence, when the principle of Marxism is ~~expressed sometimes in this way~~ that the ideas and institutions of men are determined by ~~their mode of winning their living~~ <sup>always and his</sup> ~~livelhood~~ this does not mean that ~~men only think of their food;~~ <sup>nor can</sup> it cannot be refuted by pointing <sup>out</sup> to the influence of high idealistic motives. It means that ~~this mode in~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~he wins his~~ <sup>his</sup> living, i.e. the economic organization of production ~~of the whole~~ <sup>thus</sup> ~~in individual places~~ <sup>were</sup> ~~on which~~ puts everybody in determinate relations to his fellowmen, <sup>up to our day, nearly all thoughts of men were devoted to food,</sup> and so determining his thinking and feeling. It is true, of course, that, ~~the epoch of agriculture~~ <sup>will have been</sup> up to our days, because a living <sup>had not been</sup> secured for everybody; always the fear <sup>fear of</sup> want and hunger <sup>weighed</sup> <sup>heavy</sup> as a nightmare on the brains of <sup>men</sup>. But also in a future economic system, when this fear <sup>will have been removed,</sup> <sup>when</sup> mankind is master of <sup>its</sup> <sup>thinking</sup> means of subsistence and <sup>its thoughts will be free and wide,</sup> ~~the system~~ of production <sup>will continue to</sup> still determine the ideas and the institutions.

The system of production, <sup>(Produktionsweise)</sup> which for each man ~~is~~ a given reality, is <sup>itself</sup> product of <sup>man</sup> ~~itself~~. It has been built up by mankind in <sup>the course</sup> ~~a development~~ of centuries, and <sup>at present</sup> ~~now~~ everybody takes part in building further. At a certain moment its structure is determined by given conditions. If we ask for the determining conditions of the economic system, <sup>we find</sup> as its immediate foundations two: technics and law. Capitalism is <sup>not simply production by</sup> ~~the growth of~~ <sup>we find</sup> big machines; accordingly it is production by big machines under the rule of private property. The growth of capitalism was not only the growth

of small tools into big industry but at the same time the development of the unfree, guild-bound craftsmen into free labourers, free business men. A system of production is a determinate system of techniques regulated by a system of juridical rules.

~~Marcus~~ ~~accordance~~ The often quoted and repeated thesis of Stammer <sup>the German jurist</sup>: Law determines the economic system (das Recht bestimmt die Wirtschaft) is based upon this circumstance. Stammer thought that by this sentence he refuted Marxism, which ~~had~~ proclaimed the dominance of economics over juridic ideas. <sup>And so, conversely,</sup> On the ~~reverse~~ in proclaiming that the material element, the technical side of the labor process, ~~is~~ is ruled and dominated by spiritual elements, the juridical rules <sup>by</sup> which men ~~felt convinced~~ that at the same time he ~~had established at the same time~~ regulate their relations at their own will, Stammer ~~supposed~~ ~~to~~ ~~believe~~ the predominance of ~~the~~ mind over matter. Here he was wrong; the antithesis <sup>spiritual</sup> techniques - law does not at all coincide with the antithesis matter - mind. Law is not only rule but also hard constraint, not only the article of the <sup>the</sup> statute book but also the club of the policeman and the walls of jail. And techniques is not only the machine itself but also the <sup>ability</sup> <sup>including</sup> capability to construct them, the science of physics.

Certainly Indeed the two conditions, techniques and law play a different role in ~~this~~ determining the system of production. Techniques is a given foundation that ~~depends on men~~ does not depend on the will of men directly. Law depends on their will; they make their laws and acts as they want and wish them to be. Not arbitrarily of course; they ~~regulate~~ establish and regulate their relations as, <sup>with</sup> <sup>and its development</sup> it is necessary <sup>for</sup> ~~for~~ a given techniques <sup>thus making</sup> to make production possible. The techniques of small tools ~~made~~ to make the juridical institute of private property necessary. ~~Based on this way~~ led to a system of production of craft, ~~and so~~. The <sup>development</sup> of growth big machines, which made the <sup>for its development and</sup> development of big industry possible and necessary, induced people to remove the juridical obstacles <sup>In this way</sup> to establish freedom of trade. ~~Thus~~ Techniques is the deepest ~~foundation~~ foundation, that determines law; it is the underlying productive force, whereas law belongs to the superstructure resting on it. Thus Stammer, being right in his thesis in a restricted sense, is wrong in the general sense. Just because law

