IS MARXISM ELITIST?

INTRODUCTION

Alvin Gouldner has outlined the viewpoint that Marxism is an approach that justifies the political domination of intellectuals. (1) This view is unfair because it can be argued that all political trends uphold an important role for intellectuals. The reason for this situation is because the intellectuals have a crucial role in developing the ideology of a given political standpoint. For example, conservatism is defined by people like Edmund Burke, and political economy and liberalism by Adam Smith. The type of democratic socialism advocated by the Labour Party is outlined by outstanding figures like Anthony Crosland, and Anarchism is propagated by Proudhon and Bakunin. The difference between conservatism and socialism is that the former does not deny its elite character because its major aim is to maintain the privileges of class and the private ownership of the means of production. In contrast socialism is about the liberation of the under-privileged within society. This doctrine has acquired two major strands. Firstly, socialism from above, which is associated with the proponents of reformism, who considered that the intervention of the state will bring about progress towards the socialist transformation of society. Secondly, the standpoint of socialism from below, which is associated with Marxism, and envisages that popular mass organisations, like Soviets, will be the agency of change within society.

The advocates of socialism from below define the relationship between intellectuals and the social forces promoting the emancipation of society in terms of the revolutionary role of the working class. In other words Marxism has generally upheld the standpoint of the self-emancipation of the working class. This means that the major and active agency of change from capitalism to communism is considered to be the industrial proletariat. This general approach does not deny the role of a socialist party, which is considered to be the political articulation of the interests of the working class, and has an active role in the promotion of a strategy of revolutionary change. However, in the actual process of social transformation the working class is considered to be the dynamic social force that brings about the demise of capitalism. But this approach was seriously modified by Lenin who argued that the vanguard party should outline the programme of action on behalf of the working class, and so implied that the process of revolutionary change might by the outcome of the conscious role of the party. The view of Gouldner is that this apparently elitist view can be traced back to Marx and Engels. Lenin's standpoint is merely the outcome of the understanding of the founders of Marxism.

However, we object to this viewpoint. Not only was Lenin's approach changeable, which meant he did not deny the dynamic revolutionary role of the working class, and he related the popular role of the Soviets to a process of social change. The most authoritative standpoint of Marx is provided by his conclusion in Capital. He outlines explicitly the perspective that the working class becomes cooperative labour because of the character of capitalist production. This provides the objective basis for the revolt of the proletariat and the transformation of society: “Along with the constant decrease in the number of capitalist magnates, who usurp and monopolize all of the advantages of this process of transformation, the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation and exploitation grows; but with this also grows the revolt of the working class, a class constantly increasing in numbers, and trained, united and organized by the very mechanism of the capitalist mode of production. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production which has flourished alongside and under it. The centralization of the means of production and the socialization of labour reach a point at which they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.”(2)

Marx is making the point that the very economic logic of capitalist development means the working class increasing opposes its exploitation by capital, and so unites to overthrow the system. At the very least, capitalism is based on relations of production which generate class struggle and increasing opposition to the domination of capital. The problem with this perspective is that whilst it provides a coherent explanation of class struggle, it does not establish similar justification for the demise of the system. The optimistic view that capitalism will be overthrown by the co-operative efforts of the working class may be disproved by the determination of the capitalists, and the bourgeois state, to oppose this political tendency to end the system. Furthermore, the ideology of the bourgeoisie may be very coherent, and therefore could convince the working class that the aim to end capitalism is both futile and problematical. As a result the capitalist system has a resilience and ability to oppose the forces for revolutionary change. This was not the situation which Marx and Engels encountered in the late 19th century, but it became an increasing aspect of the 20th century. The very events within recent history have indicated that there is not a tendency for capitalism to be overthrow because of its organisational character. Indeed the working class has increasingly been on the defensive because of the ability of the forces of capital to undermine its social and material gains. In this context the role of the intellectual has become crucial in order to try and improve the arguments for socialism. The intellectuals cannot replace the social role of the working class, but they can have a crucial relationship concerning discussing the complexities of the class struggle, and consequently devising an imaginative strategy which could enhance the ability of the working class to achieve social power.

Gouldner would be indifferent to these tasks because he is not concerned with the overthrow of capitalism. Instead he considers that one of his major theoretical tasks is to outline the limitations of Marxism. In this context he tries to establish that Marxism is based on intellectual elitism. The justification of this approach is combined with support for an authoritarian society. However, he cannot provide justification for his argument in terms of explicit comments made by Marx or Engels. Instead he has to make assumptions about what Marx 'really meant'. In this manner he can argue that Marx did not really aim for the self-emancipation of the working class and instead was in favour of an elite version of state socialism. It is important to acknowledge that Gouldner does not suggest the more relevant view that the possibility of self-emancipation may be an unrealistic aim. This is because he wants to defend the Anarchist alternative to Marxism. But it would be more constructive and fruitful to analyse the view that the possible domination of the intellectuals is because of the unrealistic character of various strategies of emancipation. Instead of asking this serious question, Gouldner outlines in a biased manner how he favours anarchism over Marxism. Thus the question of elitism is reduced to the apparent limitations of Marxism. This means in a dogmatic manner he has to outline in a one-sided manner how Marxism apparently upholds the rule of an elite over the people. He would have been more constructively engaged in asking if it is possible and feasible for any dominated social group to realise its own liberation. This is a serious question that Marxism continually needs to address, and its conception of socialism has to be continually revised in order to provide answers to this question.

What we know from historical experience is that the aspects of exploitation and domination within the system of capitalism will lead to mass unrest and opposition. Marxism can promote the potential of this popular discontent with capitalism. However, historical events have not answered the question as to whether the working class has a historical mission to end capitalism and build communism. Instead it remains a class with grievances within capitalism. It is also possible to undermine mass opposition to capitalism by the generation of populism and the ideology of nationalism. These ideologies have a crucial role in the process of the continuation of the existing system. Hence Marxism has an important task in developing reasons as to why capitalism should be ended and replaced by a superior system that is without exploitation and domination. Thus the tasks of Marxism are effectively permanent, and will mean that Marxism has an intellectual role until communism is successfully created. In this context the crucial question becomes whether Marxism is an ideology with its own vested interests, is it attempting to create a new form of privilege within society? Gouldner answers in the affirmative to this question, we shall attempt to construct an alternative view.

