

CAN AN INTELLECTUAL AND THE PRODUCT OF HIS LABOUR BE A COMMODITY?

Dr. Alla G. Glinchikova
Rusya Bilimler Akademisi
Moskova Felsefe Enstitüsü



Entelektüel ve Entelektüel Emeğin Ürünü Meta Olabilir mi?

Özet

Öncelikle, fikirlerin ve yaratıcılığın ürünlerinin meta olarak kullanılabilceğini yadsımıyorum. Hayatlarını entelektüel alanın fayda-maliyet analizine vakfeden yazarların rolünü azımsıyor da değilim. Tamam, eğer eğitim ve kültüre yatırım yapacaksak en akılcı şekilde yapalım. Tek söylemek istediğim, toplumsal anlamda iyi sonuç verecek bir yatırımın evrensel kanıtı olarak kar peşinde koşmanın o anda faydalı olmak anlamına gelmeyeceği ve tersidir. İnsan hayatının insanlar için çok önemli bazı alanları vardır ki, faydaları kâr terimleriyle ifade edilemez. Bunlar doğal ve fikri çevre alanlarıdır ki, kendi gelişim ve yeniden üretim kanunları vardır ve metalaşma ile yok olabilirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yaratıcı emek, yaratıcı olmayan emek, sosyal üretim, emeğin sosyal üretimi, metanın çelişkisi.

Abstract

First of all I want to make in clear, that I never denied that people and products of their creativity can be used as commodities and they are used in this way more and more. I also don't want to diminish the role of those scholars who devote their lives to so called cost-benefit analysis of intellectual sphere. O.k., if we have to invest money in education and culture let's do it in the most reasonable way. The only thing, I want to say, that running for the profits as a universal evidence of socially fruitful investment we forget about very simple and old truth-being profitable doesn't mean immediately being useful and vice versa. There are spheres of human life, very important and useful for humanity, but their usefulness can not be expressed fully in terms of profitability. These are the spheres of natural and intellectual environment, which have their own laws of development and reproduction and can be destroyed through total commodification. The idea itself is not new in essence. What is really new in this paper – the idea is not just expressed, but proved.

Keywords: Creative labour, non-creative labour, societal activity, socially productive consumption of labour, contradictions of commodity.

Can an Intellectual and the Product of His Labour be a Commodity?

“... higher education increases the supply of specialists’ services... over the limits determined by the optimization of the expenditures/results ratio...”

J. Schumpeter “Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy”

Defining the problem

The main problem is that a whole historical epoch is coming, to an end. This means that the principles of effectiveness which lay at its basis are becoming more and more removed from the interests of the survival of humanity. It means that humanity will either change its criteria of effectiveness and start a new period of its development, or it will be moving towards a dead end by preserving its outdated system of beliefs and values. "Every school child" knows today that communism "contradicts both the nature of man in his natural desire to possess private property", as well as the reality of a planned market organization of society, which is based on the money-commodity relation and has profit as its highest and the most objective criteria of usefulness, i.e. the effectiveness of the social resources expended. Change the monetary-commodity market relation between producer and consumer into state planning, private ownership to a social one, and the motive of the pursuit of the highest profit to a different motive, that of the creation of a paradise on earth and justice for all,- and you will end up with the most ineffective social system to have ever existed on the face of the earth. It consumes a lot and produces very little, it is devoid of any internal sources of dynamism and renewal. It destroys human individuality, since it is permeated through and through by non-economic forms of domination and totalistic ideological control, connected with it. It destroys production, since it is based on non-economic principles of effectiveness. However, any objective and non-biased

researcher, turning to the history of our civilization, is faced with a strange phenomenon. Since the beginning of man's history the idea of communism appears in different guises again and again. And, although history has never seen a successful implementation of this idea, its poisonous weeds grow again and again on the ruins of the states destroyed with the help of communism. Yet, is it possible that communism and Christianity are but different historical forms of manifestation of one deep tendency lying at the basis of our civilization? What are the roots of this tendency? What is lurking inside it? What new forms can it take tomorrow? What is the relation of this tendency to the logic and principles of the industrial civilization? To ask the most general question, how inevitable is the change of the civilizational paradigm? At first glance there seems to be no problem at all here, there are only "difficulties of growth". For more than a thousand years mankind, steadily developing its productive forces, was displacing human labour out of the process of immediate production, freeing social time and thus pushing more and more people into the sphere of "self-realization" through creative intellectual labor. So, one might conclude, in the process of the development of industrial civilization, all members of the human race will have no other choice at all but to become new Mozarts and Tolstoys... Our main goal is to make sure that our production is effective, that is profitable. Market and monetary-commodity relations must be the main guarantor that the production is "natural" and "correct", since they are the most effective "regulator" and "distributor" of the products of social exchange. It could all be so, if not for one objection. It is an undisputed fact that in the framework of industrial civilization profit is the universal indicator of the effectiveness of investment in resources and labour. It is also without a doubt that under certain circumstances only socially useful activity can produce profit. However, it does not follow from the above, that such a concrete indicator of the effectiveness of the social effort as profit and the system of coordinates tied to it can always serve as a universal indicator of the usefulness of labour. But what if not everything which gives profit is beneficial for the society and not all which is beneficial for the society can give profit? Then the spheres of activity which are beneficial for the whole of society, but whose usefulness can not be expressed through profit, call for the development of other principles and criteria of effectiveness. If we regard profit and all other factors connected to it as universal, then it can lead to the rejection and destruction of those very segments of societal demanded activity, regarded as "useless", which are becoming more and more important (and this is the meaning of the modern paradox) not only for progress, but even for profit itself. What are these segments of societal activity, why can they not be assessed in terms of profit and why is their development not subject to the law of profit?