required

rules economics, people try and must try to make such laws as are ~~necessarily~~ with the given technical equipment ; this is the way in which technics determine law. This implies that there is no rigid, mechanical one-to-one dependence. Law does not automatically ~~adjust itself to~~ adjust itself to ~~existing~~ technics. The economic need must be felt by men, and then they have to change and adjust their laws <sup>(the long time to be spent and adjusted accordingly.)</sup> This adjustment is <sup>the</sup> difficult and painful object of the class struggles. It is <sup>the quintessence</sup> and aim of all ~~modern~~ political strife and all great revolutions in history. ~~Socialism~~ The fight for socialism also is the fight for new law, for ~~a~~ new juridical principles <sup>which are to</sup> ~~to~~ form a new system of production adapted to ~~the enormous modern development of technics.~~

Technics as the chief productive force is the basis of society. Of course in primitive society <sup>the</sup> natural conditions play the chief role in determining the system of production; ~~the productive forces are the force~~ In the course of evolution the technical implements, the tools, are gradually improved, mostly by imperceptible steps, because the mind of man is always <sup>intent</sup> ~~at~~ on making his work <sup>less hard</sup> ~~more easy~~ and more effective. Then natural science, by investigating the forces of nature, <sup>develops</sup> into the most important productive force; all the technicalities in developing and applying science, including the most abstract mathematics, <sup>to all appearances</sup> ~~taking like an exercise in pure reason, may be as belonging~~ the technical basis of the system of production, to what Marx called reckoned ~~into~~ <sup>the</sup> the productive forces. ~~influence~~ So material (in a physical sense) and mental elements are combined in what in Marxism is called the material basis of society. Marxist conception of history puts <sup>the</sup> living man in the centre of its ~~whole~~ scheme of development, with all his needs and all <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ powers. His needs are not only the needs of his stomach (though these are <sup>the</sup> most imperative) but also the needs of head and heart. In human labor the material, physical side and the mental side are inseparable; even the most primitive work of the savage is ~~most labor~~ brain-work as much as muscle work. Only because under capitalism the division of labor separated these two parts <sup>different</sup> ~~of~~ functions of ~~two~~ classes, <sup>thereby</sup> training the capacities of both, the intellectuals came to overlook their organic and social unity. So we may understand their skew view of Marxism as a theory <sup>now</sup> ~~explaining everything~~ dealing with the material side of life exclusively.

<sup>I, physical and</sup>  
<sup>mental.</sup>

## II.

The materialistic conception of history Marx' Historical Materialism is a ~~more~~ mode of interpretation of explanation of history. History consists of the deeds, the actions of men. What induces these actions, what determines the activity of man?

Man ~~stands~~, as an organism with ~~certain needs~~ <sup>which must be satisfied as</sup> ~~the condition of his existence,~~ stands <sup>the surrounding</sup> within nature, which offers the means to satisfy <sup>them</sup> ~~his needs~~. His needs and ~~the~~ <sup>the impressions of the</sup> surrounding world are the impulses, <sup>the stimuli,</sup> to which his actions are the responses, just as with all living beings. In the case of man consciousness is interposed between stimulus and action. Though in cases of highest necessity the actions follow spontaneously, <sup>as a kind of reflexes, without premeditation</sup>, as wild explosions of passion, the usual course runs ~~from impression to thought/ideas, to more or less conscious~~ - volition, ~~and then to actions~~ from impression through the mind, through consciousness, through conscious volition. The need, <sup>as it is</sup> directly felt, and the surrounding world, observed through the senses, work upon the mind, produce thoughts, ~~ideas~~ ideas and aims, stimulate the will and put the body into action.