GOULDNER'S CRITIQUE OF MARX

Gouldner outlines how Marx generally did not mention the relationship of the intellectuals to struggle for socialism. Instead he comments that: “If Marxism affirmed the special role of the proletariat, the latter was clearly expected to fulfil its historic mission when freed from bondage to the status quo, and this required that the proletariat submit itself to the tutelage of theory. But how can the working class submit itself to the tutelage of theory without at the same time submitting itself to the authority of theorists and intellectuals, which is dissonant with Marxism's claim that its socialism involves the self-emancipation of the working class? It is because Marxism faces both ways – on the one side, stressing the importance of working class self-emancipation, and on the other accenting the significance of theory for socialism – that it develops a double ambivalence: it is uneasy about the intellectuals’ role in the working class movement, and it is also uncomfortable about the working classes intellectual adequacy for its historical task.”(3) It is important to note that none of this ambiguity is outlined in the works of Marx; instead this tension is an invention of Gouldner. Instead of this tension, Marx established from his early writings that the proletariat was the social force for communism because it had an interest in the realisation of this society. Thus, Marx considered that his role was to outline what was already logically defined by the class character of the working class, which was the aspiration for communism: “Thus, what above all else allowed Marx to overcome his hesitations about communism was the recognition that there was a force in society which had a material interest in communism. Since communism had ceased to be a dogmatic abstraction, a mere 'good Idea', the role of the communists would not be reduced to preaching about the evils of capitalism and the benefits of communism. It would involve identifying themselves with the struggles of the working class, showing the proletariat “why it is struggling” and “how it must become conscious” of the ultimate goals of its struggle. Marx's adhesion to communism was identical to his adhesion to the cause of the proletariat, because the proletariat was the class that bore communism within itself.”(4)

If this comment is essentially accurate, which Marx's views suggest it is, his neglect of the role of the intellectuals is not surprising. The point was he believed that the very essence of the proletariat was its relationship to communism. Hence the role of the intellectual is limited to indicating that the very logic of the struggle of the proletariat is connected to the historical possibility and realisation of communism. This implies that political instruction, and the question of elaborating an intricate strategy and tactics is not required. Instead these important aspects will be provided by the very close relationship of the proletariat to the aim of communism. The role of the intellectual is more profound. It is to promote the awareness of the connection of the conception of historical mission with the character of the working class. In other words, the task of the intellectuals is to indicate that the struggles of the working class have the logic of the alternative society of communism. If this message is recognised by the proletariat it is assumed that they will then develop the necessary strategy and tactics to realise this historical aim. This perspective is connected by Marx to the view that capitalism matures the conditions for communism in terms of its own logical development: “By maturing the material conditions and the social combination of the process of production, it matures the contradictions and antagonisms of the capitalist form of that process, and therefore ripens both the elements for forming a new society and the forces tending for the overthrow of the old one.”(5) Thus Marx simultaneously establishes that the very advance of the material conditions under capitalism represents the strengthening of the working class and its increasing awareness of the necessity for communism. In this context, Marxism as an intellectual task is primarily devoted to making this process knowledgeable to the working class. The workers are made aware of the logical possibilities of their own increasing strength, which is communism. Presumably, this increasingly favourable situation for communism will mean that the workers are able to make this conclusion for themselves. The very historical potential of capitalism for communism means that the working class is able to effectively act to generate the possibilities of social transformation. The very historical logic of capitalism makes the role of the intellectual almost superfluous.

This conclusion is what is the generalised logic of Marx's perspective of the process of transition from capitalism to socialism. But, of course, historical development does not smoothly correspond to the theoretical outline of the political possibilities of capitalism. Primarily, Marx's conception of history will underestimate the determination of the existing ruling class to try and maintain its domination over society, and in ideological terms the proletariat may prove to be immature in relation to the task of converting its collective strength into the realisation of communism. Thus the very important contingencies of history indicate the necessity to develop a revolutionary political party. This party will also have an important ideological role in opposing parties that equate the interests of the working class with reformist change instead of revolution. Hence there is a necessary ideological and political role for a Marxist party, and this means that the perspective of equating the character of the working class with the realisation of communism has to be continually modified. It is the complexity of tasks which results in the necessity of a political party, and this has the task of opposing bourgeois ideology and constantly addressing the practical importance of strategy and tactics.

Instead of this recognition of the importance of political tasks, Gouldner contends: “In short, Marxism's shopping for an agent premises a distinction between theory-guided intellectuals and interest-prompted agents.”(6) Gouldner implies that this very distinction is problematical and indicates that Marxism has an elitist relationship to the working class. But we can suggest that Marxism is able to establish that capitalism can only thrive in terms of its ability to exploit what are subordinated class forces. Thus if Marxism outlines a strategy of emancipation of the exploited social class this is not in some sense an imposition of the interests of the intellectuals onto the less privileged social forces within society. Instead it can be argued that the following description of society by Marx still represents accuracy: “Accumulation of wealth at one pole is therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, the torment of labour, slavery, ignorance, brutalization and the moral degradation at the opposite pole, i.e. on the side of the class that produces its own product as capital.”(7) If this in some sense is still a perspective description of the character of society, then this means that the Marxist intellectual is not trying to ;'take advantage' of the class it claims to represent. Instead in a dis-interested manner it is in some sense connecting its understanding of society with what could represent a programme of emancipation. In contrast, Gouldner's implication that Marxist intellectuals are elitists who are indifferent to the situation of the under-privileged within society would only have some credibility if it could be shown that they were justifying a deliberately false image of social reality in order to promote their own interests. Hence they would be acting like the ideologues of the system. But instead principled Marxist intellectuals genuinely try to understand reality in order to promote progressive change. In this context they are not justifying the interests of a distinct privileged stratum.

