

RICHMOND COLLEGE

Journal of the Social Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
RUSO-AMERICAN RELATIONS: A GENESIS by <i>Donald Eisman</i>	3
PRESSURE GROUPS AGAINST UNITED STATES MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM by <i>Charlotte Finkenthal</i>	27
A THEORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF ACCORDING TO GEORGE H. MEAD AND KARL MARX by <i>Jean-Louis d'Heilly</i>	39
LINGUISTIC REFLECTIONS OF SOCIAL CHANGE IN THE UNITED STATES by <i>Lea Konopko</i>	53



Richmond College of the City University of New York
130 Stuyvesant Place, Staten Island, New York 10301

Richmond College Journal of the Social Sciences

Managing Editor

Charlotte Finkenthal

Associate Editor

Jean-Louis d'Heilly

Consulting Editors

Dr. Phyllis Roberts

Dr. Stephen Stearns

This journal publishes original student articles in the social sciences. No charge is to be made on current or back issues since the journal is affiliated with Richmond College. Copies may be obtained without subscription from the Editors, Richmond College Journal of the Social Sciences, 130 Stuyvesant Place, Staten Island, New York 10301. Manuscripts and correspondence should be sent to the Editors.

1968-69

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

RUSSO-AMERICAN RELATIONS: A GENESIS

PREFATORY STATEMENT

Donald Eisman

History may be seen as a random collection of events which when viewed from afar form a totality much as a Seurat painting does when the observer steps back from the canvas. However, a study of the events of history neglects the crux of the matter. The institutions, the social forces, and, above all, the individuals behind the events are the living matter, the stuff from which the events emerge.

Often an historical epoch can be best studied as it is manifested in the life of an individual. The gross outline of historical processes find a sharp definition in the actions of the individual. Just such an individual is Francis Dana. A study of Dana's life provides us with a microcosm of the tumultuous times surrounding the revolutionary birth of our country. Less well known than his contemporaries, Francis Dana endeavored to serve the revolution first as lawyer then as diplomat.

There is only one biography of Dana available and it is in many ways of little value to today's historian (See note 13). The following article is part of a larger work now in progress which will deal with Dana's work in the cause of the American Revolution.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

INTRODUCTION

During the winter of 1780 the American Congress, in taking stock of its situation in the war now taking place on its soil, decided that it would be advisable to make as many international diplomatic contacts as possible. The recently proclaimed League of Neutrality in Europe seemed, to the Congress, an opportunity for the Americans to strengthen their maritime position. To gain admittance to this new confederation required Russian approval, as the league was said to be under the aegis of Catherine II.

The admission of the United States into this neutral league was nothing but a heady dream on the part of the American Congress. The fact that America was a belligerent country at war with England clearly precluded its admission to any neutral confederation. The Americans, however, were determined to obtain some sort of recognition from the newest of European powers.

It was for the purpose of pursuing this dream on the part of the American Congress that Francis Dana was sent to Russia to establish diplomatic contact for the first time between the two countries.

The outbreak of the American Revolutionary War in 1775 provided the occasion for a diplomatic rebuff of England by Russia. This was not to be the last of the diplomatic confrontations between Russia and England during the war. Upon learning of the outbreak of hostilities between British troops and American patriots in June of 1775 the British government thought it wise to ascertain whether Russia would provide mercenaries for Britain's

use in subduing the rebellion. The original overtures were on a highly unofficial and clandestine basis due to the delicacy of the proposal. Russia's equally unofficial answer seemed to be an agreement upon such a venture. When, however, in September of 1775 a formal request for Russian troops to be used in Canada was made to Catherine the Great, her response was a negative one. In refusing Britain Catherine explained that she had understood the troops were to be used in Spain, not against the rebellious colonists. Catherine's position reflected her disenchantment with British policy *vis a vis* the American Colonies and, more importantly, it was the germination of her desire to play the *mediatrix* in the rapidly growing conflict between England and America.¹

This effort on the part of Catherine to remain neutral in the conflict, in order to preserve her status as an arbiter between England and France, continued throughout the entire period of the hostilities. This, in effect, led to a situation in diplomatic circles at St. Petersburg which James Harris, English minister to Russia, characterized as a battlefield. Here France and Britain gained or lost ground in accordance with the abilities of their ministers and the extent of influence they had with Counts Panin and Potemkin. The ultimate influence was, of course, lodged with that partisan whose views held sway at the Russian Court.²

Catherine's zeal in maintaining her position as *mediatrix* eventually led to her declaration of an Armed Neu-

¹ Isabel De Madariaga, *Britain, Russia, and the Armed Neutrality of 1780* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), pp. 9-10.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122.

trality in 1780.³ Her declaration of a neutral league of nations stated that neutral ships were free to navigate anywhere on the seas including the coasts of the belligerent nations. In addition, the only goods declared to be contraband were "warlike stores" which freed the neutral ships to carry valuable goods to the warring countries.⁴ The declaration was immediately greeted on all sides by the realization that it was decidedly disadvantageous to the British. Harris himself in a dispatch to Foreign Minister Stormont dated May 5, 1780 stated that the neutrality was a measure "most unfriendly to us."⁵ The salutary effect (towards American interests) was recognized by American ministers in Europe. Both Benjamin Franklin and John Adams wrote to Congress urging that body to accede to the principles of the neutral league. The Continental Congress was quick to act and on October 5, 1780, passed a resolution ordering conformity to Catherine's league on the part of American vessels.⁶ The Congress mistakenly be-

³ See Appendix A.

⁴ Erich Albrecht, "Die Stellung der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika zur bewaffneten Neutralität von 1780," *Zeitschrift Für Völkerrecht und Bundesstaatsrecht*, VI (1913), 441; James Brown Scott (ed.), *The Armed Neutralities of 1780 and 1800—A Collection of Official Documents* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1918), pp. 274 & 329; Leo Gershoy, *From Despotism to Revolution 1763-1789* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1944), p. 172; De Madariaga, p. 172.

⁵ Malmesbury (3rd Earl) (ed.), *Diaries and Correspondence of James Harris First Earl of Malmesbury* (4 vols.; London: Richard Bently, 1845), I, 298. See also same volume pp. 311-312, 303-305, 318; Gershoy, p. 172.

⁶ William S. Carpenter, "The United States and the League of Neutrality of 1780," *The American Journal of International Law*, XV (1921), 517; Scott, 323.

lieved that there was to be a meeting of the neutral nations who subscribed to the declaration of neutrality. In addition, Congress felt that the United States would be asked to subscribe to the terms of the declaration, and in accordance with this view instructed the American ministers in Europe to assent to the agreement if asked to do so.⁷ In a supreme expression of audacity the congress decided to appoint a minister to the Court at St. Petersburg whose task it was to gain United States admission to the league and obtain Russian recognition of the independence of the United States.⁸ The envoy was also empowered to investigate the possibility and benefits of negotiating a trade treaty between Russia and the United States.⁹ This action on the part of the Continental Congress led to the dispatch of the first American envoy to the Russian Court.

In sending a minister to the Russian Court congress was acting in response to a variety of stimulants. Congress was especially anxious to gain diplomatic recognition from any European nation that seemed so inclined. In addition, the Americans deemed it imperative to gain Russian recognition of the rebellious colonies as well as gain admission to the newly formed league of neutrals. There was probably also a desire to open up new areas of commerce which might prove beneficial to the colonies. The Congress reasoned that by an American display of willingness to accede to the principles of the Armed Neutrality, Catherine would be disposed to admit America to the league. This despite

⁷ Carpenter, 520.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ W. P. Cresson, "Francis Dana: An Early Envoy of Trade," *The New England Quarterly*, III (1930), 717-735.

the fact that America was clearly a belligerent nation, not a neutral, and therefore ineligible to join.¹⁰

There was also a fear, shared by American leaders such as Adams and Washington, that somehow England would be able to instigate a grand coalition of European powers against the rebellious colonies. George Washington, in writing to John Jay in September of 1779, expressed this concern when he observed that Catherine had "powerful motives to support England."¹¹ These "motives" which Washington and others wondered about were, of course, forgotten in the first heady elation brought about by the news of the Neutral League.