Two kinds of labour: character of labour and the mode of its organisation

Since Adam Smith there has existed within the literature of European social thought a point of view according to which the type of societal organization is to a certain extent connected with the level of the development of production. In essence, Marxism itself was one particular version of this theoretical tendency. However, the question of the character of labour was left outside its scope and was not treated as directly connected with the type of societal organization, i.e. the mode of organization of labour.

Important shifts which have happened in the twentieth century under the influence of the scientific-technological revolution, make us wish to re-evaluate relations between the character of labour and the principles of its organization and the criteria of its effectiveness. The twentieth century has posited the problem of the socioeconomic specificity of intellectual and creative types of labour and has led to a search for adequate social criteria for the evaluation of its effectiveness. It is the necessity for broadening the principle of utility to the extent that it is capable of including in itself the imperatives of preserving and reproducing the cultural and the natural spheres, which is now demanded in order to overcome the limited conceptions of the industrial system where profit is the only universal indicator of the usefulness and effectiveness of social spending. In this case the type of social organization and economic relations will be effective in as much it will correspond to the nature and character of the social labour which these relations organize.

Social labour is usually subdivided into two categories- manual and mental, but such classification only confuses the issue. It would be much better to establish another distinction, that is between creative and non-creative labour. Creative labour has as its aim the invention and discovery of new, qualitative changes in social being. Non-creative labour, on the other hand, has its aim in the functional maintenance of a given level, where both the results and the routine manner of their achievement are already known, that is to say, labour which presupposes only the quantitative changes of being. (Here and further in the article this distinction should not be understood as the characteristics of any particular example of labour, say, the labour of the engineer or that of a manual worker. All concrete forms of labour always necessarily include both these elements in differing proportions. What we are talking about here is the principle distinction between two of the most important components of social labour which can't be seen as "separate, pure forms, but prevail in this or that concrete form of labour. These two forms of social labour have objectively completely different functions and laws, which

are determined not by the level of the development of the productive forces, but by the very nature of this or that form of labour.

Labour of the non-creative kinds can be most adequately organised, exchanged and reproduced inside the framework of the commodity-monetary relations through the market mechanism. Profit is the most universal criterion of usefulness of this kind of labour. However, labour of the creative type, because of its very nature, does not develop and can not be exchanged or reproduced according to the laws of the commodity-monetary relations, whatever is the apparent conjunction of it with the labour of the other type. Even if we agree that it can be regulated by the market, then it is so only in a very specific sense. Why is this so?

Of course, if we assume that the product of creative labour is in no sense different from the product of non-creative labour, then the problem does not exist. If, however, by their very nature the products of creative labour can not be regarded as commodities, then not only can they not be effectively included inside the system of the monetary-commodity relations, but they are actively rejected by these very relations. That, which is not a commodity, can not be effectively exchanged, evaluated or reproduced according to the laws of the monetary-commodity relations. Accordingly the simple expansion of these relations outside the sphere of non-creative labour into the intellectual and creative sphere leads to the destruction of the latter. In this case the sphere of intellectual and creative production demands different forms of organization and different principles for the evaluation of its effectiveness, which would correspond with the specific nature of intellectual creative labour. The real problem is not at all in which color we have to paint the whole economic system-socialist planned or capitalist market, but how we can try to find the principles of development of these two spheres of labour and to determine effective ways for their mutual activity.

Why is it, it can be asked, that both the product of intellectual and creative labour and its labour power can not be a commodity? Is it not true that any product can be a commodity under certain circumstances, is it not true that paintings, films, books, scientists, doctors and teachers can be bought and sold?

What product can be a commodity?

To answer this question it is necessary to understand what are the reasons which allow certain products to become a commodity. It should be stressed, that what we are interested in here is not the question of at what level of social development can products of human labour take the form of a commodity, but

what are the characteristics of the products of a particular human activity and its labour power which enable it to contain the contradictory nature of the commodity form (MARKS/ENGELS: 40-53; MISES, 1994: 77-78). So, what are the characteristics an object should have in order to be used in the process of the commodity exchange?