Instead of this acknowledgement of the genuine principled relationship of Marxism and the working class, Gouldner argues that Marxism represents the self-interested ideology of an intellectual elite that aspires to domination within society: “Marxism socialism then, is, partly a strategy for optimizing the life chances of the new cultural bourgeoisie – intellectuals – by removing the moneyed class and old institutions that limit its upward mobility, and is partly a political strategy by which the New Class can attract allies to accomplish this. Marxism thus encompasses both the ultimate political goals of the New Class and the means necessary to achieve them; both the removal of the ceiling that private corporate property imposes on the New Class’s mobility, and the provision of a class alliance to achieve that.”(8) If this comment was true it would mean that the very content of Marxist theory was false drivel and rubbish. Marxism would be nothing more than the self-interested aspiration of the power of an elite, and so its claims for social emancipation would be false and misleading. However, we can reject the claims of Gouldner. Instead we can suggest that what Marx wrote about – the limitations of capitalism and the necessity of an alternative – were seriously meant. This does not mean that his works represented an infallible understanding of capitalism and the possibility of communism. But it is surely dogmatic to claim that his work amounts to merely being the justification of the ascent to power of a new elite class. If this was his intention he would not have outlined the perspective of the realisation of the classless society.

The tenuous basis of Gouldner's view is expressed in the argument that Marx's aim of the liberation of the productive forces from the limitations of capitalism would require the administration of the technical intelligentsia. The administrative elite and the theoretical intellectuals would unite in order to organise society. (9) Obviously, Gouldner justifies his standpoint in terms of the history of Stalinism, but is this what Marx wanted? Gouldner contends that: “Marxism, then, lives on two levels; at one it is a revolutionary materialism suspicious of theory and intellectuals, and opposed to the old capitalist order on behalf of the working class's self-emancipation. At another increasingly visible level, however, Marxism is committed both to the power of ideas to change the world and to the pursuit of productivity. Both these latter commitments open Marxism to the intellectuals and the intelligentsia.......those who are intellectually superior deserve superior rewards.”(10) There is nothing in the writings of Marx, such as in relation to the Paris Commune, which justify this conclusion. Instead his view is that the advance of the productive forces generates the possibility to create the classless communist society. Marx only considers the intellectuals in terms of their relationship to the task of advancing communism. However, the agency of change must be the working class. Thus his analysis of capitalism has the major task of outlining how the process of exploitation results in class struggle and therefore indicates the possibility of communism: “In short, the theory of surplus value proves the necessity, the absolute unavoidability, of the struggle between capital and labour, classes with irreconcilable interests. This is the granite foundation for every analysis of capitalist economics, politics and social life, which can only be understood clearly and lucidly from the point of view of the exploited class, since the latter alone has a material interest in piercing the veil of mystification with which capital covers itself.”(11)

Thus Marx would argue that his motive for supporting the cause of the working class is because this represents the major basis for a superior alternative to the historical limitations of capitalism. Therefore the motive of the Marxist intellectual is not primarily one of power, and is instead a moral one concerning how to most effectively overcome the economic and political problems associated with capitalism. It could be argued that unintentionally and psychologically Marx is motivated by the aim of power. But the theoretical point is that this possible motivation is not expressed by his writings. There is no implicit view that the dictatorship of the proletariat could be expressed by a single person, nor is technology equated with the rule of a new elite. This standpoint is outlined more explicitly by the various writings of the French utopian socialists. Instead Marx is motivated by the aim of the self-emancipation of the working class. In this context the role of technology is about the promotion of the material interests of the workers, and the objective basis of human emancipation.

Ultimately, Gouldner recognises that he cannot 'prove' that Marx had personal ambitions, and so he tries to outline his argument in philosophical terms. He suggests that Marx differentiated between the popular materialism of the immediate economic issues motivating the working class, from a higher type of materialism which connected the role of the immediate with more long-term goals. The assumption is that only the intellectuals can understand this difference in terms of a higher rationality that is able to make choices that are superior to the expression of this popular materialism: “Marxism thus accepts popular materialism, and with this the everyday theory of interest, but only to a limited extent, only as a starting mechanism to launch the proletariat in “spontaneous”...struggle against the bourgeoisie. For interests of the working class are seen as limited. They permit what is at best courageous but unable to bring the working class's struggle to a successful emancipatory conclusion.”(12) This standpoint is very contentious. Instead of being critical of the everyday struggle of the workers, Marx was always prepared to outline its possibilities. For example, the struggle for the ten hour working day would promote the potential to establish the influence of the working class within capitalism. Marx comments that: “The establishment of a normal working day is therefore the product of a protracted and more or less concealed civil war between the capitalist class and working class.”(13) Consequently, far from dismissing the popular materialism of the working class, Marx was instead intent on outlining its possibilities. In other words, Marx was intent on articulating the potential of the popular materialism of the proletariat, and in that manner connecting this standpoint to the aim of communism. The approach of Marx was not to suggest that theoretical rationality was superior to popular materialism, but instead to indicate the compatibility of these two approaches, and in this manner establish the interaction of theory and practice. But what was primary was the class action of the workers; it was this that expressed the potential for superseding capitalism and establishing communism. Every strike, in some sense, represented the prospect for the communist alternative. Hence it would be inconsistent for Marx to contrast theory and practice. Instead theory was the ability to learn the lessons of practice and without the very expression of practice, the role of theory would be impossible. In this manner, the role of theory was to outline the very revolutionary promise of the spontaneous struggle of the working class, or the significance of popular materialism.

This approach is the very opposite to Gouldner's interpretation of Marxism, which locates the popular materialism of the workers in a secondary place when contrasted to the superiority of the rationality of theory. Such an approach could be said to be the initial methodology of Lenin and Bolshevism, but Marx's perspective was nearer to Luxemburg's emphasis on the dynamism and promise of the class struggle. To Marx, the role of the intellectuals was to recognise and interpret the very potential of the dynamic of popular materialism. The task of theory was not to contrast it to the supposed inferiority of practice. This intellectual elitism was the opposite to the approach of Marx. Hence, Marx outlined the emancipatory possibilities of the Paris Commune despite having reservations about its formation. He considered the Commune to be the expression of the potential for socialism and communism, even if this was not the explicit aim of the Communards. This conclusion was because he recognised the possibilities of the Commune in relation to the process of its formation, and despite the limitations in the explicit consciousness of the Communards. Thus what Marx described as the Commune was the logic of the self-activity of its participants, or the possible results of the dynamism of popular materialism.

