

SEARCHING FOR A STRATEGY OF TRANSITION

*Branko HORVAT**

In order to effect the transition socialism, we have to discover the main vehicle of social transformation. In searching for it, we can conveniently start with a study of human needs. If socialism is to be viable, it must satisfy human needs better than any of the rival systems. If it does, people will be motivated to achieve it.

Anthropologically speaking we can note three aspects of "human nature". Man is, first, a biological or natural being. He is, next, a gregarious or social being. Finally, he has certain specifically or exclusively human qualities. This classification is, of course, crude, but it will still prove helpful. As a natural being, Man has biological needs which have to be satisfied in order to keep body and mind healthy. As a gregarious being he has certain mental or social needs. As a human being, Man is a creature of self-creation — by working he changes his environment and himself — and of self-realization — since he has power of self-creation he strives to use it; as Aristotle and Marx made clear, every natural being strives to realize its powers and suffers when it is frustrated. Full self-realization is possible only if Man is free to use all his powers. Therefore, the need for self-determination.

One would expect that the three aspects of human nature and, consequently, of the corresponding needs, are not independent but rather interdependent. After all, Man is a single and not a triple being. One would also expect a certain hierarchy of needs corresponding roughly to the stages of development, of the human race.

One might like to have the foregoing propositions empirically tested. Unfortunately, this is possible only very inadequately. The psychological research of human needs is in its infancy. Thus, the two theoretical attempts that will be mentioned will have to be discussed on their own terms.

(a) HUMAN NEEDS

The theory of needs is of a very recent origin. Pioneering research in individual human needs was undertaken by Abraham Maslow.¹ Ma-

* Institute of Economic Studies, Beograd; University of Zagreb, Zagreb.

slow refers to his clinical experience and laboratory experiments. He distinguishes five basic needs which are organized into a hierarchy of relative prepotency. This means that higher needs do not emerge before lower needs have been gratified to a certain extent. It is probably more correct to describe the hierarchy in terms of intensities and not existence: all needs are always present but their intensity varies according to a hierarchical pattern.

1. The most prepotent of all needs are *physiological needs* (water, food, sex, etc.). Unless gratified, they dominate the entire affective, intellectual and practical activities of human beings.

2. The *safety needs* are next in order of hierarchy. They include needs for security, stability, dependency, protection; freedom from fear and chaos; need for structure, order, law, limits.

3. Once relative safety is secured, affective *needs of belongingness and love* emerge. Rootedness, stressed particularly by Erich Fromm, belongs here as well.

4. Still higher up are *needs for self-respect and self-esteem*. They can be divided into two sets:

- (a) the desire for strength, for achievement, for mastery and competence, for confidence in the face of the world, for independence and freedom;
- (b) the desire for reputation, status, fame, recognition.

5. Even if all four enumerated needs are completely satisfied, the human being will feel discontented and restless unless she or he can do what *she or he*, individually, is suited for "What a man can be, he *must be* He must be true to his own nature".² Capacities imply motives. The desire for self-fulfillment, to become actualized in what he is potentially, Maslow calls the *need for self-actualization*. In the need for self-actualization we easily recognize Marxian human nature treated not as a philosophical proposition but as a problem of empirical psychology. We also recognize Rawls Aristotelian Principle (Ch. 7). There is an important asymmetry to be noticed. The gratification of the first four needs reduces the desire; the more self-actualization is satisfied, the more it is desired.³

It has been pointed out that one of the needs included in the list, safety, is incongruous with the rest. It is like separating food into "food" and "palatability". Clearly, one *needs* food, but one *prefers* palatable food. While satisfaction of real needs is pursued for its own sake, it is unlikely that mentally healthy people pursue safety for the sake of safety. Safety, simply, is a precondition, a means, and not an end.⁴ A similar mistake is made in social product measurement when

¹ A. Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, Harper and Row, New York, 1970; *Toward a Psychology of Being*, van Nostrand, New York, 1968. The theory was first presented in the article "A Theory of Human Motivation", *Psychological Review*, 1943, pp. 370-396.