In October of 1780 the United States Congress issued its instructions to Francis Dana who had been chosen to represent American interests at Catherine's court. "Congress," the instructions read,

by an act passed on the 5th of October last (1780)
empower the minister plenipotentiary from these
United States . . . to cultivate the friendship of her

¹⁰ John C. Hildt, *Early Diplomatic Negotiations of the United States With Russia* (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXIV, November 5, 1906: Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1960), pp. 11-12.

¹¹ John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington*, 39 vols. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1931-1944), XVI, 246. Washington to Jay, Sept. 7, 1779. Earlier in 1777 Washington wrote to Jonathan Trumbull, "I do not doubt that they (the British) would employ Russians or any other Barbarians to accomplish their designs," vol. VII, 317. Washington to John Trumbull, March 23, 1777. See also p. 32 of Erwin Hölzle, *Russland und Amerika* (München: Verlag von Aldenbourg, 1953). "Washington . . . furchtete zeitweise eine grosse europäische Koalition Englands mit Russland und dem Deutschen Kaiser an der Spitze gegen die Amerikanischefranzösische Allianz."

imperial majesty . . . (and) to accede to the convention of the said neutral and belligerent powers for protecting the freedom of commerce and rights of nations, and to subscribe any treaty for that purpose conformable to the spirit of her said imperial majesty's declaration . . . and he is further authorized in our name, and on behalf of the United States, to propose a treaty of amnity and commerce between these United States and her said imperial majesty . . . ¹²

According to Dana's instructions, his mission had a twofold purpose. He was, most importantly, to gain diplomatic recognition from Russia as well as entrance into the League of Neutrals. Less important, but perhaps most fruitful as far as the accomplishments of his mission was concerned, was the drawing of some sort of trade agreement between Russia and America.

Francis Dana was born in 1743 of New England Puritan stock. He was a zealous American patriot who was allied in the activities of Samuel and John Adams during the pre-revolutionary fervor in America. He graduated from Harvard in 1762 and studied law for five years, after which he stepped to the bar in 1767. His patriotism was of an extreme nature and it was this which led to his being chosen as one of the delegates to the Continental Congress in 1776.¹³

¹² *Secret Journals of the Acts and Proceedings of Congress*, 4 vols. (Boston: T. B. Wait, 1820-1821, II, 358-359; Francis Wharton (ed.), *The Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States*, 6 vols. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1889), IV, 201.

¹³ The material for this brief sketch is taken from Richard H. Dana, Jr., "Francis Dana," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biog-*

In 1779 a peace commission, headed by John Adams, was appointed to go to Paris in the hopes that some negotiations with England could be begun. Dana was appointed secretary to the commission. When the commissioners reached Paris, Adams discovered that he did not get along with the French foreign minister Vergennes, and in addition, he found no prospect of opening negotiations with England. Adams and Dana were subsequently sent to Holland by the Congress with the purpose of securing loans from the Dutch. Dana soon left Adams in Holland and returned to Paris in the middle of March, 1781, to find his commission waiting for him.

Congress, in its instruction to Dana, had advised him to communicate the purpose of his mission to the "ministers plenipotentiary at the Court of Versailles." In accordance with this Dana wrote to Benjamin Franklin, one of the ministers in Paris, seeking his advice concerning the procedure to follow in assuming his tasks as minister to Russia. Dana also sought the advice of his friend Adams and the French foreign minister Vergennes. Franklin, ever cautious, advised Dana to make contact with the Russian

raphy, I (1877), and W. P. Cresson, *Francis Dana* (New York, 1930). The story of Dana's visit to Russia is briefly related to most works on Russian-American relations. There is only one extensive biography of Dana and this is the one by Cresson. There is, however, one difficulty in using Cresson's work. His footnote citations are completely inadequate. No page numbers are given, no more information on letters is given than the general collection from which they were drawn, and any other information customarily found in footnotes are eliminated. In order to reconstruct Dana's mission to Russia one is forced to utilize Wharton's *Revolutionary Correspondence* as the main source. Cresson's work is useful for a general history of Dana's life; however, the skeptical historian can make little use of this volume.

Court before he left for St. Petersburg so as to avoid the possibility of his being refused recognition upon arrival in Russia. Both Adams and Vergennes urged Dana to travel to Russia under the guise of a private citizen and to take residence in St. Petersburg before announcing his role to the Russian Court. In this manner Dana would be able to determine the right moment to apply for recognition as a minister from America. Vergennes, especially, feared that Catherine would be unable to recognize a minister from the United States for fear of offending England. England, being at war with her former colonies, would of course regard Russian recognition of Dana as an act hostile to its interests.¹⁴

Dana was well aware of the impracticality of the grand designs Congress had mapped out for him. He determined, therefore, to do nothing which would embarrass either Russia or lay open the honor of the United States to a slight from a foreign power. It was with these limitations in mind that he travelled to Holland, met with Adams, and finally departed for Russia.

Dana arrived in St. Petersburg on the 27th of August of 1781. His arrival in Russia coincided with Catherine's offer to England and France to mediate the conflict in conjunction with Austria.¹⁵ This was consistent with her

¹⁴ Wharton, IV, 326, 367-370, 348-354. Dana to President of Congress, March 24, 1781. Dana to Adams, April 18, 1781. Adams to Dana, April 18, 1781. Dana to Vergennes, March 31, 1781. Vergennes to Dana, April 1, 1781. Dana to Vergennes, April 2, 1781. Dana to President of Congress, April 2, 1781, and April 4, 1781. Dana to Franklin, April 6, 1781. Franklin to Dana, April 7, 1781.

¹⁵ Wharton, IV, 282. Franklin to President of Congress, March 12, 1781; Frank A. Golder, "Catherine II and the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, XXI (1915-1916), 94.

efforts since the outbreak of hostilities in 1777. France informed the United States of the offer of mediation and urged acceptance. In this fashion Vergennes hoped to have a role in American contact with Russia, instead of allowing an American minister to negotiate with Russia on an independent basis. France had expended much money and resources on behalf of the rebellious colonies and not wholly out of altruistic motives. It was a French wish that America, following cessation of hostilities, would follow France's lead in world affairs. Dana's mission represented a threat to the French plan to keep the United States subordinate to French foreign policy following the end of the war. For Vergennes, Dana's mission came at a most inopportune time.¹⁶

Upon his arrival in St. Petersburg Dana immediately made contact with the Marquis de Verac, who was French minister to Catherine's court. He communicated the purpose of his mission and asked for any guidance and information which Verac might have for him. Verac, as Dana expected, pointed out the efforts of Catherine as *mediatrix* and urged Dana to "reflect much before you display the character with which you are clothed, or make advances which will be more injurious than beneficial to the success of your views."¹⁷ It was evident that Verac was

¹⁶ Hildt, pp. 15-16; *Secret Journals of Congress*, II, 415.

¹⁷ Wharton, IV, 681, 683, 685. Dana to Verac, August 30, 1781. Verac to Dana, August 30, 1781. Dana to Verac, September 1, 1781. Verac to Dana, September 2, 1781. Dana complained to Adams in his letter of August 28, 1781, that he had been in Russia twelve days and "our friend" (Verac) had yet to acknowledge his arrival in Russia. Dana conjectured that a person, who he referred to as "Ishmael" may have had something to do with this coolness. The identity of "Ishmael" is not definite but there is every reason to suspect Vergennes.

pursuing the same line of deterrent argument which had confronted Dana in Paris just a few short months previous.