First of all, it should be of use to someone, to be able to satisfy a certain need and in this sense to have use value. But this is not nearly enough. Commodity exchange is a voluntary act. Use values engage in certain relations in the process of exchange, thus making the whole process a mutual and reciprocal activity. That is why we can voluntarily exchange only those products which we can compare. It follows from this that in order to become a commodity, a product which can be used for exchange, it is necessary for it to have something in common with the goods it is exchanged for but, at the same time, to be different from them. It is possible only if the physical form of the product can be the equivalent, the "full representative" of that product. Imagine that you are traveling in a foreign country and need to buy some food. For you the products useful for consumption could only be those products you can recognize either by their very structure or by the label. Now imagine a situation where a person is entering a market offering buyers a product, the manner of consumption of which is known only by him. This product can only become a commodity when someone apart from its producer can guess what its purpose is and how it can be used. This means that only if the character of the consumption of the product is given in its structure or nature, (i.e. if the character of the consumption can be socially recognized in the structure of the product) can the labour used for the production of it come to be manifested as a quality of the product, and realized in its exchange value.

From this follows another condition for the functioning of the product as a commodity. Since the commodity is a product which is created for exchange and not for consumption, it means that it is produced by one subject and consumed by another one. Of course, the worker who is producing the toothpaste in his factory can be buying it in the shop later. In any case, only that product, production and consumption of which are two separate processes, can be suitable for exchange. The product, production and consumption of which coincide, can not be used for exchange, for one can not exchange the production of it for consumption. It follows from this that such a product can not be a commodity because of its very nature.

Let us summarize. At a certain level of social development such a product of human activity can become a commodity, the manner of the consumption of which clearly manifests itself in the structure of its material body and the processes of production and consumption of it are distinct. All this

tells us, that if there exist such products of human activity whose mode of consumption does not manifest itself unambiguously in the structure of the object itself (which means that the usefulness of it can not be in principle generally recognized) or if we can find a product, the production and consumption of which is one and the same process (i.e. a product which one can not produce without consuming it and can not be consumed without being produced at the same time), such kinds of products can not be commodities in principle. Subsequently, they can not be adequately reproduced, valued and function inside the framework of the market monetary relation and its system of coordinates.

It is clear to everyone that production is production and consumption-consumption. Every thing can be either produced or consumed. How can one produce while consuming and consume while producing? And what kind of things can they be, whose production and consumption are one and the same process? The answer to this question is important also because the main source of profit is the existence of such a product of social labour, reproduction of which can be exchanged for consumption with profit. It is precisely the disjuncture of these two processes which is the source of profit. That is why any product whose production and consumption is one and the same process by their very nature can not give profit, for its production can not be exchanged for its consumption. Though in this case the selling of the product of labour can give profit, but the reproduction of the very ability to perform this labour belongs outside the limits of the value mechanism. This specific product is a man, or, to be more precise, his labour power, his ability to work. From the outset we should emphasize that such a highly specific product as labour power has such a flexible structure that, depending on the level of its development it can both acquire and lose its qualities as a commodity. That is why we will start with a consideration of what it means for labour power to be a commodity and what kind of labour power can function as a commodity.

Exactly what kind of labour power can be a commodity?

As we have established by our considerations above, only such a product, production and consumption of which are two distinct processes can be a commodity, i.e. a product capable of being exchanged. That is why the disjunction of the processes of reproduction and consumption of labour power make it possible for it to become a commodity. What do we understand by the consumption of labour power? It is its use during the process of production. What is then the reproduction of labour power? It is the provision of the means

which are necessary for its survival as labour power. It is a simple assumption that it is exactly the disjunction of these two processes, namely the social character of the consumption of labour power during the work process and the private character of its reproduction in the form of wages, which is the source of profit. We should underline that capital can reproduce labour power only in the private form, through the reproduction of the products which can serve for private consumption in the process of commodity exchange. As a rule, this is the manner of the reproduction of labour power which is identical with the living organism of the individual in its functional realization. It is extremely important to emphasize that it is exactly that labour power which is identical with the living organism of the individual which is able to be a commodity and to be wholly reproduced in the process of commodity exchange. It is so because only actual labour has an equivalent in the psychophysical structure of the individual. Why is it so? First, it is because only for this and of labour power is it possible to have a division between the social character of its use and the private character of its reproduction. Secondly, only for this kind of labour power can the actual physical organism of the individual serve as a guarantee of his future work, and the value of labour power can be just another form of its use value. This is precisely what is the basis of the development of capital as a self-growing value. The growth of value can be a consequence of commodity exchange only in the case of the participation of this kind of commodity in the process of commodity exchange, the use of such a commodity can become a key part of the process of the production of new value. This is only possible under the condition that the use of labour power has a social character and its reproduction is private. This specific product which was, at a certain stage of social development, able to effectively combine social productive consumption and private individual reproduction is a particular kind of labour power. It is precisely as a consequence of this contradiction that the process of the production of labour power separates itself from the process of its consumption and the value of the labour power separates from its use value. Both of these make it possible for labour power to become a commodity and to be freely included in the process of capitalist production and exchange.

Let us summarize. Labour power can be a commodity only in the case that it can be fully reproduced privately, through the consumption of other commodities, and if it is equivalent to the living organism of the individual, who possesses the necessary labour skills.

