

MARXIST ART THEORY FOUNDATION PROBLEM*Summary*

The text discusses Marx's and Engels's views of art, as well as Lenin's apprehension and development of those views. According to their analyses and mutual relation, the possibilities of art theory should be considered within the conditions of class society creation. The issue considered in the text is that of the base taken from Lenin's developing Marx's and Engels's ideas on the role of art production and its status in the sphere of social work division, which led directly to the foundation of art theory with the aim of serving socio-political causes.

Although Carl Marx and Friedrich Engels, as the founders of historical materialism, did not write a single piece dedicated to aesthetic issues, the philosophical system that they established was supposed to give the explanation for a wide range of social relationships which did not exclude even art production, its understanding as well as its connection to the historic changes in society. The starting point for understanding Marxist view of art, therefore, should be looked for in scattered aesthetic opinions which Marx and Engels stated while discussing philosophical, economic and political issues.

Marxist teaching points out that the development of ideological spheres is conditioned not only by an economic base but also by a prehistoric inventory that the historic period had found already existing and simply adopted. Low economic development of the prehistoric period has false presentations of nature, and sometimes a condition or even a cause to itself, as a supplement. These presentations are in the course of time replaced with others, also characterized as misconceptions but less absurd than the previous ones. However, since these misconceptions do not have their origin in some particular sphere but in the special work division sphere, i.e. how the ones who produce them make up an independent group within the work division sphere, so that these misconceptions have a reverse influence on the whole social development including economic development itself. The influence of economic development is still prevailing, but it can be indirectly stated, i.e. the influence of the economic development is seen in the very terms established by certain spheres. It means that the influence of the material base on further building does not exclude reverse effect. Namely, political, legal and other aspects of economic movement, within the boundaries of its own dependency on economic conditions, have the influence on the materialistic base itself. This very interrelation proves Marx's and Engel's support of political dictatorship of the proletariat, because, if contrary,

in case the political power was economically powerless, this support would be unnecessary.

Perspective of culture positioning in the sphere of building which is erected on the foundation of the society's economic structure, indicated the problem in a society – artist relationship. Art is not considered to be an autonomous reality, but it is put into a dependant position in terms of socio-economic relationship. Accepting Marx's teaching on necessity of changes in social relations, Marxist theory started developing more as a socio-political critique of art.

Since the Marxist theory provided art with an opportunity to influence social development, the work on changes of existing social relations, therefore, had to include influence on all the spheres which more or less had influence on the spheres and that included art as well. The influence of art should not be counterproductive to work during a wider process of changes in social relations. This necessity in its more explicit form was pointed out by Lenin in developing understanding of a relationship between Marxist theory and art. His views, although limited to the art of a political party, in fact, had much larger pretensions. Conditions set before the art of a political party, at times when one party system of governing was being established, got a wider meaning. The very thing that had determined party cultural politics was now applied to the cultural politics defined by the state. In practice, it meant that there was no possibility for foundation of an art theory and practice outside the party.

Understanding, that changing social relations requires influencing all those spheres which influence their development in a specific way, results into putting these spheres into one overall social program. Should this program include art production as well, and should that program contain political aspirations, then it means that art is subjected to political goals, i.e. it is politicized. Since there is no politics that will allow any kind of speech that comes from established political platform, there is no activity of political art that is not limited by an already defined platform. It means that freedom of an artistic production is allowed only within the boundaries of a frame set by an established political program. Setting a complete change of social relations as its goal, Marxist theory demanded that art should take the rightful position in the work on abolishing a class society. It means that art should become a part of a general social program. Moreover, it was supposed to fit in an already established political platform. It can be concluded that taking into consideration Lenin's developing of Marx's and Engels's opinions on the role of art production and its status in the sphere of social work division in one-party government systems leads to formation of art theory that would serve the purposes of achieving socio-political goals.