Dana promptly replied to Verac in an effort to refute the French minister's arguments. Catherine, he argued, was certainly wise in her desire to be neutral. Was it not likely, therefore, that she would recognize the American Revolution as beneficial to Russia's role as leader of the Armed Neutrality? Also, Dana continued, since France had recognized the United States as a viable political entity three years previous, was it not logical to expect other nations such as Russia to do the same? Despite the fervor of his rhetoric, Dana seemed somewhat unconvinced of his own arguments when he assured Verac he would still remain in a private role unknown to the Russian Court. However, he hastened to warn Verac that when the opportunity presented itself he would speedily apply to Catherine for diplomatic recognition.¹⁸ This first exchange between Dana and Verac was, unfortunately, to be prophetic for events as they transpired during the duration of Dana's residence in Russia.

In addition to France's objection to the presence of Dana in Russia there is reason to believe that Dana's presence was not welcome by the Russians themselves. Catherine's desire to play the role of *mediatrix* was not the only objection to recognition of an American minister. Catherine had a well-known aversion to rebellious governments and is reported to have commented that Dana "could not employ his time more uselessly than remaining in her

¹⁸ Wharton, IV, 695-698. Dana to Verac, September 4, 1781. Dana made this point an emphatic one. "It appears to me to be betraying the honor and dignity of the United States to seclude myself in a hotel, without making one effort to step forth into political life" (p. 698).

dominions.”¹⁹ At the very time that Catherine was attempting to strengthen her position in Europe at the expense of both France and England the arrival of Dana could very well upset her position of neutrality. That Catherine at times extolled the noble American cause is true, but only for her ultimate purpose—to weaken the role of England and France.²⁰

Dana not only faced rejection on the part of Russia, England, and France, but also from the American Congress. The American Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Robert Livingston, strongly urged Dana to refrain from making the purpose of his mission known until diplomatic recognition could be guaranteed. On behalf of Congress, Livingston instructed Dana to retain his role of private citizen and act only after consultation with Verac. Livingston disposed of Dana’s doubts concerning French motives: “To suppose France would go to war for our independence, and yet not wish to see that independence recognized is a solecism in politics.”²¹ To emphasize its confidence in Verac and Vergennes, Congress in May of 1782 passed a resolution addressed to Dana, stating that he should not present his credentials until assured that they would be accepted.²²

¹⁹ Wharton, IV, 714.

²⁰ W. P. Cresson, *New England Quarterly Review*, 718-719; Hildt, p. 19; Malmesbury, I, 289-290; Samuel Flagg Bemis, *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1935), pp. 165 & 179.

²¹ Wharton, IV, 209, 411-412. Livingston to Dana, March 2, 1782. Livingston to Dana, May 10, 1782.

²² *Secret Journals of Congress*, III, 133.

Thus began Dana's frustrating stay in St. Petersburg. His position was a difficult one at best. He was neither invited to, nor had access to, one of the most glittering courts in all Europe. He was forced to sit in his hotel room or walk the streets of the city without any hope of gaining entrance to the empress. "I did not consider," wrote Dana to Livingston, "that the real honor and dignity of the United States would be more exposed, even by her majesty's declining to accept our propositions, and by my immediate retirement from her court in that case, than they would be exposed to by my long residence here in the character of a private citizen of the United States, when the event would show that I had all the while a commission in my pocket as their public minister."²³ Even the stoic Dana could not refrain from voicing his displeasure at the situation.

While Dana sat and waited, accompanied only by his secretary, fourteen-year-old Master Johnny Adams, he turned his attention to commercial matters. Dana felt that part of the reason for France's opposition to his diplomatic recognition, was its fear of the mutual advantage Russia and the United States would find in a trade agreement between the two countries. Inasmuch as one of Dana's instructions was to explore this area of relations, he accordingly turned to promoting commerce between the two countries. "In pursuance of one branch of my duty," he wrote Livingston, "I have during my residence here, made a particular inquiry into the commerce of this country."²⁴

²³ Wharton, V, 700. Dana to Livingston, September 5, 1782.

²⁴ Dana to Livingston, March 30, 1782. From Dana MSS in the Massachusetts Historical Society . . . Quoted in W. P. Cresson, *New England Quarterly Review*, 721.

In his analysis of Russia's trade system Dana observed that the neutral league organized by Catherine was motivated more toward commercial advantage than toward idealism or political gain. Dana forecast that the future alignment of the United States with Europe would be along commercial rather than political lines. In support of this he pointed out that Sweden, one of the members of the Neutral League, was making a considerable profit by serving as a depot for United States purchase of Russian goods. It could easily be seen, he noted, that there was a considerable trade going on between Russia and America through intermediary carriers.²⁵ Dana's main task, as he envisioned it, was to "give those in (Russian) government just ideas upon the nature of the commerce of the two countries." Dana reasoned that a trade agreement between Russia and America would put a damper on hostilities and present Europe a grand opportunity to partake in the trade advantages which would exist with the new country. If Russia and Europe failed to apprehend these possibilities, America would be forced to make "the best bargain in her power with Britain" to the exclusion of the rest of Europe.²⁶

Dana composed a memorial on the subject of trade which he sent to the Russian Court, where it was "not unacceptable."²⁷ In his "Reflections" Dana asked the court:

Will it make no difference to the interest of Russia whether she disposes of her commodities to Great Britain alone, or to Great Britain and America at the same time? Will not the concurrence of America in her

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 722.

²⁶ Wharton, V, 323. Dana to Adams, April 23, 1782.

²⁷ Wharton, V, 528-29. Dana to Livingston, June 28, 1782.

ports give an additional advantage to Russia? Will it not increase the demand for them? . . . Besides, how has Russia paid for her produce and manufactures? Is it not by exchange in a very great proportion for foreign commodities of the peculiar production or manufacture of America. . . . Does it make no difference to the interest of Russia whether she receives those articles directly from the countries which produce them, or in circuitous voyages through Great Britain, and consequently from a third hand.²⁸

Dana eventually felt that his efforts on behalf of trade were all useless. His distrust of French motives were confirmed when, in October of 1782 he learned of a proposed commercial treaty between Russia and France with France as a "carrying nation" of trade.²⁹ The actions of Verac and Vergennes in stalling his acceptance at the Russian court now became clear.

With the advent of the bitter St. Petersburg winter Dana's situation had not altered. He still had not applied for admittance to the Russian Court. In addition, his economic proposals to the Russian government, while favorably received, had not changed matters at all. In September of 1782 Dana wrote to Benjamin Franklin in Paris:

Things remain here as to us in their old state. This court seems not to take any step which would be offensive to the Court of London. Nothing is therefore

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 529 & 840-1. Dana to Livingston, November 1, 1782.

²⁹ W. P. Cresson, *New England Quarterly Review*, Letter to Adams, October 15, 1782.

to be expected until that Court shall have agreed to consider the United States as an Independent Power.³⁰

With the news of the signing of preliminary peace between the United States and Britain (November 30, 1782) Dana's mission moved into a new phase of activity.

With the signing of the preliminary peace treaty in the not too distant future, Adams wrote to Dana from Paris advising him that "this is so essential a change in the state of things, that I think and Mr. Jay thinks, you will now have a reasonable ground to expect success."³¹ This was only an unofficial opinion on the part of Adams, as Livingston and the Congress had just one day previous to Adams' letter decided that the time was still not ripe for Dana to reveal himself.³² Despite the objections of Congress Adams, Jay, and Franklin sent Dana a copy of the preliminary treaty and urged Dana to apply to Catherine for recognition.³³

Unfortunately the signing of the preliminary treaty of peace did not bring about the realization of Dana's objectives. The French minister Verac was still opposed to Dana's application to the Russian Court although his objections had become less strident than before. If Dana were to be officially known at this point, argued Verac,

³⁰ Dana to Franklin September 12, 1782. Dana MSS Massachusetts Historical Society, Quoted in W. P. Cresson, *New England Quarterly Review*, 733. Also Wharton, V, 679, 741, 753. Dana to Livingston, August 30, 1782. Livingston to Dana, September 18, 1782. Dana to Livingston, September 23, 1782.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 863-4. Adams to Dana, November 8, 1782.

