The Conception of Socialism by Phil Sharpe

Hillel Ticktin has recently written an article for Weekly Worker about his vision of socialism. (1) The major problem is that he concentrates on economic issues and ignores the importance of politics. He does not address the importance of the class struggle for influencing the character of the post-capitalist society, and nor does he outline his conception of the relationship of democracy to socialism. These are outstanding omissions. The aftermath of the October revolution was always influenced by the polarisation caused by this event, and it was never able to establish a satisfactory relationship of democracy to socialism. (2) Thus the legacy of the one and only genuine proletarian revolution is not promising in relation to the possibilities of establishing a society that is more democratic than advanced capitalism. The very process of revolutionary change will create tensions in regards to the relationship of democracy to the promotion of socialism. It is likely that the act of revolution will involve the importance of popular forms of democracy, such as workers councils. These organisations will supersede the significance of the institutions of Parliamentary democracy. This means there will be a conflict of political sovereignty between two conflicting forms of democracy. The Bolsheviks resolved this dilemma by dissolving the Constituent Assembly in favour of the Soviets, or organs of proletarian democracy. The latter were considered to be a superior political form, and therefore expressed more advanced democracy than the Constituent Assembly. (3) However, this reasoning was discredited by the fact that the Bolsheviks had been out polled by the Social Revolutionaries in the elections to the Constituent Assembly. Nevertheless this action of dissolving the Constituent Assembly was made credible by the fact that the Soviets had superior prestige, and the Assembly was relatively new and had not yet established its credentials.

The situation will be different in relation to any attempt to repress respected political institutions like the Parliament of the UK. Parliament has a long history, and is respected as an expression of the democratic will of the population. Its closure will cause outcry, and could result in the undermining of popular support for the revolutionary regime. The only principled democratic decision will be to uphold the joint sovereignty of Parliament and the workers councils. This situation is not without its tensions and limitations. This is because what will be created is a contradiction between the conflicting influences of bourgeois democracy and proletarian democracy. It will only be possible to resolve this problematical situation by a revolutionary party – hopefully with Labour Party support – standing to win a majority of seats within Parliament. In this context the activity of the workers councils, such as promoting industrial democracy and popular forms of economic and political organisation, should generate electoral support for the revolutionary party. It is also to be hoped that the immediate actions of the revolutionary regime will have proved to be a progressive alternative to the economic domination of capital. Under these circumstances we can hope for an electoral victory of the revolutionary party, and so the credibility of Parliament is upheld. However, if despite the increasing influence of the forms of popular democracy, victory in the election goes to the bourgeois parties, the working class must reluctantly accept the verdict. This is because the only alternative is civil war, which can have a devastating effect on society. But, it is to be hoped that the revolution will continue to generate support and represent the potential for a future victory in elections. It is necessary to emphasise that this scenario is only possible if the forces of the ruling class also accept the principles of democracy. If they refuse to accept a possible victory of the revolutionary party in Parliamentary elections then it will be necessary to suppress any reactionary revolt. However, we have to hope that such a situation can be avoided. In order that this possibility does not occur, the revolutionary party has to promise to agree to accept the results of any future Parliamentary election. The continual development of popular democracy and industrial democracy should ensure the permanent legitimacy of the revolutionary regime.

In other words there is a tense and often contradictory relationship between the dynamics of the class struggle and the interests of maintaining democracy. It would be very tempting to suppress existing forms of democracy in the name of revolutionary principles. It is vital that democracy is not repressed because the result of this action could be the formation of a single party state. Only if we manage the delicate task of reconciling democracy with the aims of the class struggle can we then begin to conceive of a situation of political stability that will enable us to contemplate the tasks of the development of socialist economy. Ticktin's glossing over of the necessity of immediate political tasks assumes a situation of inherent stability that may be very difficult to realise. Until he develops a strategy of democratic victory in the class struggle his economic conception of socialism will be an unrealistic utopia.