 Gouldner outlines a number of episodes in which Marx utilises his intellectual prowess in order to isolate possible political competitors in the interpretation of revolutionary politics and socialism, such as Weitling. He summarises this development in the following manner: “Believing in the validity of its own view of the social world, and believing that much hangs on the possession of correct ideas, Marxists (like others) work to place themselves in strategic positions where their theory can shape events, a the same time they seek to prevent others, bearing theories they deem wrong from capturing influential positions. The contest between theories is thus accompanied by a more or less visible struggle among different theorists to control social positions, to co-opt social resources, or to influence social movements.”(14) Gouldner has undoubtedly described one of the most unpleasant aspects of politics, and Marx did engage in arrogant activity that would enhance his influence and prestige within the socialist movement. Marx's humiliation of Weitling's political stature is one of the unpleasant episodes in Marx's political activity, and cannot be excused, but it would be dogmatic to interpret this episode in the manner descried by Gouldner: “Precisely, because they are outsiders, intellectuals are disposed to deny that workers have a privileged understanding even of their own lives and conditions. For first, (it is said) the latter may see and react only to what is most immediately visible in their everyday lives, and second they may interpret this in terms of unassimilated ideologies, which may overemphasise economic and social questions like the wage question, but ignore the larger political circumference......The Marxist critique of workers false consciousness is also a fact of politics, reflecting the competition between artisans and intellectuals in the “Workers” movement, and legitimating the latter's claim to special authority in it.”(15) If this supposed power struggle motivated Marx his political history would be inexplicable. For example, his rivalry with Weitling did not mean Marx was primarily motivated by power. Instead he was concerned to articulate what he considered to be the necessary political stance for the class struggle. For example, he advocated the leadership of the German workers during the attempt to establish bourgeois democratic in 1848-49. Hence his opposition to Weitling was because of the latter's voluntarism and not because Weitling was a worker, or artisan. Furthermore, Gouldner has to acknowledge that Marx's major priority was to write 'Capital' and not to engage in the struggle for political supremacy within socialist organisations.

When Marx became involved in the First International his role was modest and limited. His intervention became limited to opposing Bakunin's attempt to control the organisation. However, Gouldner considers that this was an expression of Marx's intellectual elitism because he is biased towards Bakunin, and he has sympathy for Bakunin's version of anarchism. Bakunin's interpretation of positivist social science and Marxism led him to advocate a society of voluntary social organisations that would utilise co-operation rather than state power in order to develop an emancipatory society. Gouldner sympathetically comments that: “Bakunin had wrought a distinctively new synthesis whose originality still seems not to have won the appreciation it deserves. Indeed, it would be my own net conclusion on the questions on which Marx and Bakunin differed – the oppressive role of the state even under socialism, the elitist role of the new class, and whether it was Germany or Russia that would be the most reactionary force in nineteenth century Europe – it was Bakunin's analysis that was more nearly correct.”(16)

The point is that Marx had no alternative other than to oppose Bakunin's ideology because the latter was claiming that Marxism represented the ideology of a new class that would create a regime of oppressive state power. Marx did not object to Bakunin propagating his ideas within the International, but what he objected to was the disruption of the organisational cohesion of the International by the formation of secretive societies. Indeed it could be argued that Marx's concern with Bakunin's disruptive activities meant he neglected the task of replying in detail to his criticisms of Marxism. It was Engels who outlined why the Marxist conception of revolution, as modelled on the Paris Commune and the dictatorship of the proletariat did not mean the formation of a new state that dominated the majority of the working class. But it is also necessary to acknowledge that Marx and Engels did not provide a systematic and detailed opposition to the criticisms made by Bakunin of their position. This situation has to be rectified by a response to the views of Bakunin.

Bakunin's approach is based on the understanding that what makes social emancipation possible is support for moral values like freedom and equality. Thus he is not primarily concerned with what can make social progress possible, which is connected to economic development and the class cohesion of the working class. Instead in a voluntarist manner, he outlines how the aspiration of freedom connected to liberty will somehow in a dynamic manner realise the type of society that ends all power, privilege and domination: “I have in mind this liberty of everyone, which, far from finding itself checked by the freedom of others is, on the contrary confirmed by it and extended to infinity. And I have in mind the freedom of each individual unlimited by the freedom of all, freedom in solidarity, freedom in equality, freedom triumphing over brute force and the principle of authority (which was ever the ideal expression of this force) a freedom which having overthrown all heavenly and earthly idols, will have founded and organised a new world, the world of human solidarity, upon the ruins of churches and states.”(17) It is interesting that Bakunin does not justify his approach in terms of any coherent conception of historical development and class struggle. Instead he has outlined a collection of moral values and subjectively suggested that they 'ought' to be realised. This means he does not establish the importance of structural restraints that could undermine the realisation of his values, or alternatively indicate their compatibility. For example, the aims of freedom and equality could be shown to be in a tense relationship between it could be argued that the consistent application of equality means the end of the economic freedom of the capitalist. Indeed a society of absolute freedom is not possible. Nor is a society without power. The realistic merit of Marx and Engels is to outline how the political possibility of socialism is based on a society in which the working class has power, or the ability to influence the legislation of society in a dominant manner. Obviously, it is vital that such a society does not become the justification of the rule of a new repressive elite, but the point is that they are establishing concerns how socialism can become possible. The working class needs to be in a situation in which it controls the state, and so utilises state power in a progressive manner, such as encouraging industrial democracy within the economy. To the anarchist this very expression of political power is oppressive, but they do not explain how a society without any form of power is possible. Hence their conception of the future society is based on a collection of moral oughts, and there is no realism in this standpoint. The actual logic of Bakunin's position is to justify the freedom of the individual, but the problem with this view is that it becomes conducive to the re-formation of capitalism. The point is that a society without any centre of power becomes the expression of individualism, or the basis to promote the development of capitalism based on individual ownership of the means of production. In contrast, the state power of the working class is based on the understanding that this situation is in order to undermine the possibility for the restoration of capitalism. Instead political power has a constructive purpose; it is in order to promote the formation of communism. Hence the realistic socialist society has an aspect of power, domination and authority, but these aspects will not be oppressive because the goal of society is the realisation of human emancipation. In contrast, the anarchist upholds a collection of moral values, but is unable to explain how they would be realised without a system of power and domination. Instead in an implicit manner it is being suggested that these values are sufficient for their own realisation, or in an autonomous and idealist manner. But this standpoint is nonsensical because only some form of authority can enable these values to be realised within society, but Bakunin has rejected the role of authority because it is considered as being inherently oppressive. This type of anarchist society will soon descend into chaos, it will be without law and order, and the aspiration to solidarity will become unrealistic in this chaotic situation. The very decomposition of society will be the logical outcome of the anarchist approach. In contrast, Marxism advocates the role of a democratic and accountable state that will have the necessary political power in order to promote socialism. This situation will not necessarily uphold centralisation. Instead the economy will be de-centralised in terms of the self-government of industry by the producers, and the state itself will involve the participation of society. But the point is that there will be a centre of power that is able to ensure that the promotion of the objectives of socialism will be promoted and realised.