³² *Ibid.*, 862. Livingston to Dana, November 7, 1782.

³³ Wharton, VI, 131. Adams, Franklin, and Jay to Dana, December 17, 1782.

he would not be directly rebuffed, however Catherine would stall Dana and postpone his recognition until a definitive treaty was signed.³⁴ In addition to Verac's objections there were other obstacles barring Dana's path. Dana had discovered that there was a custom at the Russian Court requiring all countries entering into a treaty with Russia to pay each of the four principal ministers 6,000 roubles. The total sum figured to be 4,500 pounds sterling. Looking ahead to the day when a commercial treaty might be possible, Dana asked Congress to provide such a sum, either directly or through Franklin in Paris.

Dana's patient wait was interrupted on March 5, 1783 when he was informed by a member of Catherine's private cabinet that he might, with all assurances of success, transmit the purpose of his mission to the Russian Vice Chancellor Count Ostermann. Acting on this advice and without consultation with Verac, Dana sent a note to Ostermann divulging his mission. Dana's haste in accepting the advice of his contact was, no doubt, due to his extreme inactivity up to that point. The assurances of success he received were cruel delusions. Sir James Harris, English minister in St. Petersburg, upon hearing of Dana's overtures, protested to the Empress. He was assured by Catherine that she would not treat with any American "agent" until a definitive peace had been signed with Great Britain or Great Britain recognized an American envoy prior to the signing.³⁵ This proved to be the final blow to any hopes Dana had of successfully completing his mission. Although

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 214 & 263. Dana to Livingston, January 15, 1783. Dana to Livingston, February 25, 1783.

³⁵ Harris Correspondence Quoted on page 276 of Wharton, VI.

there was still much negotiation to come before Dana left Russia, the Russian position in regards to Dana became an extended stalling maneuver.

Dana seemed to sense the failure of his efforts in the spring of 1783. He wrote his friend Adams in March that he saw no prospects of America's joining the League of Neutrality now that the hostilities had ended. In addition he did not think it "worthwhile for America at this time to pay near five thousand pounds sterling to the ministers of this court for the liberty of acceding to the marine convention."³⁶

Over a month and one half lapsed before Count Ostermann even contacted Dana to acknowledge receipt of his letter of March 5. On April 22 Ostermann informed Dana that he would transmit the purpose of the American's mission to Catherine. On this same day Dana heard rumors which reached him from the Russian court. The intimation was that Dana would not be extended diplomatic recognition unless his letter of appointment was dated prior to the acknowledgement of American independence by Great Britain. With deep disappointment Dana noted that this condition would be totally unacceptable to the United States as it would, in effect, "strike off seven years" of the United States' existence as "free, sovereign, and independent States."³⁷ Dana's worst fears were confirmed in an interview with Count Ostermann on April 23. The count confirmed the rumors heard by Dana and reiterated that Dana could not be received until the final peace treaty was signed between the United States and Great Britain.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 306. Dana to Adams, March 16, 1783.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 381, 390-1. Dana to Livingston, April 17, 1783. Dana to Livingston, April 22, 1783.

Dana, as could be expected, protested vehemently, but to no avail. The Russian decision was to stand firm.³⁸

The final act in the first American drama played on the St. Petersburg stage was very anti-climactic. The American Congress, meeting on May 21, 1783, decided that "the treaties lately entered into for restoring peace have caused such an alteration in the affairs of these states as to have removed the primary object of (Dana's) mission to the Court of Russia." In addition, the Congress resolved that unless Dana had already entered into a commercial treaty, this area of negotiation should also be abandoned. Thus with one legislative stroke Congress had reduced Dana's stay in Russia to an exercise in diplomatic futility.³⁹

There was little left for Dana to do in Russia except complain to Adams of the treatment he had received at the hands of Congress⁴⁰ and wait patiently to take his final leave. On August 16, Dana visited Ostermann and informed him that he must return home because of his ill health. He told Ostermann that, in all eventuality the final treaty of peace would be signed in the winter. When this occurred he assumed that the Congress would attempt to reopen negotiations with Russia. Dana regretted that ill health would preclude his being in Russia at this time.⁴¹

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 392-3, 411-15. Dana to Livingston, April 25, 1783. Dana to Ostermann, May 8, 1783.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 437-442; Secret Journals of Congress, III, 350-4.

⁴⁰ "I have several times acquainted Congress of my wish and intention to return to America as soon as I had concluded a commercial treaty . . . As it is, I say to myself begone. I will begone. And God grant that I may soon have the pleasure of meeting you in our Country and all friends well." Wharton, VI, 617-618. Dana to Adams, July 29, 1783.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 656-7. Dana to Livingston, August 17, 1783.

Dana left St. Petersburg in the middle of September and, after a voyage of ninety-five days, arrived in Boston on Friday, December 13, 1783. All that remained for Dana to do in conjunction with his unfortunate mission was to report to Congress in person on his stay in Russia.⁴²

The first attempt on the part of the United States to establish diplomatic relations with Russia had ended in a rather curious failure. It was not until twenty-six years later, in 1809, that the first American minister was accepted at the Russian Court. As fate would have it, the first minister was John Quincy Adams. Master Johnny, who as a boy of fourteen accompanied Dana to St. Petersburg, returned in far more auspicious circumstances than he and his mentor had left.⁴³

⁴² *Ibid.*, 739. Dana to Congress, December 17, 1783.

⁴³ Max M. Laserson, *The American Impact on Russia 1784-1917* (New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 135.

APPENDIX A

There exists a controversy revolving around the question of the origin of the Armed Neutrality of 1780. Was the League of Neutral Powers formed by the declaration solely the product of Catherine's initiative or were other European statesmen responsible? Miss De Madariaga is of the opinion that the credit belongs to Catherine: "There can be no doubt that the idea of forming a League of Neutral Powers at this particular moment stemmed from Catherine herself." In an appendix to her book she traces the origins of the various historical opinions concerning the league. The view that Count Panin founded the league is credited to James Harris, who was England's minister to the Russian Court. His views on the subject were given public circulation in his published memoirs.

There is another view of the neutrality of which Miss De Madariaga either was not aware or chose to ignore. This view holds that the neutrality was a master stroke of diplomacy on the part of the French foreign minister Vergennes. Piggot and Ormon are two early writers who advanced this view. Leo Gershoy asserts that "to be successful, Vergennes' project of a league of neutrals needed adherence to Russia" and "Catherine was indebted to France for friendly aid in her imbroglio with the Turks, and a grateful Empress ultimately accepted the French basis for the proposed league." Samuel Flagg Bemis subscribes to the Vergennes theory also: "It (the Armed Neutrality) fulfilled the hopes of Vergennes to isolate England completely." Perhaps the most persuasive argument for the Vergennes claim is the one advanced by John J. Meng. In

his study dealing with Vergennes he states, "The Armed Neutrality League of 1780, after a long and painful struggle, crowned M. de Vergennes' efforts."

While it is difficult to properly evaluate the subject without the primary sources at hand it seems as if credence should be given to Vergennes for providing the impetus for the league through his skillful diplomacy.

De Madariaga, p. 173; Malmesbury, I, 299. Letter from Harris to Lord Viscount Stormont, May 5, 1780, Sir Francis Piggott and G. W. T. Omond, *Documentary History of the Armed Neutralities of 1780 and 1800* (London: University of London Press, 1919), pp. 6 & 12, Gershoy, p. 172, Bemis, p. 162, John J. Meng, *The Comte De Vergennes European Phases of his American Diplomacy 1774-1780* (Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1932), pp. 86 & 110.