² Maslow, *Motivation etc.*, op. cit., p. 46.

³ Maslow, *Toward etc.*, op. cit., p. 30.

⁴ Cf. J. C. Davies, *Human Nature in Politics*, Wiley, New York, 1963.

statisticians add the "output of safety", i. e., the services of the police and army, to the output of commodities and services that satisfy consumer wants.⁵ A pair of shoes remains a pair of shoes with or without the police. What the police does — if it functions properly — is to *make possible* that the pair of shoes be used. We are, thus, left with four basic needs to be gratified under the conditions of relative safety. The first of the needs relates to more physical survival. The next two are due to the fact that people live in societies. The fourth one reflects personality development, which is a specifically human quality.

This leads us to an examination of the characteristics of the hierarchy of needs. Maslow describes a number of them and the following four seem to be more important.⁶

1. The higher needs is a later phylogenetic or evolutionary development. The need for food is shared with plants and animals. The need for love is shared with higher apes. The need for self-actualization is not shared with anybody. "The higher the need, the more specifically human it is".⁷

2. Higher needs are later ontogenetic developments. At birth, only physical needs exist. After some months of life, the infant shows the first signs of affective ties. Still later, the child requests respect and praise. Full self-actualization requires a mature personality and, in an alienated world, this may never occur.

3. "The higher the need the less imperative it is for sheer survival, the longer gratification can be postponed, and the easier it is for the need to disappear permanently".⁸ Higher needs are less urgent subjectively. However, once higher needs have been experienced, they do not disappear immediately if the overall level of need gratification is substantially reduced.

4. Higher level of need gratification means greater biological efficiency, longer life, better sleep, etc. "Higher need gratifications have survival value and growth value as well".⁹

How do we know that the needs on our list are really basic human needs and that they are not simply neurotic or socially conditioned? Maslow offers four possible proofs¹⁰:

1. The frustration of these needs is pathogenic, i. e., makes people bodily and mentally sick.

2. Their gratification, on the contrary, is healthy. This is not the case with the gratification of neurotic needs.

3. It is also spontaneously chosen under free conditions.

4. These needs can be directly studied in relatively healthy people.

If Maslow is right, thwarting the gratification of the four basic needs will produce sick individuals. And sick individuals make a sick

⁵ Cf. B. Horvat, *Towards a Theory of Planned Economy*, Yugoslav Institute of Economic Research, Belgrade, 1964, Chapter 11.

⁶ *Motivation etc.*, op. cit., p. 98.

⁷ Loc. cit.

⁸ Loc. cit.

⁹ Loc. cit.

¹⁰ Op. cit., pp. 273-74.

society. The symptoms of sickness at the societal level, how such a sick society functions, has especially been studied by Erich Fromm.¹¹ On the other hand, a society which satisfies basic human needs substantially better than other societies must in some fundamental sense be a more progressive society.

So far, Maslow's original theory of motivation has not been firmly supported by empirical evidence, except in the case of the self-actualization need. Empirical research in real-life situations failed to identify five independent needs and to confirm the simple ordering of needs.¹² Thus, attempts were made to eliminate overlapping of needs by reducing their number to three or two and, while retaining the hierarchy, to introduce more complex ordering. The most successful revision along these two lines has been made by Clayton Alderfer.

His classification of needs corresponds quite closely to my introductory propositions about human nature.

Alderfer compressed Maslow's five needs into three which he called Existence, Relatedness and Growth. People must first keep alive, they must relate to each other and, in order to be human, they must be creative by changing their environment and themselves. Thus, existence needs subsume material and physiological desires. When resources are limited, as they are in the scarcity world in which we live, one person's gain is another person's loss. Relatedness needs involve relationship with other significant people and include acceptance, confirmation, understanding. Here the activities do not represent a zero-sum game; the satisfaction depends on a process of sharing or mutuality. The satisfaction of growth need "depends on a person finding the opportunities to be what he is most fully and to become what he can."¹⁴

Alderfer tested his theory in organizational settings. Five out of seven original propositions concerning the functioning of the three-need hierarchy survived the test in more or less revised form. Thus, the following empirically-supported theory of motivation emerges.¹⁵

1. The less existence needs are satisfied, the more they will be desired.

¹¹ Cf. his *Escape from Freedom*, Farrar, Straus & Giroux, New York, 1941; *The Sane Society*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1955.