Ticktin immediately establishes strict criteria for the possibility of socialism: “However, there must be relative abundance or else there cannot be socialism at all, and there can be no market.”(4) This definition amounts to a rejection of what socialism could be in practice. The criterion of relative abundance is problematical in this era of ecological problems. The needed raw materials to develop an economy are precious and often scarce, and it will be necessary to produce the goods we need to realise human wants in the most effective and productive manner. The point is that the importance of scarcity cannot be overcome with the creation of the post-capitalist economy, and how we tackle this scarcity will be vital if the aim of socialism is to be realised. Furthermore, the significance of scarcity means that the role of the market cannot be dispensed with. This means production must be orientated towards the continued importance of supply and demand. The greater is the demand for a give item, the more production has to occur in order to realise this demand. This is how the market allocates resources and determines the levels of production. The only alternative to the market is the role of rationing or coercion as the method to decide how goods are distributed. These measures can only be utilised in exceptional circumstances. In general the failure to utilise the market in order to realise consumer demand will result in the discontent of the population.

The ability of advanced capitalist societies to generally meet the needs of the population will mean that socialist societies will have to be very effective in relation to their capacity to satisfy wants. People will not tolerate the low quality goods and waste of Stalinism. The only criteria by which needs can be satisfied in the most efficient manner is through the role of the market. It is the very experience of the USSR which has proved this point. The high level of production of consumer goods within advanced capitalism is also confirmation of the importance of distribution via the role of the market. We want to build on these achievements rather than attempt to develop a type of economy that is without precedence within social reality. However, there will also be large sections of the public sector, as Tony Smith explained, that will not be subject to market criteria. (5) This is because the role of the market in these areas would distort the ability to realise need. But, in relation to production of consumer goods that are able to satisfy expectations, there is no substitute for the role of the market.

Ticktin also makes another controversial statement: “Abstract labour amounts to the control and imprisonment of the ordinary worker and for that reason we cannot have abstract labour under socialism/communism. If it continues to exist it means there is no socialism/communism or any higher form of society: the worker is still exploited and controlled.”(6) This comment indicates the problem of conceiving reality in terms of categorical absolutes. Within the socialist society small businesses will not be nationalised under workers control, and so will still be subject to the importance of the law of value. In this context commodities will represent the character of abstract labour. If we applied the approach of Ticktin these enterprises will be nationalised in order to undermine the possibility of the generation of abstract labour. This development will only alienate the small business owner from the aims of socialism. Preobrazhensky has outlined a more realistic understanding of economic reality in the transitional period.(7) He argues that the period before the realisation of socialism is one of the competition between the forces of socialist economy and the private commodity sector. The state sector has to create the economic conditions by which the private sector becomes dependent on it. This will take the form of interaction, or the private sector selling goods to the state sector in exchange for industrial goods. Obviously his concrete analysis referred to the Soviet economy, but it seems a useful model for the process of transition in more advanced societies. The point is that whilst the forces of socialism are establishing their hegemony, the role of abstract labour, or the influence of the law of value, cannot be immediately overcome. Instead we would expect this transforming process to be of a long-term character. The very importance of the interaction of old and new economic forces means the alienated and abstract character of labour remains for an extended period of time.

What will determine the ability of the forces of socialist economy to become dominant is that it becomes more productive and effective than the private sector. In this context the state sector is able to produce goods in less time than the private sector. Hence labour time is still important in the transition period, but this situation is not an expression of exploitation because the domination of capital has been replaced with the ability of labour to define its own conditions of work. This means the ability to create cheap goods is because of the importance of the initiative and creativity of the workforce, and not because of the ability of capital to extract surplus value from alienated abstract labour. In contrast, Ticktin argues that because abstract labour is completely absent from the post-capitalist society it will not be possible to make calculations in terms of labour time. This seems a dogmatic view because of the continued importance of labour time for establishing the price of goods. However what has changed is that capital no longer determines the conditions of production. Instead industrial democracy means that the exploited character of labour is overcome.

Ticktin argues that it will not be possible to compare the value of different goods because the law of value does not operate and abstract labour is not generated. If the logic of this approach was carried to its conclusion it would not be possible to compare the worth of different goods. But this is where the importance of the market is vital. The market, or consumer demand, helps to define the value of a good in terms of willingness to purchase at a given price. If at a given price the consumers do not want to purchase, this indicates that price has to be lowered in order to promote demand. But, if the goods are quickly sold at a given price, this indicates the necessity to increase price in order to lower demand. However, there is a limit to the latter process in a socialist society. It may be preferable to increase production of the goods in order to continue to meet demand at the lower price. The point is that the relationship of supply and demand can be realised in a more flexible manner in a socialist type of society. The amount of labour time will also be an important guide for prices because this is an indicator of the value of the good. However, the good is not a commodity because the relations of production are no longer those of capital and labour.