PRESSURE GROUPS AGAINST UNITED STATES MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Charlotte Finkenthal

This report will deal with pressure groups against United States military involvement in Vietnam. There are many different kinds of pressure groups engaged in this activity. These groups differ in their objectives, methods, and organizational structure. Their common objective is halting the war.

Some were formed specifically to handle the "U. S. involvement in Vietnam." When this issue is resolved these groups will either disband or seek other issues and continue as pressure groups. This report indicates which groups fall into these categories.

Other pressure groups are anti-war and have existed for a long time. Here we find pacifists: secular and non-secular. Many civil rights, student, and other groups are sympathetic to the anti-war organizations and provide support morally and financially.

Since the number of pressure groups involved in these activities is so numerous it will be the purpose of this paper to examine only the most familiar ones, as of December 1968.

Further, the most effective spokesmen are not necessarily affiliated with a group. They issue public statements and write articles. The most eminent of these are: Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Jean-Paul Sartre, and Bertrand Russell.

One of the problems involved with raising of funds is the lack of tax-exempt status. Two groups, which enjoy a

status whereby contributors receive tax exemptions are: Friends Service Committee and the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Arguments against the war are numerous and broad. Some of the groups emphasize economic reasons. For example, the civil groups claim a higher army Negro casualty and induction rate. Moreover, cuts in the anti-poverty programs and the existence of high taxes affect the Negro community more profoundly than the white.

Other groups stress moral reasons for opposing the war. The War Resisters League, Friends Service Committee, and others are pacifist and anti-war in general. They argue that the regimes in Saigon are corrupt dictatorships. This is reflected in various newspaper articles. An article in *The New York Times* of December 1, 1966 stated that the present Chief of State, Premier, most Cabinet ministers, several ambassadors, most province and district chiefs and thousands of office holders (including the manager of the Saigon radio station) are military men.

Still other groups and individuals claim practical reasons for protesting the war. Fear of a nuclear holocaust or an all out conventional war are given as related reasons.

Various groups and individuals combine some or all of these arguments and mention U. S. violation of the Geneva agreement of 1954.

A minority of protest groups advocate major changes in our political system and concentrate their efforts to achieve that end, supporting the Vietnam protest as a side issue.

The civil rights groups (SNCC, CORE) cooperate with and support the anti-Vietnam protest groups. Religious organizations (Catholic Worker) lend support as

do veterans groups (Veterans and Reservists for Peace). The protest movement carries over into the political clubs, trade unionist groups and many other groups.

The protest groups vary in their methods of differing with official government policy in Vietnam. This report will not cover all the various arguments of the protest groups because so much has been previously written on these arguments.

Protest is historically entwined in the American democratic process and the right to dissent is contained within the framework of our society. The freedom of criticism is a salient characteristic of our political system and is essential to its preservation.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY, INC.

OBJECTIVES

The minimum objective would be a cease fire, negotiation with the National Liberation Front and cessation of bombing.

TECHNIQUES FOR REACHING THE PUBLIC

This group employs various techniques including mailings, rallies and marches (occasionally with other groups). Representatives of SANE speak on T.V. and radio programs. They employ a Director of Publicity who obtains public coverage for their news releases, events, and advertisements. They employ a full-time representative who acts as a lobby in Washington, D. C. Their publication is called "Sane World."

DATE FORMED AND PURPOSE

This group formed in 1958 primarily to bring about a cessation of atomic testing.

STRUCTURE

This is a national organization with between 25,000 and 30,000 dues paying members from approximately 125 chapters in approximately 30-35 states. They have international sponsors. The National Executive Board of 40 members includes Professor Seymour Melman of Columbia University, Dr. Benjamin Spock, and many other public figures. This board meets monthly and mainly consists of people who do not have political backgrounds. The board members themselves elect some of the board officers, with chapters adding about one-third of the national board members. Local chapters elect their own chairmen, and officers. These chartered chapters are governed by the national by-laws. The National Board and local chapters meet annually to discuss and decide policy. There are no Ad Hoc committees. They held a coordinated rally at Madison Square Garden on December 8, 1966 and sold 20,000 tickets (full-house). This rally was mainly for publicity. Of the National Board of 40, only 4 are on salary with some 8 clerical workers. Almost all of the local chapters rely on volunteers. There are few salaried workers even in the major cities.

EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

After the Test Ban Treaty their membership dropped but there was a resurgence in the membership rolls. When SANE formed in 1958 it was a non-membership group. Membership began in 1962. SANE members work volun-

tarily and contribute money to political candidates sympathetic to their cause. They supported Representatives William Fitts Ryan of New York and George Brown of California, both of whom won. The number of marches has increased and the Washington, D. C. march of November 27, 1965 was attended by approximately 40,000 people. On this march SANE with other groups arranged for some of the buses and trains.

FIFTH AVENUE VIETNAM PEACE PARADE COMMITTEE

OBJECTIVES

The minimum objective would be immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, and negotiation with the National Liberation Front.

This group does not attempt to set policy on a large number of issues, since it is essentially an Ad Hoc committee and represents over 150 diverse groups.

TECHNIQUES FOR REACHING THE PUBLIC

Their techniques include mailings, rallies, and marches. Their publicity consists of advertisements in *The Village Voice* and *The New York Times*. They do not have a publication.

DATE FORMED AND PURPOSE

The Parade Committee was formed in the Fall of 1965 with the exclusive purpose of protesting the Vietnam war.

STRUCTURE

There is no membership, or chapters. The committee consists of one representative from each of the 150 groups

in the New York City area. These participating groups contribute funds to the Parade Committee. In addition, the Committee solicits funds publicly. The three executive officers are unsalaried with the four fund raisers, clerical, and organizing staff receiving subsistence salaries. The Committee engages in coordinated affairs with other groups.

EVALUATION OF THEIR EFFECTIVENESS

The number of participating groups has increased from 40 to 150 groups (inc. SANE). Also, the number of demonstrators has increased in each of their marches. According to *The New York Times* estimate, there were 10,000 marchers on October 16, 1965. *The New York Times* article dated March 27, 1966 stated the New York Police Department Bureau of Operations estimated that there were between 20,000 and 25,000 marchers on March 26, 1966. In the demonstration of April 27, 1968 *The New York Times* estimated that there were 87,000 marchers into Sheep Meadow, N. Y. C.

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

OBJECTIVES

The minimum objective would be negotiation with the National Liberation Front, immediate cease fire, and withdrawal of American troops. This group adopted a resolution for the abolition of the draft.

TECHNIQUES FOR REACHING THE PUBLIC

Their techniques consist of mailings (their list exceeds 20,000), and marches (either coordinated or their own). They have held two large demonstrations of over 5000

women marching in Washington, D. C. and New York City. Their advertisements have appeared in *The New York Times*. They do not have a separate publication. Their representatives have appeared on national T.V. and local radio programs.

DATE FORMED AND PURPOSE

This group formed in November, 1961 to protest atomic testing and fallout.

STRUCTURE

This is a national organization without membership, dues, board or officers. They have chapters in approximately 70 cities and towns plus about 50 metropolitan area chapters which are largely autonomous. They have a policy conference once a year and anyone can attend to plan for future programs and policies. There is a New York coordinating committee which meets every other week to determine current programs and problems. They also employ Ad Hoc committees for particular issues. The workers are unsalaried. Funds are raised through affairs by local groups and public contributions.

EVALUATION OF THEIR EFFECTIVENESS

This group has worked for the election of candidates in many states. They feel there has been an increase in public agreement with their cause because of the increase in marchers and chapters.

CLERGY AND LAYMEN CONCERNED ABOUT VIETNAM

This is a group formed by clergymen in January, 1966 to protest the Vietnam war.