¹² C. P. Alderfer, "An Empirical Test of Human Needs", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1969, 143-75. M. A. Wahba, L. G. Bridwell, "Maslow Reconsidered: A Review of Research on the Need Hierarchy Theory", *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1974, 514-20. The results of empirical testing are rather ambiguous. It has been pointed out that needs are intrinsically interdependent and not independent, and that the research technique used (factor analysis) was methodologically wrong. Instead of orthogonal rotation, which forces independent factors, oblique rotation, which allows for interdependence among the underlying constructs, ought to be used. V. F. Mitchel and Pravin Moudgill used the oblimin technique and obtained a loading pattern displaying close correspondence with Maslow's classification ("Measurement of Maslow's Need Hierarchy", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1976, 334-49.)

¹³ C. P. Alderfer, *Existence, Relatedness and Growth*, Free Press, New York, 1972.

¹⁴ Alderfer, op. cit., pp. 9-12.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 148-49.

2. For low satisfaction of both existence and relatedness needs, the less relatedness needs are satisfied, the more existence needs will be desired. This implies a fixation on material objects in an authoritarian setting with a low level of living.

3. Desire is inversely related to satisfaction at the low level of satisfaction and positively related at the high level of satisfaction of relatedness needs.

4. When relatedness and growth needs are both relatively satisfied, the more relatedness needs are satisfied, the more growth is desired.

5. Growth is more desired the less growth needs are satisfied at a low level of satisfaction and the more they are satisfied at a high level of satisfaction. It was also found that in a challenging discretionary setting, the more a person was satisfied the more he desired, and the more he desired the more he was satisfied. Thus, a growth-oriented person is likely to become increasingly so.

It follows that the simple deficiency-desire postulate applies unconditionally only to existence needs. The frustration-regression postulate applies to existence and relatedness needs. The satisfaction-progression postulate applies to relatedness and growth needs. Next, the relatively satisfied R needs make G desirable (proposition 4). Alderfer fails to find empirical support for a similar proposition making the desirability of R a function of the satisfaction of E. Other researchers, however, have found some empirical evidence. The general hypothesis that the satisfaction of lower level needs activates higher level needs can be justified on the ground that the higher needs become more urgent and the released energy must be productively applied. In the reverse case, when lower level needs are frustrated, energy is absorbed to repair the deficiency and so less is available for activities at a higher level.

It is obvious that, while questioning the simplicity of Maslow's theory, Alderfer upholds its essential idea: human needs are objectively identifiable and are hierarchically ordered. The ordering is not rigidly determined. By manipulating environmental factors, individuals may be oriented towards lower needs. By contrast, since all needs are always present, at least in a latent form, individuals may be induced to reach the growth stage faster and then experience the self-reinforcing, satisfaction-desire process. If Maslow and Alderfer are right, the thwarting of basic needs not only makes society sick but also generates the motivation for change. The change implies satisfying the basic needs more fully.

How do we find out which society satisfies basic needs more fully? The hierarchy of needs makes possible a simple solution to the problem. A society which satisfies a higher need better, *eo ipso* better satisfies all other needs down the list. Consequently, it suffices to show that socialism satisfies the self-actualizing need more than either capitalism or etatism in order to prove that it satisfies all human needs better and is, in this sense, a superior socio-economic system.

(b) NEEDS AT THE SOCIETAL LEVEL

Before we proceed, a difficulty must be removed. The classification of basic needs from the point of view of individual development is not the same as that from the point of view of social system design. We must discover how to transform the several-stage scheme at the micro level — physiological, affective, self-esteem and self-actualization needs or existence, relatedness and growth needs — into one applicable at the macro level. As usual, an analysis of historical experience provides the answer.

1. Since physiological or existence needs have a survival quality, neither an individual nor a society can exist if they are not satisfied. At the societal level, this category is enlarged to include all *physical needs* such as food, clothing and shelter.