Ticktin suggests that the character of abstract labour is identical to an act of compulsion within the labour process, and this is why it will be transcended under socialism. This view seems generally correct, but the role of labour time remains. This is because such criteria seem the only basis to compare the original worth of different goods. Hence the question of what is productive and efficient is still connected to the role of labour time. Instead of this objective criterion, Ticktin considers the question of productivity exclusively in terms of the perception of the workers: “In a socialist society you would expect workers to work in the way that they judge is correct. Since a worker's incentive under socialism is not money, they work as best they can in order that they not only fulfil what they are doing for the collectivity, but for themselves. You would expect them to work as well as they can, without any need for discipline from outside.”(8) This view is completely unrealistic. Under any advanced economy the workers will have some understanding of what they are expected to produce in a given time. This productivity of labour is the guideline by which they measure the efficiency of their work. However, under socialism the workers themselves are able to influence the process by which levels of productivity are established, and this procedure is not dominated by the role of managers and supervisors. There will also have to be rules and procedures by which quality control is understood and realised. Indeed, it is to be expected that the workers will have pride in their work and will not want to create defective goods. Under socialism this situation can be realised by the importance of self-discipline and is not enforced by the alienating agencies of capital.

In contrast to this understanding of how workers control would operate, Ticktin is vague about what is meant by 'society controlled by below.'(9) But he has also indicated that this situation will be connected to the importance of centralised control: “So there has to be control by the population as a whole, and the periphery and the centre must trust each other.”(10) This relationship will not work in these vague terms. The very historical experience of the USSR meant that the institutions of the centre undermined any possibility of democratic control from below. (11) This situation was intensified by the development of local management that was not accountable to the trade unions. Industrial democracy was considered to be impractical and so was quickly replaced with hierarchy in the form of national and local centralisation. Ticktin wants to maintain the expertise of the centre and connect it to the role of industrial democracy. This process will not work unless the centre is accountable to the local and national working class in the form of democratic supervision. The plan has to be the creation of the working class and not the experts. Hence the experts have to have a strictly supervisory role. If they have any greater power they will dominate the process of production. It will be argued that the working class is not cultured enough to be the major social force in the elaboration of the plan. Ticktin's formulation seems to accommodate this view. Instead of his ambiguity we will argue that the very conception of an economic centre of planning is problematical. Instead the workers should employ experts in order to promote the creation of a democratic and effective plan.

It is also necessary to suggest that the plan is not just the creation of the workers, but is also an expression of the aspirations of consumers. Indeed, workers are also consumers. In this context the role of the market or supply and demand will be a vital guideline for the plan. The plan will have to express flexibility in order to allow for sharp fluctuations in demand. Thus in order to work the plan has to reject rigid targets, and instead be flexible enough in order to be responsive to the possible rapid changes in consumer preference. Ticktin denies the importance of this issue because he comments: “Planning, including central planning would be entirely possible under socialism without a market: people would be able to walk into a distribution point and pick up what they need.”(12) This viewpoint is a recipe for massive over-production. He is forgetting that many products are perishable, and so in order to avoid waste an understanding of their level of demand is vital if the supply is not to be massively greater than consumer requirements. (A low level of over-production is unavoidable, and such surplus goods could be distributed for free) The point is the role of the market under socialism can be without the reactionary ideological influence it has under capitalism, and instead it becomes a neutral form of the allocation and distribution of scarce goods in the most effective manner. Without the market, which is no more than attempting to connect supply and demand, we have no guideline for distributing goods in the most effective manner. Indeed, the role of a plan without a market will still have to attempt to estimate demand. If it does not do so, the result will be massive inefficiency and waste of resources. Hence the actual objection to the role of market is ideological, or it is rejected because of associations with capitalism. This is a dogmatic view, and can only be practically sustained with the compulsory economic measures of War Communism. The Bolsheviks realised this approach was flawed, and instead the New Economic Policy had to connect the role of the market with the aim of promoting socialism.