It is a non-membership group composed of Protestant, Catholic, Jewish clergymen and laymen. The National Committee includes Reverend William Sloane Coffin, Jr. of Yale University, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, Dr. Hans Morgenthau and others.

They have conducted vigils in Washington, D. C. where they talked to elected and unelected government officials regarding the stopping of the war. They plan large advertisements in religious publications.

Their stated objectives are negotiations with the National Liberation Front, arbitration of the Vietnam conflict by an international body, and a change in U. S. foreign policy towards China (including admission of China into the United Nations).

STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

OBJECTIVE

Unilateral withdrawal by the U. S. from Vietnam.

TECHNIQUES FOR REACHING THE PUBLIC

This group uses mailings infrequently. They engage in rallies, marches on and off campus (coordinated). Their officers have appeared on WBAI and T.V. programs (e.g. The David Susskind Show). On January 8, 1967 the National Broadcasting Company broadcast a one hour program on the Monitor Show with a representative from SDS. They have advertised in *The Village Voice*, student

and campus papers with funds provided by other groups. Their publication is called "New Left Notes." They regionally publish a "newsletter" appearing occasionally because of their lack of funds. Members do neighborhood social work and attempt to educate at all levels of society.

DATE FORMED AND PURPOSE

This group was formed in 1960 by students interested in implementing a more democratic society with grass roots participation.

STRUCTURE

They have a national membership of approximately 8000 dues-paying members with about 300 chapters in 50 states. They have a total of 35,000 members who are members of the local and/or national group. The officers are students who receive subsistence allowances. The local chapters are autonomous and decide what actions and methods will be employed.

EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

Membership has been steadily increasing.

COMMITTEE OF THE PROFESSIONS

OBJECTIVES

Cease fire, and negotiation with the National Liberation Front is their minimum objective.

TECHNIQUES FOR REACHING THE PUBLIC

This group uses mailings, and is currently planning for future demonstrations. During January 29-February 5,

1967 they conducted a "Week of the Angry Arts" to reach the public. This was a project covering public activities by members of the arts—music, painting, theater, poetry, film, and combined forms. These artists performed in theaters, museums, recital halls and business buildings to protest publicly for their cause. This group placed the largest political advertisement in the history of advertising. The advertisement appeared in *The New York Times* dated June 5, 1966 in conjunction with the Universities Committee. The advertisement listed 6500 names representing the nation's academic and arts community. This group coordinates with other groups and merge in marches and rallies. They have a publication called "Peace Reporter."

DATE FORMED AND PURPOSE

This group formed in August, 1965 to protest U. S. military involvement in Vietnam.

STRUCTURE

This is a non-membership group. They receive voluntary public contributions. They have affiliates in the U. S. The three executives are unsalaried.

WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE

OBJECTIVE

The long range objective would include a coalition government with ample Buddhist representation. This government might be socialist but not communist. The league is opposed to totalitarian rule.

The minimum objective would be unilateral withdrawal by the U. S. Forces.

TECHNIQUES FOR REACHING THE PUBLIC

Their techniques include mailings, rallies (coordinated and their own), marches (coordinated and own), and infrequent radio and T.V. appearances by league speakers. They do not maintain any special staff for handling their publicity. Their publication is called "WRL News."

DATE FORMED AND PURPOSE

The United States group was formed in 1923 as a reaction to World War I. They are pacifist and secular.

STRUCTURE

They are affiliated with War Resisters International which has active sections in 20 countries. The U. S. membership is about 4000 with few chapters. There are no membership dues. The National Chairman, two Vice Chairmen, one Treasurer, Executive and Advisory committee are not salaried, and only small clerical expenditures are made. Public contributions are used to operate their organization, with its national budget of \$25,000 a year. They do not have contributing sponsors. Ad Hoc committees are used as needed; the Civil Defense protests were an example. Coordinating projects and demonstrations are engaged in but not as fund raising endeavors.

EVALUATION OF THEIR EFFECTIVENESS

In the recent five year period membership has doubled, with increased numbers of marchers. This group does not endorse political candidates and any endorsement is on an individual level.

A THEORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF ACCORDING TO GEORGE HERBERT MEAD AND KARL MARX

Jean-Louis d'Heilly

Consciousness as it develops into the self occupies a prominent place in philosophy. George Herbert Mead and Karl Marx, two social philosophers, were interested in the problem of the self in relationship to society; Mead examined the self as a product of social interrelationships, Marx examined and explained the self as resulting from social relationships determined by the mode of production. Mead's theory of "self" is fully developed in one work (*Mind, Self & Society*), whereas, in Marx the self is treated only indirectly, consequently one has to probe to extract Marx's concept of self in his works. Each was interested in the development of self for different reasons; their methodological development (language, consciousness, and self-consciousness) of selfhood is nearly parallel. An examination of this methodological development demonstrates this apparent similarity.

One problem in comparing Mead's* and Marx's idea of the self is a difference in terminology. Marx preceded Mead, thus, the differentiation between man's consciousness and consciousness-of-himself (self-consciousness) is

* Although Mead claimed to be a Behaviorist there are no strict empirical grounds upon which he could claim to be scientific; Marx made no other claim than that of being a materialistic, hence "real" philosopher.

less developed than Mead's. For the purposes of this paper, consciousness and self-consciousness will be methodologically analyzed and defined as Mead did: consciousness being, "Our constructive selection of an environment—colors, emotional values, and the like—in terms of our psychological sensitivities";¹ self-consciousness: "referring to recognition of appearance of self as an object."² These definitions are in basic agreement with Marx's: "My relationship to my surroundings is my consciousness."³ And with Marx's revised Hegelian position:

[s]elf consciousness itself alienates itself; for in this alienation it establishes *itself* as object, or, for the sake of individual unity of *being-for-self* establishes the object as itself.⁴

Mead and Marx, it appears, based their methodology of examining the self within traditional philosophical guidelines. Their premise was taken from the materialist hypothesis that man grew up and was shaped by his environment. Traditional philosophic methods were utilized by

¹ George H. Mead, *Mind, Self & Society* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 129.

² *Ibid.*, p. 169.

³ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968), p. 42.

⁴ Karl Marx, *The Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (New York: International Publishers, 1967), p. 179. This quote represents Marx's position as long as it is remembered that he is talking about real people. "First of all: consciousness—self-consciousness is at home in its other-being as such. It is therefore—or if we here abstract from the Hegelian abstraction and put the self-consciousness of man instead of Self-consciousness—to be directly the other itself." *Ibid.*, p. 184.

them in their approach to the development of the self (although Mead stated that he was a Behaviorist).⁵ Mead, post-dating Marx, had the advantage of a more complete body of work (knowledge) to draw upon for his idea of the self, therefore his development of the concept of self is more complete. When Marx treats the problem of consciousness, his development is similar to and pre-dates many of Mead's ideas of the self.

Mead and Marx rejected the philosophical hypothesis of Ideation—the idea that the individual develops consciousness independently of society. Mead asserts that the individual only develops self-hood in the social situation;⁶ Marx agrees, stating that it is a philosophical abstraction to talk of an “isolated individual.”⁷ They both declare the absolute necessity of explaining consciousness in terms of social interaction. Mead stated this essential interaction between consciousness and society:

We are forced to conclude that consciousness is emergent from such behavior [social]; that so far from being a pre-condition of the social act, the social act is the pre-condition of it [consciousness].⁸

Marx, also, states this precept:

. . . society produces *man as man* . . . activity and mind, both in their content and in their *mode of existence are social: social* activity and *social* mind . . . My general consciousness is only the theoretical shape

⁵ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 328.

⁶ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. xviii, 133.

⁷ Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, pp. 666-7.