What kind of labour is determined and guaranteed by the psychophysical structure of the individual? Only such labour, that is easily predictable and based upon familiar and routine activities. The right psychological and physical characteristics of the individual who is being bought, combined with

the concrete means of labour and with a certain level of professional training can guarantee the necessary result. This is labour the task of which does not include the creation or invention of something new and unexpected, or involve changes in the form of work organization. In this way the labour power of non-creative work is capable of bearing in it the contradictions of the commodity and of being fully reproduced in the process of commodity exchange with the help of other commodities. The paradox lies in the fact that it is precisely this labour of a noncreative type, which was seen as antagonistic to the capitalist system by Marx, but can in reality be perfectly adequately reproduced according to the laws of the capitalist system. Resistance occurs only when people start to claim their right to be something more than simply a source of noncreative labour power.

Is it true, however, that this separation of the social character of the consumption of labour power and the private character of its reproduction is possible for any kind of labour? Is it true for every kind of labour power that its reproduction is only identical with the reproduction of the organic body of the individual only?

Why can't intellectual creative labour power be a commodity?

Let us examine the way in which intellectual creative labour power and its product function and are reproduced. Is it enough, for a person capable of creative work, to be reproduced only via his organic body? No, it is not; the reproduction of his ability for creative and noncreative work are two completely different processes by their very nature. It is enough for the reproduction of the ability for non-creative labour to reproduce a healthy human organism and supply it with the necessary skills. This can indeed be perfectly adequately done by the traditional capitalist methods through the individual's consumption of commodities. And how is it possible, with the help of commodity exchange (which means with the help of wages in regards to labour power), to reproduce the ability of the person for creative work? The answer to this question is that it is simply not possible. The reason for this is that the ability of a person for creative work is born not through a man's relations to commodities, but through his relations with other human beings. Human beings start to engage in creative work not because they consume food stuffs, but because they consume the fruits of civilization in the process of social practice, that is in social, scientific and artistic creative activity. The ability to be creative is reproduced not by bread, but by the possibilities and the extent of the social inclusion of a person into the experiences of contemporary and preceding generations. The broader

the range of these possibilities and the higher the level of their realization, accessible for anybody, the more effective is the reproduction of intellectual-creative labour power. And, although it is true that if you don't feed an artist he will die, hence won't be able to create anything, it does not mean that the creative ability is a necessary attribute of the well-fed organism. The ability for creative activity is not at all a straightforward consequence of the existence of the brain, psychological activity and hereditary genetic individual inheritance. All these are no more than the conditions of creativity, which can only be realized through the creative communication of people in society, which is the mechanism that allows people to participate in the cultural process (ILYENKOV, 1968, 1974, 1991). That is why capitalism's general process for reproducing labour power through the mechanism of private commodity consumption is incapable of reproducing the creative abilities of the human personality. Of course, one can not simply create genius through particular social conditions, but it is quite possible to create such a social-economic situation, which will be intolerable for the manifestation of creativity and which would prevent the emergence of any talent altogether. It is our opinion that this factor will play an ever greater role in the economic and political competition between different countries and regions.

As far as creative labour power has such a specific nature and conditions of existence and manifestation, it demands particular social, and non-commoditized forms of organisation to allow for its reproduction. This system of reproduction is formed by a full and open access to the system of education and socialization; well developed mass communications, high levels of quite fluid forms of the social mobility for individuals in the social system; technical, political and legal developments to help the optimization of social communication and participation. That is why the process of the reproduction of the labour power of an intellectual creative type is absolutely inseparable from the process of its consumption, because that is the form in which it exists. By its very nature, intellectual creative labour power can not be a commodity, because the process of its reproduction coincides with the the process of its social consumption. That is why its consumption can not be purchased for any sum of money and can not be exchanged for any other commodity. It is surely possible to reward a scholar, scientist, engineer or an artist, it is even possible to fix his salary, but all this does not amount to the reproduction of his creative ability. It is possible to "tease out" already existing ideas from the intellectual, but only a certain level of social praxis and of socio-cultural participation can "fill" him with these ideas. The payment of the intellectual is not in essence the value of his labour power, but only the repayment for an already produced commodity, which is different both from him and from his labour power. Thus ,

we can conclude, if the animated labour power, incarnate in the brain, muscles, nervous system - all of which can be "fed" with food bought for money, is not the equivalent of his creative ability, this means that creative labour power can not be a commodity. What does not have an equivalent, can consequently not be sold.

The product of intellectual creative labour and the specific character of its "consumption"

At last we come to the question what is the product of creative intellectual labour power and how can it be appropriated, or consumed? The answer to this question is that the product of intellectual creative labour can not be appropriated in the capitalist sense for the very reason that it can not in principle be the object of private individualistic consumption. One can not eat, or put on, or hang on the wall an idea, invention or creative thought...