To the acting man himself his ~~deeds~~ thoughts and aims are the cause of his deeds; he does not ask where these thoughts <sup>come</sup> ~~are coming~~ from. The more so as thoughts, ideas and aims are not derived from the impressions by conscious reasoning, but are the product of ~~a~~ subconscious spontaneous process in our mind. For the members of a social class the everyday experience of <sup>life conditions and the</sup> the needs of ~~this class~~ moulds their mind into a definite line of feeling and thinking, producing definite ideas about what is useful, what is good or bad. And because ~~these~~ <sup>the</sup> conditions are life necessities, <sup>imperatively determined</sup> by the place they <sup>occupy</sup> in the system of production, <sup>people</sup> they cannot imagine themselves outside these conditions and consider ~~that~~, what is good or bad for them, <sup>to be</sup> good and bad in general. When <sup>then</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>ripe</sup> ~~opportunities~~ <sup>men</sup> go into action and shape society according to their ideas, ~~so~~ So the rising French bourgeoisie in the 18th century <sup>feeling</sup> ~~of~~ the necessity of freedom of trade, <sup>personal</sup> freedom of the citizens, ~~they~~ proclaimed freedom as their slogan, and in the French Revolution ~~they~~ conquered power and transformed society.

The idealistic conception of history explains the events of history ~~as~~ as caused by

always  
incomplete  
in that)

altogether) But it is always incomplete.

the ideas of men. This is not ~~entirely~~ wrong; It is ~~very~~ wrong, ~~when~~ it takes the general abstract formula for its special meaning, ~~and~~ overlooking <sup>the fact</sup> ~~that~~ the French bourgeoisie wanted only that <sup>that was good for her</sup> And freedom ~~for itself~~. ~~And~~ it is ~~always~~ incomplete, because it stops ~~at~~ halfway. It omits the real problem, the origin of these ideas. The materialistic conception of history explains ~~the cause of history~~ these ideas as caused by the social needs <sup>arising out of</sup> ~~determined by~~ the conditions of the existing system of production. So the events of history ~~and the~~ are determined by forces arising out of <sup>then in</sup> the economic ~~class~~ system. The materialistic conception <sup>explains</sup> the French revolution <sup>a modern state</sup> by the necessity for the rising capitalism wanting ~~the bourgeoisie ruling~~ <sup>with</sup> the state and ~~adopting~~ legislation ~~to~~ adapted to ~~to~~ its needs, this is not in contradiction to the ~~former~~ conception that it was brought about by the citizens <sup>desiring</sup> ~~wanting~~ freedom; <sup>this</sup> ~~from superficial phenomena~~ (it only goes down to deeper roots). ~~It~~ may seem contradictory only because in the short indication of these deepest roots the middle terms are omitted. Expressed ~~in~~ more in detail it says that rising capitalism <sup>produced</sup> in the rising bourgeoisie <sup>conviction</sup> ~~awakened~~ ~~that~~ <sup>thus having</sup> economical and political freedom was necessary, <sup>awakening</sup> the passion and enthusiasm that enabled them to conquer <sup>the</sup> political power and to transform the state.

In this way Marx established causality in the development of human society; here he pointed out ~~that~~ has been a necessity of the same character as in natural phenomena ~~established by~~ the laws of nature. It is not a causality outside ~~men~~; history at the same time is the ~~not~~ product of human action. Man is a link in the chain of causes and effects; the necessity in social development is a necessity effectuated by means of human action. The <sup>material</sup> world ~~acts~~ upon man, <sup>determines</sup> his consciousness, his ideas, his will, his actions, and so he acts upon the world and changes it. For traditional middle class mode of thinking this is a contradiction - the source of ~~the~~ endless misrepresentations of Marxism -; either the actions of <sup>man</sup> ~~men~~ determine history, <sup>they say,</sup> and then there ~~is~~ no necessary causality because man is free, or, <sup>if, as Marxism precludes,</sup> there ~~is~~ a causal necessity, it <sup>can only</sup> be ~~as a fatal~~ <sup>ity</sup> to which man has to submit without being able to change it. For the materialistic mode of thinking, on the contrary, the human mind is bound by ~~a~~ strict causal dependence ~~to~~ the whole of the surrounding world.