⁸ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 18.

of that which the living shape is the real community, the social fabric . . . ⁹

Individuals, according to Mead are "biosocial," that is they are biological entities arriving into a structured social condition; therefore they are biosocial because of the interaction between the biological entity and the social groupings, since the existent society imposes its conditions on the biological organism. Consciousness is developed through the interaction of the biological identity and the social; Mead and Marx find consciousness arising from the social shaping of the individual. Mead departed from the Cartesian hypothesis (*cogito ergo sum*) and accepted society as an *a priori* condition of existence.

We are starting out with a given social whole of complex group activity, into which we analyze (as elements) the behavior of each of the separate individuals composing it. For social psychology, the whole, society, is prior to the part (the individual), not the part to the whole; and the part is explained in terms of the whole, not the whole in terms of the part.¹⁰

Marx and Mead absolutely maintained that consciousness was attained through the social process: "Con-

⁹ Marx, *Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, p. 137. The contemporary social philosopher Sidney Hook, also finds in Marx the connection between social consciousness and the developing "self," and states that: "Marx never disassociated man from his social environment . . . The function of social theory is to bring human beings to self-consciousness." See Sidney Hook, *From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1968), p. 59.

¹⁰ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 7.

sciousness is, therefore, from the very beginning a social product, and remains so as long as men exist at all . . . My relation to my surroundings is my consciousness.”¹¹ Marx probed beyond an *a priori* concept of society and described the mechanism whereby the social process was explained through the division of labor in the productive process as it determined the structure of society, its consciousness, and the individual’s consciousness:

The fact is, therefore, that definite individuals who are productively active in a definite way enter into those definite social and political relations . . . [into] a connection of the social and political structure with production. The social structure and the state are continually evolving out of the life process of definite individuals . . . as they *really* are; i.e., as they operate, produce materially, and hence as they work under definite material limits, pre-suppositions and conditions independent of their will.¹²

Language is the mechanism through which consciousness (Mead’s “mind,” Marx’s “consciousness”) develops. Language grows out of the “significant symbol” (Mead)—the gesture; gestures grow out of the need to convey information to the other. Mead finds that the gesture expresses emotion at first,¹³ but soon develops into a distinct meaning, i.e., language. Language as the significant symbol (gesture), conveys meaning both to the other, and originating mind; both agree to the “meaning” of the

¹¹ Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, pp. 146-7.

¹² Marx, *The German Ideology*, pp. 136-7.

¹³ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 45.

symbol. Meaning arises in the social mind; it is accepted by the biological mind where it is taken as its own, then, it is conveyed to the other person, who in turn recognizes the accepted meaning. Language is therefore the avenue whereby the mind (consciousness) arises. Mead, according to Charles W. Morris who wrote the introduction to *Mind, Self & Society*: "... has shown that the mind & self are, without remainder, generated in a social process, and that he has for the first time isolated the mechanism of this genesis [language]." ¹⁴ Marx shows much the same awareness of the importance of language. In fact, he gave to language the same primacy as Mead. Marx went further, and asserted that language arose from the division of labor, and the mode of production. ¹⁵

Man also possesses 'consciousness'; but, even so, not inherent, not 'pure' consciousness. From the start the 'spirit' is afflicted with the curse of being 'burdened' with matter, which here makes its appearance in the form of agitated layers of air, sounds, in short, of *language*. *Language is as old as consciousness, language is practical consciousness* that exist also for other men, and for that reason alone it really exists—for me personally as well; language, like consciousness, only arises

¹⁴ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. xv.

¹⁵ Marx finds the first division of labor to have been the sex act. See Marx, *The German Ideology*, pp. 33, 44, 504. And Robert Tucker, *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 186. Engels also finds that the sex act was the first division of labor. See Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* (New York: International Publishers, 1967), p. 43. And Ruben Osborn, *Marxism and Psychoanalysis* (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1967), p. 43.

from the need, the necessity of intercourse with other men. [my emphasis]¹⁶

Language essentially acts as the significant symbol, as the medium whereby one mind conveys to another a meaning. It also means that the originating mind had to take the same attitude to the significant symbol as the other. Otherwise the symbol would not be "significant," hence, of no social use. With the use of a significant symbol, thinking becomes possible via the internalization by the mind of the significant symbol. This internalization of a significant symbol becomes the reflection of the other. As the significant symbol becomes the language used by the social group, meaning is freely interchanged by the group, whereupon the group develops its own consciousness which is then imparted to new biological organisms (children). Therefore, the mind (consciousness) develops through language and interaction with the other:

. . . it [the biological organism] becomes a self only when it has developed within the context of the social experience. Mind arises through communication by a conversation of gestures and is a social process or context of experience—not communication of mind through mind . . . communication is fundamental to the nature of what we term 'mind'; . . . ¹⁷

¹⁶ Marx, *German Ideology*, p. 42. Commenting on the above passage, Sidney Hook calls it "a passage which sounds amazingly modern, man's consciousness is his speech." Hook, *From Hegel to Marx*, p. 44.

¹⁷ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 50.

Developing minds evolve by means of thought processes through symbols—language—and what they are evolving within themselves is a reflection of others. Thus, the individual's original self is a reflection of others, and when the individual expresses himself through language he is expressing that fact. This is generally Mead's process, although, this same process is found in Marx:

Since he came into the world neither with a looking glass in his hands, nor as a Fichtian philosopher, to whom 'I am I' is sufficient, man first sees and recognizes himself in other men. Peter only establishes his own identity as a man by first comparing himself with Paul as being of like kind.¹⁸

Thought becomes a part of mind through the mind's taking on the attitudes of others; this process becomes Mead's "generalized other." Thought arises out of a process of the generalized other which has the character of being common to the group (that which is common within the particular social milieu). From thought comes reason, Mead finds, and the mechanism of reason is reflection; reflection of the attitudes of others toward the self brings forth rational control by the self in its comprehension of particulars, whereupon, thoughts can be expressed to others in abstract terms because they are gathered from the generalized others:

The very universality and impersonality of thought and reason is from the behavioristic standpoint the result

¹⁸ Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production* (New York: International Publishers, 1967), p. 52. It is suspected that Mead accepts the *a priori* Fichtian concepts of Time and Space. See Mead's *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 117.

of the given individual taking the attitude of others toward himself, and to finally crystalizing all these particular attitudes into a single attitude or standpoint which may be called that of the 'generalized other.'¹⁹

Thought, according to Marx, is man's attempt to objectify himself—that is understand himself. Therefore man as an object becomes an object to himself. It is in the perception of the other as an object that the subject can objectify himself; Marx explained the phenomenon:

... it is only when the objective world becomes everywhere for man in society the world of man's essential powers—human reality, and for that reason the reality of his *own* essential powers—that all *objects* become for him the *objectification of himself*, become objects which confirm and realize his individuality, become *his* objects; that is, *man himself* becomes the object. The manner in which they become *his* depends upon the *nature of the objects* and on the nature of the *essential power* corresponding to it; for it is precisely the *determinate nature* of this relationship which shapes the particular, *real* mode of affirmation. To the *eye* an object comes to be other than it is to the *ear*. The specific character of each essential power is precisely its *specific essence*, and therefore also the specific mode of its objectification, of its *objectively actual living being*. Thus man is affirmed in the objective world not only in the act of thinking, but with *all* his senses.²⁰

¹⁹ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 90.

²⁰ Marx, *The Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, p. 140.

Mead took reflection to be of prime importance; he found that the self develops consciousness only through organization of incoming material and that this organization, in relation to the self, and to others, comes about through reflection.²¹

Reflection or reflective behavior arises only under the conditions of self-consciousness, and make possible the purposive control and organization of the individual organism of its conduct, with reference to the various social and physical environments, i.e., with reference to the various social and physical situations in which it becomes involved and which it reacts. The organization of the self is simply the organization, by the individual organism, of the set of attitudes toward its social environment—and toward itself—from the standpoint of that environment, or as a functioning element in the process of social experience and behavior constituting the environment—which it is able to take.²²

Mead, in setting the stage for the development of the reflective self, found it necessary to have a pre-stage before this stage could be reached, a mechanism whereby self can be explained and developed. For Mead, the necessary condition of self is "mind." Man's interaction with other men results in an inner experience from social experience, which he takes as his own inner experience and then interacts with others on their own level; this stage is called consciousness since the individual has reached a state of social integration. Mind begins reflective reactions with other in-

²¹ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 134.

²² Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 91.

dividuals within the social process. With the reflective pause the mind takes the attitudes of others towards itself—the generalized other. With the ability to take on the attitude of the generalized other, the mind is able to modify information and interact on the social plane through language. But it is mostly in the reflective process that Mead finds an essential—that the reflective self—mind—self-consciousness develops to where the self becomes its own object. Now the mind utilizes the reflective process in relationship to itself. It becomes its own object and reflects upon itself; it has become both subject and object. The individual now has an experience of self, thus, memories arise and the future is projected on the basis of reflection on these memories. This ability of the self enables it to engage in rational activities with others as well as itself. Rationality is thus engendered. But before all of this can take place however, Mead finds that certain stages in the development of the self must first take place.

The return to significant symbols (language) is held essential by Mead, to the rise of the self. The significant symbol, in the rise of the self, is utilized by the self in “conversation” with itself.²³ These significant symbols are given within the context of the society and the individual utilizes them from various sources within the society. The self internalizes these symbols and synthesizes them. The self comes to represent the repository of these significant symbols, hence, the society. The self takes these significant symbols—language—and internalizes them. The self takes itself as an object and reflects within. In order to do so effectively, two other processes must be gone through: the

²³ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 139.

play stage, the game stage.²⁴ Within and through these two stages the emerging self is formed. Play engages the child in taking the attitudes of the other towards himself. Thus he becomes conscious of how others view him, and thus psychologically he comes to view himself in the same light. Mead finds that assuming the role of the other enables the child to form his consciousness as reflected social attitudes—individual social attitudes. In games the child takes on the role(s) of all who play in the game. This becomes the generalized other for the self; with rules, organization, and form. Now the child is able to abstract the social ethos, or norms, and impose them on himself. Thus he accepts the control of the group from which his consciousness—and his very self arises.

Within the self, therefore, two processes have been gone through: the self's role as an individual; the self's multiple role as the generalized other. The former remains the core of the individual, while the latter becomes the individual's societal self. Mead thus finds the first to be the "I"²⁵ and the second to be the "me." Now the "me" as the social role gives rise to the "I" the historical "we." "We" acts as the censor of the "I."²⁶ Therefore the self has a duality, the "I" which acts as the creative dynamic force and the "we" which acts as its restraint.²⁷

A duality has been created whereby the self can regard itself as an object—an object of reflection. The "I" acting on impulse demands action, the "me" acting as the censor

²⁴ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, pp. 153-4 & xxiv.

²⁵ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 174.

²⁶ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 209.

²⁷ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. 210.

(society) forces the "I" to reflect. Reflection wherein the self has become its own object has then fully developed in Mead's opinion.

Marx's development of the self is implicitly, rather than explicitly stated in his writings. He finds self-consciousness within the realm of class; hence the individual self is formed by his class relationships.²⁸ Basic to this condition of self-consciousness, is the mode of production and division of labor. For Marx, the self was not of central importance and was not as well articulated as with George H. Mead.

In summary, there is some question as to why Marx and Mead seem to be so much alike on the self. The answer may lie in their philosophical backgrounds. They were both inheritors of the idealistic philosophers. In this case, they both were influenced by Hegel. Mead studied with Royce (who had studied with Hegel). Morris states how the "Idealistic philosophies such as those of Hegel and Royce stressed the social nature of the self and morality—and Mead had studied under Royce."²⁹ Marx, also, employed Hegelian philosophy. It is possible that this is the reason for their similar theoretical development of self.

Since the main purpose in Marx's delineation of the self is to show the cause and the consequences of economic forces on the individual, it was only natural that his treatment of the self was a cursory one, in comparison to Mead's. Therefore, Marx's writings of the self are interspersed within the main body of his works. Considering this, it is all the more remarkable that his development of the self parallels

²⁸ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*, p. 95 *passim*.

²⁹ Mead, *Mind, Self & Society*, p. xiii.

that of the later Mead, whose central theme concerns the self. Marx's similar methodological development of the self follows in a sequential process from: language, reflection of the other, and socialization, culminating in self-consciousness (the self as its own object). Mead's originality, therefore, should be admitted, though it consisted less in inventing the argument than in perceiving its importance.

LINGUISTIC REFLECTIONS OF SOCIAL CHANGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Lea Konopko

Linguistic activity is a function of the imitative instinct—an instinct which sociologists agree is most deeply engrained in the heritage of social beings. The young and adult continue to modify their language to bring it closer to those people they consider as models, and whether conscious or unconscious, this imitative phenomenon points up one problem involved in studies of linguistic evolution.

Models, or leading figures, sway certain segments of population in ways of speaking, choices of words, and incorrect usages. Contemporary terms, e.g., New Frontier, and Great Society, attain an accepted position and play a not inconsiderable role in our view of society. Historical examples of linguistic influence are numerous: the *Ancien Régime* salons dictated semantic modes, concepts, and ideas. Only the speech of this minority *literati* was held correct. Later, the French Revolution brought to power a social class whose speech, hitherto considered vulgar and incorrect, came to share in the prestige formerly accorded the salon group; newly acquired political status brought with it a change in the standards for language. Another example of change in speech usage is to be found contemporaneously: the black American's attempt to establish his unique identity coincides with his need to communicate with the rest of society. There is an evident upsurge of particular verbal patterns emanating from the black community, and their

language has been incorporated into the mainstream of the American idiom. Several of their terms have found a way into the society-at-large.

"Black Power" is a term coined by Stokely Carmichael, and utilized by the activist blacks whose imagination it captured. "Black is beautiful" has also become part of our language. Ralph Ellison's December 9, 1968 lecture at Richmond College dealt with the need for recreation of the language, stating that "the idiom of much of music, dance, speech, and food is a key in the analysis of a minority problem." The diversity of language may be seen as the expression of the moral and political problem the Negro presents. Expressions of "cooking with soul" have found their way into the press. "The New York Times Magazine" of November 3, 1968 contained a discussion by Craig Clairborne on the popular discovery of an American school of cooking, yet this style is almost as old as the nation itself. Soul Food, like Soul Music was created in the South by the Negro and is more basically indigenous to this country than cranberry sauce or Philadelphia pepper-pot. New York City soul food restaurants are increasing, and are discussed with enthusiasm at sophisticated cocktail gatherings. Soul food cook books are appearing. Although the term "soul" is not confined to, and may not have originated with food, it had for a long while been associated with food alone; it has now evolved into "soul brother," "soul sister," "soul music" and its appendage to any common noun brings some part of the black movement into existence. A National Broadcasting Corporation report by Huntley-Brinkley on January 11, 1969 brought Floyd McKissick's announced plans for a "new black built, black owned town to be called Soul City." This name is to be a

symbol of the black desire for self-determination of institutions, and economic power. Thus, cultural pluralism and linguistic diversity are seen to result in a dynamic interaction upon our language. The staid Treasury Department has now altered its language from "Negro" to "Afro-American."

A semantic shift from pejorative designations of "Nigger" is not pervasive; the term "Negro" with its connotations is at present fluctuatingly employed—when black is not. Linguistic markers can be useful as predictive symbols of certain changes in social relationships, for words play a central part not only in the development of thought but in the historical growth of consciousness as a whole; words may be considered as microcosms of human consciousness. Hence, the broad acceptance of original black terminology also implies a change in the present and future social status of the blacks; perhaps we are experiencing the beginning of an era wherein the blacks will be more than merely tolerated, where they will be socially desirable in white America. Certainly, their linguistic effect on our language seems to indicate this.