2. Once basic physical needs are relatively satisfied, different needs, which we may call *cultural needs*, begin to be acutely felt. People are first concerned with their bodies; next they become concerned with their minds. Education, entertainment, art and science belong under this heading. Health ought to be included here as well. At the lowest stage, health is often traded for increases in material comforts. It is only after a certain minimum level of living is achieved that health as such becomes a primary concern.

3. The first two stages make for the level of living. The next two stages make for the quality of life. In a relatively affluent society, people become increasingly concerned with the so-called political liberties. *Political needs* (freedom of speech, conscience, assembly, etc.) correspond to Maslow's needs of self-esteem and are included in Alderfer's relatedness.

4. Finally, in an affluent and politically-liberated society, the main concern is focused on the growth of personality, on the full development of the inherent potentialities and capacities of every individual. It is not sufficient to simply survive, enjoy life and be recognized as a separate and (formally) equal member of the group; it is also necessary to live one's own self-determined and authentic life. This *need for authenticity* and *self-determination* corresponds, of course, to Maslow's self-actualization and Alderfer's growth need. It includes affective needs since personal life cannot be authentic if solidarity, love, friendship, etc., are thwarted or alienated.

Stages 1. and 4. are the same at both individual and societal levels. Stages 2. and 3. are not. Besides, the historical evidence is not straightforward. The periodization above corresponds to etatist development. In capitalist development, political liberties were established before the cultural needs of the broad masses of the population were satisfied. The explanation for this historical indeterminacy is not difficult to find.

The precondition for the development of capitalism was the establishment of a free market. This, in turn, required that the political restrictions of feudalism be removed and political freedoms be made available for the bourgeoisie as well, not only for the aristocracy. On

the other hand, the proletariat could not improve its position vis-à-vis the bourgeoisie unless political freedoms were extended to all members of the society, regardless of their origin and ownership of property. In this way, the class struggle generated political democracy while cultural needs remained only rudimentarily satisfied.

Consider now a different historical situation in which, due to a revolution, economic growth is substantially accelerated and the benefits are fairly evenly spread throughout the society. People will now tend to be more concerned with improvements in the level of living than with politics. This explains the social stability of etatism. It is, of course, unlikely that the absence of political democracy can be preserved for long without overt political repression. But the repression is not a *differentia specifica of etatism*. It exists in capitalism as well. Only there it takes the form of *economic repression*. When, on occasion, the oppressed refuse to tolerate the continuation of economic exploitation, economic repression is immediately replaced by political repression.¹⁶

As consumption and cultural levels of population increase, it becomes less possible to prevent the full development of political democracy in an etatist environment. Similarly, material affluence and political democracy lead to a gradual satisfaction of cultural needs (free education at all levels, health insurance, setting up of museums, art galleries, etc.). In this way, both systems converge to a state in which a relative satisfaction of material, cultural and political needs will generate pressures for radical social changes in the direction of self-determination.

(c) WORK: ITS DECOMPOSITION AND REINTEGRATION

Needs are satisfied by work. This is true not only in the trivial sense that work produces goods and services for consumption. It is also true in a more important sense, that work is an essential human activity. Thus, there will be some correlation between the types of need satisfaction and the types of work. In the first three need-satisfaction stages, work is only instrumental and, consequently, alienated. One sells one's labour power and works in order to achieve something else. Work as such is toil, pain, cost, something to be avoided. In the fourth need-satisfaction stage, the situation radically changes: work becomes an enjoyment, a need, an end in itself. Let us take a somewhat closer look at this process.