(that former form systems)  
 (the former form of society has brought in this way) in the human mind, ~~in its thoughts,~~  
~~in material form,~~  
 the theories, the ideas, have been preserved for posterity firstly (in the subsequent historical  
 actions, which built up our modern world). But ~~it~~ <sup>they</sup> has also been preserved, in another,  
 in a spiritual form. The ideas, the sentiments, the passions, the ideals that ~~were~~ incited former  
 generations to action, were laid down in the products of their mind, ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> literature, in  
 science, in art, in religion, in philosophy. ~~and other branches of knowledge~~  
 we come in direct contact ~~with them in the~~ the study of humanities. These sciences belong to the  
 most important fields of research for Marxian scholars; the explanation of the differences  
 between the philosophies, the literatures, the religions of different peoples in the ~~several~~  
~~course~~ <sup>of</sup> series of the centuries can only be understood ~~by~~ <sup>from</sup> the moulding of men's minds through  
 societies, i.e. through their ~~societies~~ systems of production.

It was said above, that the ~~existing~~ effects of society upon human mind ~~are~~ deposited in  
 material form in the ~~historical~~ events. This, however, is only true for the past, and  
 not for the present. In the past the chain of causes and effects: economic needs -  
 new ideas - ~~struggle with old ideas~~ class struggle and social action - new institutions - new economic  
 system, is finished; we see <sup>both</sup> the original cause and the final effect, and we may  
 describe the process in a short formula, mentioning only the economic development  
 and leaving out <sup>the</sup> human mind. And we can show, as an example of the truth of the  
 Marxian principles, how the effect corresponds to the cause. In the present, however,  
 the matter is different: ~~we see~~ we see numerous causal chains that are not  
 finished. <sup>Present</sup> Society works upon the minds of men, producing thoughts, ideas, ideals,  
 theories that are struggling (<sup>one with</sup>) another in their heads, try to induce them  
 to actions, awaken the beginning of class struggles, but have not yet resulted in  
 the political, juridical and economic changes that are necessary. Here we are  
 able to see - what in the past is not always ~~been~~ clearly - how complicated are the effects  
 of what at first seem to be simple and plain conditions. Here we stand ourselves inside  
 the midst of the process of all these influences, <sup>we stand right in</sup> in the midst of the slow ripening of new  
 ideas, the gradual preparation of future revolutions. It is necessary to point out this

in this lack of finiteness in current history)

difference with the use of Marxism to explain the past, because here we meet with reality and apparent contradictions between theoretical expectation. (e.g. that in the most highly developed capitalism (USA) there is only little of a revolutionary working class movement. And at the same time it is important for the present generation, which has to ~~think~~<sup>to day</sup> frame society of tomorrow, ~~in~~ understanding the events, to know how Marxist theory may be of use to ~~them~~ and in determining their own conduct. Hence a more thorough <sup>consideration</sup> ~~investigation~~ of how society acts upon the mind, will be necessary here.

### III.

The human mind is entirely determined by the real world surrounding. It has already been remarked that this world does not comprise the physical matter only, but everything that is objectively observable; the ideas of our fellowmen, which we observe by means of their speech or by reading, belong to this real world, though the fancied objects of these thoughts, angels, spirits or an Absolute Idea, do not, <sup>belong to it</sup>. The belief in such objects is a real phenomenon and may have a notable influence on historical events.

As a continuous stream the impressions of the world penetrate into ~~surrounding~~ us. All our observations of the surrounding world, all experiences of our life are assembled and sunk into our mind, continually enriching its contents, partly consciously stored in our memory, partly sinking down and resting in subconsciousness. What do we do with ~~it~~ it?