We may be asked, why not? Is it not true that paintings are bought and sold, in the same way as a sausage or an item of clothing? Are not intellectuals paid for their services, in the same way as the workers in the sphere of noncreative labour? It is absolutely obvious that a painting can be bought. The price for it, as well as for its creator can be agreed. However, to buy a painting is not the same as to "consume" it. What do we understand by the words "to consume"? Any object at all can be used, that is to be included in the cycle of life activity and can be simply destroyed. Both of these would be a use of this object. But if, after buying a cup, we drink tea out of it, we really use it, i.e. according to its purpose. If, on the other hand, after buying a cup we throw it through the window or dig it into the ground-we consume it without any useful purpose; we destroy it, which in actual fact means that we do not consume it. What actually happens with the painting (by Raphael, for the sake of argument), when we buy it for an astronomical sum of cash and proudly hang it in our very own private corner? The paradox of this situation consists in the fact that our ability to consume this painting is not at all guaranteed either by us being able to buy it, nor even by us being in possession of an extremely healthy organism. Of course, we can derive great pleasure out of the combination of colors (in the best case) or because of the very fact of owning a great Raphael (in the worst). However, this way of consuming a work of art is in no way different from the proverbial using of a logarithm slide-rule to bang nails into a wall. Any object is only truly consumed when it is used in accordance to its nature. Of course, Beethoven's symphony can aid digestion, and the combination of colors in the "Last Judgment" can cause pleasant sensations, but this would not constitute real consumption of these objects. For the aim of a

work of art is the development of our interest in the thoughts and feelings of other people and a better understanding of our own, as well as a development of our ability to express this interest. Works of art, which represent the pinnacle of human culture, are only really "consumed" when their "consumer" can ascend to the heights of a human being's understanding of others and themselves. Only then the artful combination of colours becomes an answer or an attempt to answer a question of "what is a man?" They become alive in the consciousness of those people who can make them alive. People are not born with the ability for intellectual consumption, but this ability is acquired by a human being as far as he reaches in his own activity the level of mankind's self-understanding already present in these works. If this reaching does not happen, the consumption of this work of art will be simply nominal or formal. We can say that our ability for the consumption of food, clothes, housing is assured by the characteristics of our organism and so is reproduced automatically along with the physical reproduction of our natural body during the process of the private consumption of commodities and services. So on the other hand, our capacity for the consumption of the products of intellectual-creative labour emerges and develops only through the active participation in their...production and reproduction. Only that person who actively tries to understand himself and others and to express this understanding through art or science...is able to experience the steps which humankind has passed on its way. This is precisely why products of creative activity are immediately social, firstly because of the character of their production, and secondly by the character of their consumption as well. This means that not only intellectual-creative labour, but also its product does not contain in itself the contradiction between the social character of production and the private character of its consumption, the absence of which makes it impossible for any thing to be turned into a commodity.

In essence, not only is it impossible to buy the labour of the intellectual, but also the product of that labour as well. That is why capital as a social relation, though effective enough for insuring the reproduction of labour power of a non-creative type, is much less effective in the reproduction on an ever increasing scale of the creative type of labour power, which has an immediately social character.

It does not, however, at all mean that capital does not have a deep interest in the development of this kind of labour. Quite the opposite! The more the success of production comes to depend on creative labour, the more capital needs it. We only claim that the value mechanisms of the production and reproduction characteristic of the capital are not able to *effectively sustain the reproduction of something as indispensable as intellectual-creative labour*

power. Creative labour power is not a commodity and it functions in society according to completely different laws.¹

What are the laws of activity of intellectual-creative labour? The mystery of "barracks's communism"

What are these laws? We don't want to frighten humanity, which is already scared by the "ghost of communism", but our professional honesty demands from us a recognition of the fact that the most important feature of intellectual-creative labour at all stages of history and under all "isms" was the complete absence of any correlation at all between the quality of the "labour power input" and the payment for it. This independence, which is an objective feature of intellectual-creative labour, has very often led to intellectuals being denied not only proper pay according to their minimal needs, but also very often being hounded during their lifetime or starved to death and being buried in a paupers' grave. It would be very strange indeed if Mozart, say, would put his position as follows: "The bigger sum you will pay me, the better 'Requiem' I will write." The quality of the music in his "Requiem" as little depended on the sum of the reward as the improvement in the quality of this music would depend on this reward itself. Michelangelo was creating his Moses in a way that only he himself could have done, irrespective of his payment, and whatever the payment was he would not have done it worse than he did. For the aim of intellectual-creative labour, unlike non-creative type, lies in it itself and not in the reward.