Bakunin contends that in order that oppression shall cease it is necessary to ensure that there is no centre of political power or domination. But this development will not end the role of power, but instead individuals will ensure that unequal power relations occur between them. It is unrealistic to suggest that the very role of power should be ended. Instead power should be regulated in the most accountable and democratic manner, via the role of a commune state which is based on the participation and supervision of the people. This central power will also be able to establish the priorities of society in terms of promoting the end of economic exploitation and the development of democratic planning in order to generate the construction of socialism. In contrast, Bakunin considers that the state can only be an expression of the impulse of individuals to establish their power over society. (18) This stance is based on the view that the state must be uniquely corruptive, and so results in the aspiration of a few people to dominate society, via their control of the state. The problem with this viewpoint is that it is unable to establish any alternative credible form of authority within society. Indeed, Bakunin is against the role of authority. The logic of his position is to accept the dynamic of chaos within society. This prospect can be opposed with the formation of a democratic state that is not controlled by a few individuals and is instead accountable to society, like the Paris Commune. In this manner the role of power can be regulated, and coercion kept to a minimum. Bakunin argues in a dogmatic manner that the realisation of a democratic state is not possible. Hence he denies the possible that people can form political structures that they are able to control, and so ensure that dictatorship does not form. He is unable to outline what the alternative of a society without authority would mean. Indeed it is impossible to form a society without the application of the principles of power, authority and some form of domination. The vital point is which class exercises power. Unfortunately the logic of Bakunin's position is that he is also against the utilisation of power by the proletariat. He is against the formation of a proletarian state. This means that his position is objectively counter-revolutionary. The point is that he can only promote a collection of moral values rather than being able to outline a valid conception of an emancipatory society. This problem is connected to the individualist emphasis of his approach which means that he cannot establish a collective character to the type of society he is advocating.

The criticism of Marxism as being the ideology of an elite who consider that they have a monopoly of truth over the understanding of science and society is not based on any accurate evaluation of this standpoint. Nor is the claim 'that on the morrow of the revolution the new social order should be set up not by the free integration of workers associations, villages, communes and regions from below....conforming to the needs and instincts of the people, but solely by the dictatorial power of the learned minority, allegedly expressing the general will of the people'(19) You could be forgiven for forgetting that Marx's major elaboration of the political character of the state of socialism was based on support for the Paris Commune. In his praise of this development, Marx made no mention of any elite role for a vanguard minority, and instead made suggestions about how the Commune could realise its democratic potential. However, he still considered the Commune to be a form of state because the conditions had not matured for its demise. In other words in contrast to the impatient desire of the Anarchists that the state should immediately be dissolved after the revolution, Marx was cautious and wanted to outline the continued historical possibilities of a new type of state. A state based on the political rule of the working class, and which would promote the maximum participation of society in relation to its activity. This state was necessary in order to organise against the potential for counterrevolution, and to supervise the democratic activity of its functioning. Hence the very exceptional character of the state that Marx was recommending was that it was not a state based on the rule of an elite, and instead it was a state in which its decisions were made in the most democratic manner, in terms of the accountability of its officials to the people. Furthermore, Marx was not instructing the Commune how to proceed; instead he was trying to extract the theoretical lessons of its actual practice. The decisions of the Commune were made by its Proudhonist majority, and Marx was content to outline what this policy meant in terms of the potential to create a state that would promote the aim of communism.

Bakunin contends that Marx's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat meant the rule of a privileged minority: “Between revolutionary dictatorship and the state principle, the difference is only the external situation. In substance both are one and the same: the ruling of the majority by the minority in the name of the alleged stupidity of the first and the alleged superior intelligence of the second. Therefore both are equally reactionary, both having their result the invariable consolidation of the political and economic privilege of the ruling minority and the political and economic enslavement of the masses of people.”(20) This understanding of Marx's perspective of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not based on an actual study of Marx's views of this question, and is instead Bakunin's interpretation of the possible logical result of this standpoint. Marx, himself, was emphatic that the dictatorship of the proletariat meant the political rule of the working class, and his example of this situation was provided by the Paris Commune and its democratic tendencies towards the participation of the people in the administration of the state. He was certainly not advocating the rule of the people by a vanguard party or elite. In this context, there is nothing to suggest that he was in favour of a one party state, and instead Marx was supportive of a multi-party system based on universal suffrage and the accountability of representatives to their electors. However, the reason that he elaborated the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat was that this would represent the major influence of the working class in terms of the administration of the state. The state was still necessary in order to organise the political activity of society, and to supervise the economy, which would be based on the self-government of the producers. In this context what was a workers state would not implicitly represent the rule of a minority over the majority. If this possibility was to occur it would mean that the hegemony of the workers state had been ended, and instead a new form of exploitative state had been established. Marx's theoretical and political aim was to establish a profoundly democratic state that would involve the participation of the people, and in this manner promote the realisation of the aim of communism.

Bakunin establishes his position that Marxism defends the conception of an elite minority dictatorship because he cannot consider any other possible motive for this standpoint: “Now it is clear why the doctrinaire socialists who have for their aim the overthrow of the existing authorities and regimes in order to build upon the ruins of the latter a dictatorship of their own, never were and never will be enemies of the state, but on the contrary that they were and ever will be its zealous champions.”(21) To Bakunin only opposition to the historical role of the state is principled and revolutionary. Any other standpoint means, as with Marx, self-interested support for a minority regime, of the formation of a state that oppresses the majority of the people. Thus Bakunin considers that Marx's view that a state can be formed that is based on the interests of the majority of society is an invalid and inconsistent view. But Marx opposes Anarchism because he maintains that it is not possible to establish organisation and administration in a society after a revolution without the formation of a state. This state will not represent a minority dictatorship because it is based on institutions that involve the participation of the majority of society. Bakunin replies to this view and contends that: “One may ask then: if the proletariat is to be the ruling class, over whom will it rule? The answer is that there will remain another proletariat which will be subject to this new domination, the new state.”(22) In this context, Bakunin is making a valid point about, how to avoid the problem in which the role of the administrators becomes privileged and so results in domination over those being administered. However, his answer is idealist and absolute because to him only the demise of the state can overcome this problem. Instead of this dogmatism, and inability to recognise the practical necessity for the state, we would suggest, following Marx, that the answer to this complex question is that only the formation of a democratic state that is truly accountable to society can resolve the issue of privilege and domination. Bakunin considers that this issue can only be resolved by the abolition of the state. This is an unrealistic approach to a genuine problem. Instead it will be necessary to continue to improve the workers state, which ultimately will be responsive to the needs of society because it is based on the importance of multi-party elections. In this manner the state does not become the expression of the interests of a remote bureaucratic caste.