Ticktin has also suggested the rejection of the role of money under socialism: “Obviously there will be no such thing as finance, and whole sections of economic activity will no longer exist because they are completely wasteful and unnecessary.”(13) This view only adds to the confusion. Society will not work without money. It has been argued that money is the essence of the law of value and the requirements of capital accumulation. (14) The point is that there is a transhistorical reason for money that transcends its connections to the requirements of capitalism. This is the ability of money to act as a universal representation that enables us to obtain the goods that we need. The only alternative is barter, or strict rationing via the role of coupons. These methods have ultimately proved unpopular. Instead people have generally been able to estimate the worth of goods in monetary terms. The popular saying 'value for money' is very perceptive. If money is abolished we effectively revert to more primitive forms of the universal equivalent. Thus what we should aim to do is to overcome the domination of capital within the relations of production without also rashly ending the role of money. Indeed, it is unlikely that society would accept the development of socialism without money. In other words wages become a genuine reward for the role of labour, and the connection between wages and exploitation is ended in the society aiming to realise socialism. It is also vital that the democratic plan is outlined in monetary terms. Only in this manner is it possible to connect levels of supply and demand in an accurate manner. Without these aspects we have no objective basis to estimate the overall and specific levels of value of the plan. It is important to recognise that the continue role of money does not mean that goods are commodities because labour is not exploited and therefore does not generate abstract labour in the process of production. Instead we have surplus product, goods instead of commodities, and money that does not express the wages of alienated labour. In the last analysis people will not tolerate a society without money. Full Stop.

It is also problematical to suggest that the financial services developed under capitalism may be unnecessary under socialism. Marx and Engels made the point that socialism will be based on the realisation of the potential of the achievements of capitalism. This could include the role of the banking sector. However, the banks will be made into co-operatives that will meet the requirements of its customers in a more effective manner. The banks will also remain a useful source of finance for investment in industry. In this manner, Lenin was right to suggest that socialism is the expression of state monopoly capitalism plus proletarian power. (15) We should not be indifferent to the importance of the forms of economic activity under advanced capitalism despite their relationship to capital accumulation and the exploitation of labour. Instead we should be sensitive to the possibility to adapt capitalism to the requirements of socialism. Ticktin makes this point in relation to the usefulness of computers, but he seems to deny this possibility in relationship to the role of finance capital.

It is also reckless to suggest categorically that there will be no arms production under socialism. Of course, this possibility will be realised with world socialism. However, it is entirely likely that the formation of socialism will occur in uneven terms, and that hostile capitalist societies may remain. In these circumstances the issue of unilateral disarmament will have to be carefully considered. The policy of peaceful co-existence will be promoted, but the question of the continued importance of nuclear weapons should be decided by careful evaluation of the threat from other societies. It is to be hoped that unilateral disarmament can be realised, but it would be dogmatic to deny the necessity of all forms of military defence. In this context, Ticktin should make his conception of socialism more precise. Is he considering what would be possible under world socialism, or instead the possibility of socialism within a situation of the continuing domination of international capitalism? The latter context means choices would be restricted, and the possibility of relative abundance would be even more problematical. However, the level of stability and harmony that he seems to suggest are to be conceived within his conception of the future society are related to the implicit assumption of the development of world socialism.

In order to make his approach precise he should outline at what level he is envisaging the character of the socialism he describes. This omission is nearly as important as his failure to outline the political conditions of the development of socialism. It is always vital to understand the significance of the balance of class forces. If we are considering the possibility of an isolated society that is trying to realise socialism then world revolution will be one of its most important tasks. This perspective will be connected with the revival of the Communist International and encouragement of the international class struggle. However, if we are contemplating world socialism then the issue of peace will be a primary priority. Ticktin fails to mention any of these questions. Instead all that is important to him is organising the economy. His emphasis on the economy means that he can gloss over the possible continued significance of the international class struggle. Yet his actual description of socialism is at the level of the national. Issues of trade and world economy are not mentioned. This goes alongside his neglect of the continued role of the private sector. In other words, the nasty problem of globalisation is not mentioned. Instead the prospect of the success of socialism in one country is assumed. The contradictions of this situation can be ignored in order to outline the abstract features of this timeless and geographically ambiguous socialist economy.