It goes without saying that the reward can be an additional external stimulus for intellectual-creative labour and a more effective self-realization of the personality. We only want to stress that this stimulus is absolutely inadequate for ensuring that the result of that self-realization will be an intellectual product of "high quality". The demands of brutal necessity can both force the individual to follow the way of self-realization in a creative act - or to earn his keep by non-creative work. It follows from this that the choice of creative self-realization is not just the simple consequence of the need for pay. It is something else which makes a man choose the way of self-realization as a means of existence. That is why we are justified in saying that this very

¹ The difficulty and specific features of the "building in" of a whole group of new segment into the structure of market relations is analysed by many modern modern conomists (MCCONNELL, 1992).

something is the main aim and reason for creative activity. That "something" is the striving for the understanding and expression of the self, which means the yearning to be for himself and for others, to be not only physically (that is on the level of the biological individual), but to be a human being (that is a person). That is why the stimulus to be, in physical sense, which is connected with the receiving of payment, should not be seen as more "natural" or powerful than that stimulus to be a person. It is simply that what is a determining and sufficient motive for non-creative types of work, in creative work serves only as a secondary motive, which masks the really important one. The man, even if he is called poet, or writer, or scholar, who does not have an actual internal motivation for self-realization and only seems to pursue the aims characteristic of non-creative labour, is only a parody of real creative labour. What he creates is just a falsified creative product which, of course, can be characteristic of its epoch, but only in regard to its creative degeneration and impotence.

Again, this does not mean that the desire for the realisation of the self is all that is needed for the ability to produce a real creative product. What is important is the "content" of the personality and so the payment for labour is not the crucial factor. That person will have rich "content" who learns in order to understand, not the one who learns in order to get a high mark, or good salary, or to have the reputation of a learned man. Even the possible coincidence of the former and the latter should not stop us from remembering that reasonable pay is no guarantee of quality and so does not bear a direct influence on either the choice or the purpose of the activity. It may even have a damaging effect because in real life for those who pay the salary both types of people look exactly the same but the second type is much more convenient. There does not exist any quality control committee which can distinguish between the really valuable "useful" product of intellectual creative labour and a "forgery". Only culture, the mind of the whole of humanity, will, sooner or later, choose and assimilate those products which are really adequate and beneficial for its development and growth. The pay can not be the main determining motivation for creative labour, if only because it can also act as a motivation for non-creative or even pseudo-creative labour.

The need for a reward is a necessary stimulus of alienated labour, and really creative labour can not be alienated labour in any social system by its very nature. Reward is a "social recompense" for the alienation of man from his essence both in the process and in the product of non-creative labour. In the process of creative labour, however, a man is not alienated from his essence, but realises and develops it. In such a society, though, which as a whole, is on a mass scale based on the alienated labour of a non-creative character and in which the motivation of the reward is the universal motivation of the peoples'

connection to labour as a way of earning a living, in such a society this motivation spreads onto unalienable creative labour as well. In so doing it creates an illusory form of connection between intellectual-creative labour and the social process. It is extremely important to understand that the culture of humankind is based on two kinds of labour, which have completely different forms of development, reproduction and connection to the overall social whole. It is necessary to closely study the dynamics, tendencies and characteristic features of the related activities of these two spheres in the modern period of development and try to find the most adequate form for the contemporary situation so that the economic, political and social principles of these two spheres are given their appropriate significance for social production. This is especially important because attempts to universalize to the whole of society those principles of effectiveness, characteristic of one sphere of social activity, leads at the end of the day, towards the destruction of all of them.

Thus, when principles which organically belong to intellectual-creative labour are spread, on the initiative of some intellectuals, onto the organization of the whole society, including the sphere of non-creative labour- it is exactly then that "totalitarian communism" appears, of which "the Bolsheviks spoke so much".-» It is enough to transfer the principle of the independence of production from the rewards, adequate for creative intellectual labour, to the organization of non-creative labour-and we will end up with the "Gulag archipelago". The paradox of this situation also consists in the fact that the universalization of these principles to the whole of society has painful consequences not only for the effectiveness of non-productive labour, but also deforms creative labour and leads to the collapse of the whole social system. The withdrawal of market commodity relations from the sphere of the organization of non-creative labour and this sphere's transference to a socialist path creates an economic system which is so ineffective, that at some point it stops having any need for the products of creative labour at all. Thus there emerges in such a context what might be termed, "socialist redundancy" in relation to intellectual-creative labour. In this case society does not need the products of creative labour; not because it can not effectively evaluate their reproduction, but because it chooses the way of "diminishing consumption" of these products. Apart from that, the totalitarian bureaucratic forms of the organization of that kind of society turns it into the enemy of any intellectual-creative labour which is predicated on the freedom of enquiry, research, self-expression and communication.

It is important to stress that from the fact that intellectual creative labour is unalienable by its very nature and has its own laws of development, it does not follow that we can't pose the problem of an effective connection of that

sphere of social activity onto the system of market relations. For Russia today that problem has a special importance and urgency.