The recurrence ~~of~~, always anew, of the same situation and the same experience leads to definite habits of action and behaviour, found <sup>to be</sup> effectual <sup>with</sup> them; they are accompanied by definite habits of thought. The recurrence of the same observed phenomena is ~~left~~ nearly in the mind as the expectation, the rule that always these phenomena are connected in this way. The rule is a mental abstraction of the multitude of analogous phenomena, in which the differences are neglected and the concordance is emphasized. The names by which we denote definite parts of the world of phenomena, indicate conceptions,

which likewise are formed by taking the common traits, the general character ~~out~~<sup>of</sup> of the totality of these phenomena, and ~~making abstraction~~<sup>abstracting</sup> from the differences. The endless diversity, the infinite <sup>plurality</sup> ~~number~~ of all phenomena cannot be kept separate in our mind; ~~we keep~~<sup>what is</sup> a simplified image in which the unimportant accidental traits are neglected and the important, ~~essentially~~<sup>what</sup> ~~material~~ characteristics are preserved. ~~By these~~<sup>Through</sup> origin as habits of thought they have the nature of being fixed, crystallized, invariable; ~~in each~~<sup>in terms of</sup> progress in clearness of thinking consists in more exactly defining ~~their properties, the conceptions~~ and in formulating the rules. ~~The world of our experience however, is continually~~<sup>be modified</sup> expanding ~~and changing~~<sup>and</sup> and changing; our habits are disturbed and have to ~~change~~<sup>change and to</sup>, and our mental world of conceptions has, ever anew, to adapt itself to its original, by introducing ~~substituting~~<sup>modifying</sup> new meanings for old ones or varying their confines, and definitions.

When the world does not change very much, when the same phenomena and the same experiences always return, the habits of acting and thinking ~~are~~<sup>become</sup> fixed to great constancy; ~~the~~ new impressions of the mind fit into the image formed by former experience and intensify it. These ~~conceptions~~<sup>habits and these</sup> are not a personal ~~property~~ but a collective property; they are not lost with the individual, ~~and~~ They are intensified by the mutual intercourse of the members of ~~society~~<sup>the community</sup>, who all ~~are~~<sup>the next generation</sup> are living in the same world, and they are transferred to ~~posteriority~~<sup>as</sup> the mental store of the community - a system of ideas, beliefs, an ideology: Where ~~during~~<sup>for</sup> many centuries the system of production does not change perceptibly (as e.g. in old agricultural societies), the relations between men, their habits of life, their experience of the world ~~remain~~<sup>practically</sup> the same, every next generation finds the ~~ideas, the~~<sup>existing</sup> ~~conceptions~~<sup>and</sup> ~~habits of thinking~~<sup>in which case</sup> in accordance with ~~their~~<sup>its</sup> own experience, ~~and then they~~<sup>there begins</sup> they petrify to a dogmatic, unassailable ideology of eternal truth. Just the opposite is the case with our modern world. When, however, ~~the world is changing, the development of the~~<sup>in consequence of</sup> productive forces new and different ~~impressions enter the mind, which do not fit into~~<sup>into</sup> the old image. Then a process of rebuilding ~~begins~~<sup>there begins</sup>, out of parts of the old ideas and the new experiences. Old conceptions are ~~replaced~~<sup>replaced</sup> by new ones, former rules and

## crystallize

judgments are upset, new ideas ~~for themselves~~<sup>member of the same class or group</sup>. Not in every ~~case~~<sup>case</sup> in the same way and at the same time; spiritual strife arises connected with the class struggles and fought with ~~the problem, first to the society and with its~~ so much eagerness because the life of everybody is connected with ~~the development of the~~ system of production. And now, in modern capitalism, the economic and political changes take place so rapidly, that <sup>the</sup> human mind hardly can keep pace with them. In ~~fierce~~ internal struggles ~~across~~ the ideas are revolutionized, sometimes rapidly by strongly appealing events, sometimes <sup>slowly</sup> in a continuous <sup>strenuous</sup> difficult effort against the weight of the old ideology. In such a process of ~~across~~ <sup>society, to</sup> unceasing transformation human consciousness adapts itself to the real ~~world~~ world.