Ticktin is right to suggest that the only principled form of planning will be decentralised. He understands that the limitations of the Soviet economy were connected to its unrealistic attempts to maintain strict centralisation. Many goods and services can only be provided in terms of the importance of a local or regional input. This is an aspect of realism that is welcome. Unfortunately he fails to connect this sensible aspect to a more measured understanding of the socialist economy in general. Thus in relation to administration he conceives of society in terms of compulsory participation which seems to deny the individual the right to refuse a role in the organisation of society. He comments: “In contrast to current society, where people are so far removed from decision making, you would expect the people as a whole will take part in running society when given the opportunity. It is not just a question of elections: you would expect administration roles to be rotated and no-one would perform such roles permanently. It is only in this way that there could be a truly democratic system – democracy would have to be fully incorporated into the economy of society and be present throughout social life.”(16) The problem is that whilst we should attempt to oppose the formation of a rigid and elitist bureaucracy that dominates the state, and monopolises important positions within society, we cannot expect this possibility to be realised by an effective process of compulsion in relation to the question of involvement in the administration of society. Instead in a more voluntary manner people should be encouraged to participate in the promotion of the role of the commune state. It would be perfectly acceptable that individual have the right to decline involvement in the organisation of the state, and even to be non-political persons. One of the problems with Soviet society was the constant pressure to be a 'political person'. This type of pressure has to be ended, and instead the primary basis to make the state and government accountable will be the role of regular elections, and the right of recall of the elected delegates and state officials. The multi-party system in accordance with universal suffrage will become the primary basis to make the state accountable to society.

It is worrying that Ticktin seems to dismiss the importance of universal suffrage and the multi-party system. Instead he seems to implicitly accept the possibility a single party rule that presides over a commune state. If this is his intention it is entirely possible that all the bureaucratic and undemocratic limitations of the Bolshevik regime would be repeated. The very Soviet experience indicates that single party rule can only result in the generation of the unaccountable power of the bureaucracy. Ticktin glosses over the importance of rejecting support for this legacy because he seems to repeat Lenin's understanding of the Commune state. We have learnt that the Paris Commune should be our model. (17) What we know from advanced capitalism is that people will not support a society without multi-party democracy, or based on one party rule. Nor is a society without parties practical or acceptable. This non-party view is possibly what Ticktin is envisaging, if this is his approach it is as impractical as anarchism.

Ticktin concludes his article by suggesting his viewpoint is that of the individual, as being primary in relation to role of the collective. This is a false contrast. Only if society functions in collective terms can the aspirations of the individual be realised. If society is flawed at the level of its collective functioning then this situation is expressed by the undermining of the aims of the individual. Ticktin is right to suggest that Stalinism denied the interests of the individual, but this was because at the level of the collective, or the apex of society was a repressive state. (18) In a functioning and emancipatory society the individual co-operates with others in terms of agreed and voluntary aims. This is not possible under capitalism because of exploitation of classes, but socialism should overcome the importance of exploitation and replace it with harmony between classes. In this manner the individual should be able to realise their objectives without undermining the co-operative character of society. In this manner society should thrive and develop.

The major problem with the approach of Ticktin is that he can only outline the character of socialism in terms of its smooth functioning. He is unable to accept that the potentially superior character of socialism does not overcome important problems. Indeed the very novelty of the alternative to capitalism is a problem. This point can be made in relation to the complex issue of transition from advanced capitalism to socialism. We are used to a society with limited affluence and a high level of quality of consumer items. In this context socialism will have to be superior in terms of its ability to create goods that are able to meet realise needs in a manner that is superior to capitalism. The fact that capitalism is a system of the highest level of achievement is a tremendous challenge for socialism in relation to the prospects of generating a higher level of the productive forces and the provision of superior goods. Indeed we presently accept the limitations of capitalism because it generally provides a reasonable standard of living during periods of boom and expansion. Thus the possibility for socialism to be superior will be a tremendous challenge, and require the highest level of human ingenuity and creativity. Hence we are making what may be a dogmatic assumption that the creativity of labour can be superior to the advances made by capitalism. We can never overcome the element of chance in relation to the view that the following description of socialism will be superior to capitalism: “In capitalism, the collective social powers of labour appear in the alien form of value, a power standing over and above working men and women. In the above model of socialism, a high proportion of production is still undertaken for the market. But decisions regarding the overall level of social investment, the provisions of public goods, and the social priorities for new investment, are all determined in a democratic planning process, prior to private decisions in the market. The self-valorisation of value is not the organising principle of the social order when these measures are in place; they are sufficient to overcome the tyranny of the law of value.”(19)