The specific circumstances of Russia

Although the problem of the reproduction of intellectual potential is a fundamental problem of modern industrial society as a whole, for Russia it acquires a special significance, and because of a whole plethora of different reasons, has a poignant urgency. Unfortunately, this urgency has not received the appropriate attention neither in Russia nor outside it. The development of the Russian intelligentsia was significantly different from the development of the intellectual circles of the West. In Western Europe the intelligentsia was born and grew initially inside the bid of the church, and later in opposition to the Church, drawing resources from the financial might of the cities, industrial and trade centers. In the West intellectuals historically evolved from the artisans and in the urban environment. The state always tried to extract resources for the education and the army from taxation on trade, industrial and agricultural profit. In Russia the process of the development of the intelligentsia was completely different. Due to a whole array of historical circumstances, which are widely known, Russia has taken the road of extra-market sources for the financing of the regular army and intellectual circles. The notorious economy based on the dependent peasantry was its source. It had a twofold effect. On the one hand, it allowed the achievement of an incredible flowering of culture and ensured the competitiveness of the army in a very short period of time. On the other hand, however, the price of the "extra-economic" drive had an adverse effect. Low literacy, low level of mass culture and consequently low levels of mass production and consumption—that was the abyss separating Russia from the most developed countries. The unfortunate events of the First World War provide the evidence that Russia did not have enough time, even though its capitalism was developing at an extremely high rate, to reach a level for solving these problems, which was necessary for her to become a main player in the world process. It should be noted, however, that such a rapid destruction of the entire basis of private enterprise can be explained by, among other factors, the fact that the Russian intelligentsia, being objectively a part of an extra-market segment of society, could not find any common interests with Russian industrial capitalism and therefore formed an alliance with the bureaucracy.

If our aim is a successful market reformation of the Russian economy, it is necessary for us to take into account the following two particular features, which distinguish contemporary Russia from classical Third world states:

1. The Russian economy combines a relatively underdeveloped industrial sphere of non-creative labour with very high levels of development in the spheres of culture and education. Connected with: his fact is the unique social structure of a post-soviet society, which includes a highly specific and numerous "middle class/strata", which only superficially can be compared with the similar strata inside genuine capitalist societies, both developed and developing. The future direction and development of our country will greatly depend on the position of this strata.

2. Because of the particular features of its geo-political position and historical development, Russia chooses the way not of territorial or ethnic, not even political, but cultural self-identification. This is what allowed her always to survive, even when loosing territories, changing ethnoses, including different religions and changing political regimes.

That is why the question of the preservation and reproduction of the sphere of intellectual-creative labour for Russia is a question of both politics and economics. The dangers of the contemporary situation is that the lessons of October 1917 might not be understood in time. If modern reformers, blindly copying Western economic models, will not do soon what is long overdue, that is to exempt the cultural sphere from the array of other social welfare programmes and so pursue the original task of working out strategies and mechanisms for connecting the cultural sphere to the sphere of industrial-market production, if they again fail to find a viable form of co-existence between these two spheres inside a single framework of industrial society, then Russia will have the choice of two possible alternatives. The first possible development is the gradual slow drift towards the complete disintegration of the territorial, economic, political and socio-cultural unity. The second is the return to non-economic forms of compulsion and governing of society.

We should keep in mind the fact that the bureaucracy's ability to consolidate Russian political and economic space was inseparably linked to the ideology of international communism. Having lost this ideology, bureaucracies of the post-socialist period can consolidate their societies only on the basis of the nationalist idea. Can this narrow nationalist ideology serve as a basis for unifying such a multiethnic region as the space of the former Soviet Union, or even of Russia alone? The answer is unequivocally no. That is why we must emphasize that a bureaucracy which lost its justification in communist ideology loses its stabilizing role and becomes a highly destabilizing factor for the development of these societies. We should be aware that today intelligentsia's support for the bureaucratic course of reversing economic and social reforms will mean not even the return to the "socialist past" with all its "merits and drawbacks", but the descent to a new level of national self-destruction.

What are the particular features of the modern situation?

It is not at all our desire for the reader to have understood the argument of this article to mean that the intellectual does not need to be fed, or that he has no need for payment because he can't help being creative, as it is "what his soul commands him" to do. The direction of our argument is exactly the opposite. We are saying that the social value of intellectual-creative labour is practically impossible to be expressed in the categories of the commodity-value relation, and so this labour appears to be completely "socially useless" as seen from inside the limitations of the purely industrial system of coordinates. On the other hand, it is clear that society will have to invest in the reproduction of the cultural sphere and in intellectual potential. And this investment will have to rise even more as we move further into the future. It is high time now to pose the question of the pressing need for the discovery of new principles of evaluation of the social effectiveness of these rising investments, and also of the new ways of building in the intellectual sphere, which has very particular laws and principles of development, inside the space of modern market relations.

It is a matter of fact that throughout the whole of human history Leonardo da Vinci, and Van Gogh and Spinoza did manage to find the means of subsistence. And without the theory of the value of intellectual's labour humankind managed successfully to fly in space and even make nuclear bombs. We should add that the clarifying of the problem of how Mozart and Socrates did find their subsistence is the task of specialized research which can be called the "Historical forms of the reproduction of the intellectual potential of society". It is without a doubt that research of this kind is now one of the most important tasks of social science. It is, however, not at all an accident that it is now that the problem of the reproduction of the intellectual potential of society has acquired an important socioeconomic status, and demands the most urgent state solution. With the change to fully automated production, the economic demand for the mass reproduction of intellectual potential will be constantly rising. This calls for the creation and development of a special system to assist the effective circulation of "social intelligence", which must ensure flexible mobility of communication both inside the Intellectual system and its coordination with production and economic management.