Bakunin also asks the connected question: “What does it mean, “the proletariat raised into a ruling class?” Will the proletariat as a whole be raised to the head of the government? There are about forty million Germans. Will all forty million be members of the government? The whole people will govern and there will be no one to be governed. It means there will be no government, no state, but if there is a state in existence there will be people who are governed, and there will be slaves.”(23) Marx did reply and suggest that this was what he meant, but in practice not all the people will be able to govern. The organisational efficiency of government will mean that the state is composed of a small amount of people, but what will undermine this situation becoming one of domination is that this state, and it local forms, will be accountable to the people. The role of democracy is vital in ensuring that the state can act in accordance with the wishes of the working people. Bakunin cannot recognise the validity of this perspective, because to him the state is the expression of domination and authority within society. Only abolishing the state will satisfy Bakunin. The problem is that he is vague as to how this society can function without descending into chaos. Instead he is content to ridicule the approach of Marxism. He contends that: “By a people's government they mean the governing of people by means of a small number of representatives chosen by the people. Universal suffrage – the right of the people to elect its so-called representatives and rulers of the state – that is the last word of the Marxists as well as the democratic school. And this is a falsehood behind which lurks the despotism of a governing minority, a falsehood which is all the more dangerous as it appears as the ostensible expression of the people's will.”(24) In other words the dogmatism of Bakunin has led him to argue that unless the state is abolished even the most democratic form of representation of the people can only result in the domination of a small minority. He does not recognise that democracy can be the very system by which the role of the representatives is made accountable to the people. The government of a few people is made genuinely an expression of the will of the people because the representatives are accountable as a result of the system of democracy of the highest order. Bakunin cannot recognise this possibility; he will only be satisfied with abolition of the state!

In other words, Bakunin has conceded that Marx wants the highest level of political participation within society, and the development of genuine democracy, but he cannot recognise that this is because Marx aspires to the creation of a workers state that is concerned to advance the aim of communism. Instead Bakunin still contends that Marx is upholding the conception of a minority dictatorship because he is against the abolition of the state. However, this criticism is crucially flawed because Bakunin can outline what he is against, but he cannot elaborate what he is in favour of. Bakunin argues that Marx's state would consist of the vanguard elite, or the party of Marxists. (25) This view is a caricature of what Marx is advocating. Marx was obviously aware that the Paris Commune had few Marxists within its administration. But he supported the Commune because he understood that it actions within the given circumstances were promoting the ability of the working class to establish the most genuinely democratic form of government. Furthermore, the Commune was acting to facilitate the transition to higher forms of society which would mean the advance towards communism. Hence Marx envisaged that it was entirely possible that the revolutionary transformation of society could occur without the formation of a Marxist based government. Instead the very dynamics of the class struggle could result in the creation of a democratic and participatory state that was promoting the demise of capital and advancing the interests of the working class.

Furthermore, the social and political progress of the workers state would create the conditions for the demise of the role of the state because a communist society has been realised. Bakunin considers that this view is contradictory: “They say that this state yoke – the dictatorship – is a necessary transitional means in order to attain the emancipation of the people: Anarchism or freedom is the goal, the state, the dictatorship is the means. Thus to free the working masses, it is first necessary to enslave them.”(26) This view of Marxism is contradictory only if we consider the dictatorship of the proletariat to be a minority government of an elite, and in this situation it would be unrealistic to expect that it could promote the formation of a classless society without the role of a state. But Marx considered that this government could be truly democratic, and the genuine participation of the people in the administration of society would create the political conditions for the demise of any form of state. In fact that aim is ambitious because the aim of the end of the role of the state is unrealistic. The state is necessary in order to organise society, but it can be transformed so that it becomes the highest form of state in terms of its accountability to society and related high levels of involvement of the people in its administration.

Bakunin contends that it is illusory to consider that the role of the state will bring about the emancipation of working people. To some extent this is fair comment because what is of crucial importance is the transformation of the economy so that it becomes an expression of the self-government of the producers. The state has a modest role in facilitating this possibility, and ensuring that democracy is the principle for the political organisation of society. Hence the state is not necessarily the most crucial apparatus for social emancipation, but it does have an important role. In contrast, Bakunin has only one policy, which is destruction of the state immediately after the revolution. This action, even if could be considered to be practical and feasible, would only result in the generation of a lack of social cohesion within society. This would mean chaos occurs, and the functioning of the economy would be seriously undermined. However, Bakunin makes an important ideological point; he outlines how support for the role of the state should not result in accommodation for the national state under capitalism. (27) But his conception of the role of a society without a state is reduced to a collection of slogans like freedom, equality and justice. What this means in practice is not outlined in satisfactory detail. Instead he defines his approach in the following manner: “On our banner, the social-revolutionary banner....the destruction of all states the annihilation of bourgeois civilisation, free and spontaneous organisation from below....by means of free association, the organisation of the unbridled rabble of toilers, of all emancipated humanity, and the creation of a new universally human world.”(28)

In other words, Bakunin's standpoint is basically an assortment of values which are meant to represent the basis of the development of a society without the state. He does not establish why this society would be superior and more emancipatory than a workers state. In contrast, Marx utilises the example of the Paris Commune in order to establish the political principles of a society that is aiming to overcome capitalism and establish the semi-state of the working class regime. Marx is careful to avoid any suggestion that this regime would be a justification for the rule of an elite. Indeed he does not outline what would be the role of a Marxist party in this revolutionary process. Instead he emphasises that the workers state would be accountable to society, and is based on the principle of popular participation and the importance of mass organs of administration. It could be argued that this type of society is unworkable and will result in the dictatorship of an elite, but if this criticism is to be valid it could also be made of Bakunin's post-revolutionary society. Bakunin's approach is based on the implausible view that it is possible to realise an emancipatory society without any central organisation, it consists of a loose collection of local organs and regions. He seems to suggest that spontaneity will replace the principle of organisation in the formation of society, but this is a recipe for dislocation and fragmentation. Instead of this chaos, Marx is still aware of the necessity for authority, but he defines in terms of being popular and democratic. In this context a minority dictatorship would be a distortion and denial of the principles of the Commune state. The regime of the Marxist party would be in opposition to the democratic principles of a genuine workers state. In this very important sense, Marx is not trying to justify the regime of a new class or of the intellectuals. Instead his aim is openly proclaimed which is to create a principled dictatorship of the proletariat in order to promote the realisation of communism.