~~that~~ Hence Marx's thesis that the real world determines consciousness, does not mean that the present <sup>day</sup> ideas are determined by present <sup>day</sup> society. Our ideas and conceptions are the crystallization, the comprehension <sup>give</sup> essence of the whole of our experience, present and past; what came from the past was already fixed in <sup>such mental</sup> ~~this abstract forms,~~ and now the present is added and must be included into it by <sup>such adaptations as are</sup> ~~carrying them for a~~ necessary. So the new ideas <sup>appear to be</sup> composed <sup>out of</sup> two elements, the present reality, and the system of ideas risen from the past. The different <sup>nature</sup> character of these two elements gives rise to one of the ~~most~~ commonest objections against Marxism: <sup>that</sup> not only the real material world, but in no less degree <sup>the</sup> spiritual elements, ideas, beliefs, ideals determine human mind and in consequence, ~~human~~ man's deeds and the future of the world. ~~For middle class philosophers these ideas~~ It would be a ~~true~~ objection, if ideas originated by themselves, without cause, or from ~~the~~ given, ~~eternal~~ nature of man, or from some supernatural spiritual ~~deity~~ source. Marxism, however, says that ~~they~~ also must have their origin in the real world, ~~and find~~ <sup>these ideas</sup> in former social conditions. What remains as <sup>human nature as</sup> original instincts, habits and passions, which appear here as a given inborn nature of man, ~~must~~ must be explained by the conditions of his development in the <sup>still earlier</sup> most primitive animal or half-animal state.

Among the forces in modern social development these ideas from the past present themselves as traditions, hampering the <sup>spreading</sup> ~~diffusion~~ <sup>new</sup> of the ideas that express the new necessities.

leave the realm of  
~~crosses the boundary line~~)

In taking account <sup>into</sup> of these traditions we do not go outside Marxism. For every tradition is a piece of reality - just as every idea is itself a part of the real world - , living in the heads of men, often a very powerful reality <sup>in</sup> determining their actions. It is a reality of spiritual ~~nature~~, that has lost its material roots because ~~they~~ are former conditions of life that have since disappeared. That it could subsist after they disappeared is not simply a consequence of the <sup>nature</sup> ~~character~~ of human mind, ~~that keeps an~~ <sup>they</sup> keeping and preserving, as remembrance or subconsciously, the impressions of the past. Much more important is what may be <sup>termed</sup> ~~named~~ the memory of society, the keeping and <sup>preserving</sup> ~~collection~~ <sup>the collective</sup> of ~~ideas~~ <sup>systematized</sup> <sup>prevailing</sup> <sup>(and transferred to the next generations)</sup> system of ideas, in the form of ~~dominant~~ beliefs and ideologies, in oral communication, in books, in literature, in art, in education. The surrounding world determining the mind <sup>consists</sup> ~~not only~~ <sup>in</sup> the economic world of our life experience, but also in all the spiritual influences from our fellow men, through our continuous intercourse <sup>with them</sup>. Hence the power of tradition, which in a rapidly developing society ~~lags~~ <sup>causes</sup> ~~makes~~ <sup>development of the</sup> that the ideas <sup>lag</sup> behind the development of society. Of course it must yield at last to the power of the unceasing battering of the new realities of life, gradually transforming the minds. Its effect upon the social development is, that instead of a regular gradual adjustment of ideas and institutions in line with the changing necessities, these necessities, when ~~they~~ <sup>are</sup> too strongly in contradiction ~~to~~ <sup>With the old</sup> the institutions, lead to explosions, to revolutionary transformations, in which the ~~backward~~ <sup>lagging</sup> minds are drawn along and in a rapid development <sup>are revolutionized themselves.</sup>