In other words the crucial question becomes can socialism be superior to capitalism in terms of the ability to develop a more efficient economic system because exploitation, and the domination of the law of value, has been replaced by the dynamism of the creativity of labour, and the connected ability to provide high level public provision in order to meet these needs of social welfare. The very achievements of capitalism mean that this possibility is problematical. Indeed, Tony Smith has acknowledged the fact that the supporters of socialism have to address serious questions about the efficiency of socialism if we are to make effective arguments in favour of an alternative to capitalism.(20) Furthermore, the process of revolutionary change creates problems for the prospects of promoting socialism. The success of revolution is based on the dynamics of class struggle which creates instability and upheaval within society. This situation results in political polarisation and therefore undermines the possibility to promote a new economic system without social tensions. It is the very process of change that seems to put the superiority of socialism into question. Consequently, Marxists have to address the serious question about how can we realise an alternative to capitalism which is able to also promote social harmony instead of the possibility of civil war? It is these types of uncertainties which have meant that capitalism, based on the relatively stable system of liberal democracy, which seems to be superior to all other forms of society. How can we advance the cause of socialism given the apparent limitations of what seems to be the dis-advantages of movement towards the realm of the historically unknown.

The apparent inability of Marxism to address these serious concerns has led to support for reformism. However reformism is compromised by the fact that it has to accept capitalism and all its limitations such as global poverty, war and famine. The continued justification of Marxism is that it can understand social tensions as expressing the possibility for significant change: “Marx is more specifically concerned with historical change, which he regards as following from real, or objective, social contradictions situated within the social world.”(21) This means capitalism cannot overcome the importance of class struggle. The continuation of this situation means that the possibility of revolutionary change is not ended by improvements within the existing system. The Marxist view is that the working class will not become permanently reconciled with capitalism. However discontent is not the same as inevitable change, or the promotion of socialism. Instead it could be argued that alienation occurs within the context of social progress within capitalism. What we do know is that the orthodox Marxist view that the capitalist system will be undermined and transformed by its internal contradictions has proved to have been falsified by historical events. Olin Wright contends that the future is essentially unknown: “Alas, there is no map, and no existing social theory is sufficiently powerful to even begin to construct such a comprehensive representation of social destinations, possible futures. It may well be that such a theory is impossible in principle – the process of social change is too complex and too deeply affected by contingent concatenations of causal processes to be represented in the form of detailed maps of possible futures. In any case, we don't have any such map available. And yet we want to leave the place where we are because of its harm and injustices. What is to be done?”(22) We can accept the importance of an unknown future without also rejecting the validity of developing a strategy of change. But in order to be plausible this strategy has to address the very issue of fear of the unknown that is represented by socialism. In this sense people may reluctantly accept the continuation of capitalism because they consider the risks involved with the process of transition to socialism as being too great and unacceptable. Indeed these risks seem to have undermined the argument for socialism because of the very achievements of capitalism. However principled Marxists will attempt to address these issues, and provide a reasonable argument for socialism.

Unfortunately Ticktin does not make this type of argument because his approach is based on dogmatic assumptions. He assumes inflexibly that the rational person does not need to be convinced of the superiority of socialism to capitalism. Hence he outlines a vision of socialism without problems, and which is assumed to be superior to Stalinism. But in order to provide this re-assuring vision he has to omit the importance of politics, fails to discuss the problem of power, and instead contend that economics will resolve all outstanding issues. This 'economism' is not a plausible alternative to the merits of liberal democracy, and nor is it a conception that promises a higher standard of living than can be possible under advanced capitalism. Instead in an ethical manner he argues more convincingly that alienation and exploitation can be overcome. But without discussing the tensions of the revolutionary process, this abstract conception of socialism is not satisfactory. We need an honest discussion of the difficulties of transition to socialism. Only with this thorough understanding of all the problems involved can we make an accurate assessment as to whether the task of trying to achieve socialism is worthwhile. It should be the task of Marxists to address these controversial issues.
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