Gouldner defends Bakunin and suggests that he understood that Marx underestimated the problem of power. But the point is that Bakunin evaded the issue of power because he could only envisage society in terms of the total rejection of effective authority. In contrast, Marx wanted to ensure that power was regulated in terms of the role of the influence of the mass organs of the working class, which were able to supervise and define the actions of the state. Under these political conditions it was not possible for the state to act in a manner that was not based on accountability to society. But Bakunin was not able to establish similar criteria of how power was to be restricted within the revolutionary regime, instead all he could do was to moralise about the corrupting influence of power. Gouldner also repeats Bakunin's view that Marx was justifying the regime of the intellectuals in the form of a centralised state, and connects this view to the importance of culture and education. But whilst Marx may be reticent to tackle this issue, it is implicitly tackled in terms of the fact that he considered the democratic Paris Commune as his model of the future society. In this manner the domination of the intellectuals would be a violation of the democratic aspiration to create a regime without privilege and in this manner connected to the interests of the working class, and of society in general. Gouldner also indicates that according to Bakunin, Marx ignored the importance of a change of consciousness because of his emphasis on the role of the economic. This claim is extraordinary. Marx was aware that revolutionary change would only occur if a corresponding transformation of class consciousness occurred. Capitalism was dominant because of the influence of bourgeois ideology, and in this context the potential for socialism meant that increasingly militant practice in the class struggle would also promote the radicalisation of the working class. Hence it is a caricature to imply that Marx's approach was based on economic determinism which ignored the role of consciousness. Instead the economic only created the pre-conditions or material basis for socialism, but the act of change would imply the importance of human conscious action. However, in opposition to Marx's coherent historical materialism, Bakunin upheld the importance of a vague collection of moral values for explaining revolutionary change. This approach justified voluntarism, as Gouldner agrees, but it means that he lacked a systematic and coherent conception of revolutionary change.

But Gouldner is correct to outline how Bakunin recognised the revolutionary potential of the peasantry in contrast to Marx. But this does not mean that Bakunin had a systematic perspective of the relationship of the proletariat and peasantry in the revolutionary process. Indeed, Gouldner admits that Bakunin conceived of revolution as the destruction of the old order. Gouldner is forced to admit that this does not suggest the appropriate basis for the success of the revolution. Instead he accepts that this approach suggests a regime based on mass terror. Despite his reservations about aspects of Bakunin's politics, Gouldner ultimately supports him against Marx because: “The society that is premised, as well as the political measures through which Marx proposes to bring it about, both entail building the state apparatus, its centralisation, increasing the scope and variety of its functions, the extension of its powers, and along with this, an increasing role for intellectuals and other technical specialists whose skills are a kind of cultural capital acquired through specialized education.”(29) This viewpoint is not based on what Marx has actually justified, but is instead based on the assumptions made by Bakunin about Marx. The only detailed understanding of the revolutionary state made by Marx is the one that is based on his observations of the Paris Commune. This is not some form of justification of the regime of intellectuals, but is instead about the possibilities created by the actions of the working class in Paris. If he wrote anything at all about the intellectuals it was to briefly deny his support for a new form of repressive and elitist regime. The theory of Marx was not elitist, but this does not mean that it could be interpreted in an elitist manner. This is the issue that will have to be tackled when we study Leninism.

POST-MARX MARXISM

Gouldner contends that Leninism was merely the continuation of the Marxist concept of the importance of the intelligentsia. Lenin provided an organisational form for this understanding in terms of outlining the importance of the vanguard party for leading the working class in the process of revolution. Gouldner outlines how Lenin applied this elitist reasoning to the understanding of the character of the post-revolutionary state. There was no suggestion that it would not be based on the party's leadership of the working class. This standpoint may have some merit, but it is based on an amalgam of various events in Lenin's political history. In actuality, the reality is more complex. The 1917 revolution transformed the perspective of Lenin. He had previously advocated a party led conception of the revolutionary process, but the formation of Soviets in 1917 radically modified his approach. The fact that the February revolution has been the outcome of the spontaneous mass action of the working class, and that the result was the formation of Soviets, meant that his conception of the relationship of party to class was altered. He recognised that the character of the Soviets was connected to the role of the Commune state in Paris of 1871. The very actions of the working class had led to the formation of a type of state power which could realise a popular and democratic alternative to the bourgeois Provisional government. Hence the aim was no longer a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry which meant the effective realisation of the party dictatorship of the Bolsheviks. Instead the changed strategy of the Bolsheviks meant the promotion of the formation of the realisation of the Commune type state in the form of the Soviets assuming political power. The working class has by its revolutionary energy created the potential state form that can emancipate society and end the domination of capitalism. The role of the Bolsheviks is to adapt to the dynamism of the working class and to express its logic in terms of the perspective of calling for 'All Power to the Soviets'. The very actions of the working class express the basis of the strategy of the Bolsheviks. The latter only attempts to establish the logic of what mass struggle has made possible: “The class significance (and the class explanation) of the transitional and unstable situation is this: like all revolutions, our revolution required the greatest heroism and self-sacrifice on the part of the people for the struggle against Tsarism, it also immediately drew unprecedentedly vast numbers of ordinary citizens into the movement.”(30) This means that the task of revolutionary party is to connect to the mass movement, and to make it conscious of its ultimate logic – the realisation of Soviet power.