The decisive changes in the role played by the family in the upbringing and education of children and the transmission of cultural traditions also leads to changes in the very nature of the formation of the cultural environment and in intellectual communication. This increases the *significance* of the "impersonal" mass-media and the new information technologies. All of these

developments place an important corrective on the process of natural reproduction and the processes of the intrinsic development of the intellectual sphere. Because of the development of the new technologies mankind has reached not only previously unseen prospects of development, but, unfortunately, the prospect of the total destruction not only of the physical, but also of the intellectual environment as well. There is a clear danger in the fact that the ability for "intellectual consumption" demands also a certain type of education and inter-communication, the values of which can very often be at variance with the traditional criteria and values of the industrial system. If Dostoevsky was right to say that "Beauty will save the world", then now we should of necessity add, "if people would not lose the ability to value it". This ability "to value beauty" can both be perfected and can degenerate, and in a manner that does not have a direct relation with industrial progress. This fact is an explanation for the modern phenomenon of the temporary "industrial surge" of a whole group of different countries with a corresponding deterioration in the level of the general culture of their populations; it is obviously possible to observe in the existence of very affluent societies, a majority of the population which does not have any need for intellectual creative activities. It should also be noted that this kind of cultural inertia, at the end of the day, always leads to a very pronounced decline of all the spheres of development in society.

The problem of choice

Generally speaking, the role of the natural sphere of inter-personal communication, the evolution of its forms and the impact of its destruction on the condition of the intellectual potential of society is the most acute problem of psychological and social-economic research. The destruction of the "natural habitat" of culture, connected with the gradual displacement of the traditional forms of interpersonal communication, leads to the syndrome of the "loss of addressee", which in turn, creates important psychological obstacles for self-expression, including the possibility of losing the very need for it. That is why it is so important today to discover and describe the natural principles of development of the sphere of social intellectual environment, to understand what can lead to its destruction and raise the question of the reorganization of society which would allow the restoration of the lost balance.

The paradox and a very frightening symptom of our time is that there are emerging doubts about the real necessity of culture in principle. Is this doubt not the consequence of the universalization of the values of industrial civilization, which leads to the value and social usefulness of culture becoming less and less acknowledged. What choice will humanity make: will it throw

away its culture, blindly following industrial values, or will it change its value system in the name of preserving culture? This choice is particularly stark now, when under the influence of the automation of production, there exist the necessity for the mass reproduction of the intellectual-creative labour force, which alone is capable of control and management of the highly complex systems of production. At this stage creation and reproduction of the labour force ceases to be "the private affair" of this or that particular intellectual and becomes more and more the socioeconomic, political and cultural prerogative of society as a whole. It is important to have in mind that capital in itself is quite incapable of carrying out this task, so necessary for society and production (capital has its own very important aims and functions related to the effective organization of non-creative labour). However, in the most advanced countries it makes attempts to find ways to use other, non-capitalists for this aim. Among these ways are both private and state subsidies for the risk enterprises, the creation of research companies, "destined to make losses", the work of various funds, charity organizations, as well as the organizations of the armed forces and the budget spending on the social sphere. All these are, in fact, nothing else but the beginning of the search for alternative ways for the reproduction of the essential social labour power of a creative type. This search is already well on the way in the most developed countries.²

The whole plethora of questions which are only slightly touched on in this article, will need special investigation. For the time being we would only like to dwell on the following, as the most important, conclusions. The values of industrial civilization have their own particular historical and socioeconomic boundaries. The limitations of these values become more and more apparent, especially with the rising significance of the reproduction and preservation of those spheres of humanity's activity, the "usefulness" of which can not be adequately assessed according to the limited values of the purely industrial economic system. These spheres are the natural and socio-cultural environment. In the interests of the survival and the future development of mankind it is of paramount importance that we find principles for effective social investments in these areas, which would allow us to harmonize the industrial, the socio-cultural and the natural spheres of life in modern society, on the basis of the principle of a proper correlation of means and ends. The possibility of overcoming the dangerous contradictions between the values of the industrial

2 It is the famous quotation from the Lenin's speech at the Congress of the Council in 1917, after the seizure of the Winter Place: "the socialist Revolution, of necessity of which Bolsheviki spoke for so long..." –translator's note.

and the socio-cultural spheres will probably contain in itself the main mystery and difficulty for the emergence of a new civilizational paradigm.

References

- ILYENKOV, E.V. (1968), *On Idols and Ideas* (Moscow).
ILYENKOV, E.V. (1974), *Dialectical Logic* (Moscow).
ILYENKOV, E.V. (1991), *Philosophy and Culture* (Moscow).
MARKS, K. / ENGELS, F. (), *Coll. Works*, Vol. 23.
MCCONNELL K.P. / BRU, S.L. (1992), *Economics. Principles, Problems and Politics* (Moscow).
MISES, L. Von (1994), *Socialism. Economic and Sociological Analyses* (Moscow).