The character of Bolshevism during 1917 was based on the actual possibilities of the mass unrest with the bourgeois government. The fact that the society was not ready for socialism was bound to be underestimated and effectively ignored during this period. The central question was how to connect the role of the Soviets with the task of the seizure of power. This meant the aim of the revolutionary process was how to establish Soviet power, and therefore create a Commune state. This aim seemed to be realised with the October revolution. But the isolation of the regime, combined with increasing economic problems and the threat of the civil war, meant the perspective of the Commune state seemed to be increasingly ambitious by mid-1918. Lenin outlined his systematic modification of the aims of the regime in his pamphlet: 'The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government'.(31) Lenin outlines how the economic and political tasks of the Soviet government require the important role of the working class, but this role is connected to the question as to whether the productivity of the economy can be enhanced: “Such a revolution can be successfully carried out only if the majority of the population, and particularly the majority of the working people, engage in independent creative work as makers of history. Only if the proletariat and the poor peasants display sufficient class consciousness, devotion to principle, self-sacrifice and perseverance, will the victory of the socialist revolution be assured. By creating a new Soviet type of state, which gives the working and oppressed people the chance to take an active part in the independent building up of a new society; we solved only a small part of this difficult problem. The principal difficulty lies in the economic sphere, namely the introduction of the strictest and universal accounting and control of the production and distribution of goods, raising the productivity of labour and socialising production in practice.”(32)

Lenin has concluded from the character of the Soviet revolution that the principal aspect is the dynamic role of the working class and poor peasants. They have made the revolution and so should express the basis to utilise their dynamism in order to generate the possibility of a new society. This process takes the form of the creation of a Commune or Soviet state which because of the participation of the people is able to promote the development of an economy of a similar character. However, it is also suggested that the complex character of the task of administering society and the economy may mean that this principle of popular participation is diluted. Therefore it is not surprising that he also argues: “Without the guidance of experts in the various fields of knowledge, technology and experience, the transition to socialism will be impossible, because socialism calls for a conscious mass advance to greater productivity of labour compared with capitalism....Socialism must achieve this advance in its own way, by its own methods.....Had our proletariat, after capturing power, quickly solved the problem of accounting, control and organisation on a national scale.....then we....would have completely subordinated these bourgeois experts to ourselves by means of universal accounting and control.”(33)

This comment indicates that compromise of the principle of the involvement of the working class in the development of a socialist society had nothing to do with the historic views expressed by Lenin about the primary role of the vanguard party. Instead this dilution of principle was because of doubts concerning the abilities of the working class to solve acute economic problems and in this manner develop productivity. It was considered that only with the role of the bourgeois technical experts would it be possible to generate the necessary efficiency in order to promote the effective functioning of the economy in order to resolve the outstanding problems inherited from the disruption of the war. Hence Lenin's acceptance of the necessity to dilute the principle of workers control had nothing to do with either Marxist theory or his own historic conception of the relationship between party and class; instead it was the outcome of the specific unfavourable situation in Russia, and the important necessity to quickly develop the productive forces. In this context Lenin considered that the decree on workers control was transitory in relation to the realisation of higher forms of production relations. The assumption was that workers control did not represent the sufficient organisational potential to facilitate the necessary functioning of the economy. Hence principles about the involvement of the workers in the economic and political administration of society had to be constantly compromised in order to promote more efficient organisation. Thus Lenin bluntly contends: “Had the proletariat, acting through the Soviet government, managed to organise accounting and control on a national scale, or at least laid the foundations for such control, it would not have been necessary to make such compromises.”(33) This viewpoint establishes that the policy changes in terms of the employment of the bourgeois experts are not the preferred option. It would have been more desirable to have been able to establish effective workers control of production. But this has not been possible because of what Lenin calls a lack of accounting and control within the economy. The implication is that the economy has not developed because of this non-functional situation. Hence it was necessary to take the pragmatic measure of encouraging the role of bourgeois experts in order to develop the possibility to overcome the fragmentation and dis-organisation of the economy. In this context, he does start to define the regime in an authoritarian manner: “Dictatorship, however, is a big word, and big words should not be thrown about carelessly. Dictatorship is iron rule government that is revolutionary, bold, swift and ruthless in supressing both exploiters and hooligans.....And the struggle....cannot be waged solely with the aid of propaganda and agitation, solely by organising competition and by selecting organisers. The struggle must also be waged by means of coercion.”(35)

Thus Lenin's approach has begun with the outline of the conception of a democratic and participatory form of class struggle, in which the dynamism of the workers and poor peasants is crucial to the success of the attempt to consolidate the Soviet regime. However the dire economic problems not only mean that this perspective is compromised but that the policy of appointing bourgeois experts to supervise the workers is also upheld. But this development becomes the basis to uphold the authoritarian view that a minority government – presumably of the party – becomes the political basis of society and this minority dictatorship is maintained by the role of coercion. The terrible economic problems have meant that any continued support for the popular organisation of the Soviet regime becomes rejected. Instead the role of democracy becomes a formality, in order to 'let off steam. In practice the regime becomes based on the subordination of the workers to the managers of the given enterprise: “We must learn to combine the “Public meeting” democracy of the working people – turbulent, surging, overflowing its banks like a spring flood – with iron discipline while at work, with unquestioning obedience to the will of a single person, the Soviet leader while at work.”(36) It is difficult to envisage that the participatory character of the Soviet state could survive under these conditions of authoritarianism in the workplace. Instead Lenin continues to insist that the Soviets, as the expression of being the Commune state, have a profound organic relationship to working people: “The fight against the bureaucratic distortion of the Soviet organisation is assumed by the firmness of the connection between the Soviets and the people...Even in the most democratic capitalist republics in the world, the poor would never regard the bourgeois parliament as “their” institution. But the Soviets are “theirs” and not alien institutions to the workers and peasants.”(37)

This was the illusion that enabled Lenin to justify the authoritarian measures within the economy, and coercive methods in relation to politics in general. He could still uphold the dogma that the Soviets represented a commune state, and were based on the participation of the people. However, Lenin became increasingly aware of the bureaucratic measures of the Soviets and state. He proposed measures to rectify this situation. But he did not recognise that this improvement would be limited and inadequate if it was not connected to the development of industrial democracy within the economy. He also did not understand that genuine Soviet democracy would require the restoration of multi-party democracy. Instead Lenin was the original founder of state socialism, which represented the politics of a degenerated workers state. It was Stalin, who in the name of the party, ended this transitional situation and imposed the rule of the new class. Stalin was the real creator of Gouldner's conception of the new class.
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