Work is a complex activity with several dimensions. The development of capitalism and etatism is accompanied by a decomposition of work along its various dimensions. The totality is broken up into components, the components become independent and the process results in alienation. The labour of an artisan or a peasant is an undifferentiated

¹⁶ "The U.S. Internal Security Act of 1950 established six standby concentration camps... to be activated at the president's discretion in case of an internal security emergency and gave broad powers to hearings officers to incarcerate citizens without trial..." (Ch. Lindblom, *Politics and Markets*, Basic Books, New York, 1977, p. 264.)

ted whole. The first step in the disintegration of the labour process was to separate the producers from the sources of supply and from the customers. The producer retained his means of production and control over the immediate labour process, but became dependent on and exploited by the capitalist. This was known as the putting out system. The next step in the process was to separate the producer from the means of production. This was also the most difficult step. It was extended over centuries. In Britain, it implied enclosures; in the Soviet Union, collectivization. It meant transforming human beings into appendages of machines, into a factor of production along with other factors such as capital and land. Labour was reduced to manual labour — labour pure and simple — and workers were reduced to "hired hands". The producers, of course, refused to work, resisted, tried to combine in order to control their destinies. The owners knew better. "Combination among workers was visited with brutal punishment, flogging, prison and banishment were the penalties for strikes. Workers were bound for long terms of service, often extending over several years, and were hounded down like military deserters if they left their employment... There was frequently forced recruitment of labour privileged establishments of all kinds, and parents who did not send their children into industry were threatened with heavy fines".¹⁷ These methods, characteristic of Europe from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries, reappeared in the European colonies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The separation of the producer from his means of production meant not only a differentiation of labour into free and hired but also its decomposition into manual and non-manual. The latter was retained by the owner for himself. Economic development and the ensuing division of labour pushed the decomposition one step further. The owner began to hire persons with expertise necessary to cope with various production problems in the undertaking whose complexity was growing. In this way, hired manual labour was supplemented by hired mental labour. The owner retained only entrepreneurship, i. e., the overall control and supervision, for himself. Eventually, the supreme supervisory labour was also hired and the owner remained just an owner, pure and simple. In other words, in the last stage of the capitalist work decomposition, managers were separated from rentiers; the latter, being pure capitalists, no longer have any productive function. In the meantime, both types of hired labour — manual and mental — were fragmented into simple and routine tasks requiring no skill or intelligence.

This process of decomposition generating several partial workers resulted in at least three important consequences. First, the sequence of decomposition — manual labour, hired mental and hired supervisory labour — is at the same time the order of socio-economic positions or social strata in contemporary class societies: manual workers occupy the lowest position, business and political bosses the highest.

¹⁷ M. Dobb, *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*, Int. Publishers, New York, 1963, pp. 234—35. Stalinist collectivization was not essentially different.

Secondly, however paradoxical it may seem, up to a point various strata have a common interest in preserving the existing system. For the ruling stratum that is obvious. Manual workers, on the other hand, still find themselves in the region of lower needs whose satisfaction is quite compatible with the existing social system. In the United States, this is reflected in the conservative attitudes of the unions, which are primarily oriented towards improvements in material well-being. In the Soviet Union, intellectuals, receive little support from the workers in pressing for political freedoms. Since needs are not psychological constants but cultural variables (with a psychological core), this state of affairs may be preserved over long periods of time by artificially inflating lower needs. Thirdly, ownership pure and simple — either private or state — is devoid of the productive function and is becoming growth-inhibiting, which renders it dysfunctional. Function-less or dysfunctional institutions are sooner or later replaced by those which are positively productive. On the other hand, labour pure and simple, i. e., alienated labour, cannot be tolerated any longer once the lower basic needs have been relatively satisfied. Thus, the next evolutionary step can consist only in reversing the past trends. The decomposition of labour has reached its ultimate limits. What one can expect in the future is reintegration on a new basis. This new basis can only consist of self-determination.

(d) THE FUNDAMENTAL STRATEGY

How is this reintegration of producers and the means of production, of various components of labour, to come about? Which is the social force that will carry it out? The traditional answer is that this social force is the proletariat. We have seen, however, that the proletariat does not transcend trade union consciousness, i. e., that it remains *within* the confines of the system of decomposed and alienated labour. This is particularly true if the system leaves sufficient room for the gratification of lower basic needs. Two solutions to the problem have been offered.

The first one is by Lenin. Consistent with his idea of the working class not being able to produce socialist consciousness by its own efforts, he urged the creation of a disciplined party of political activists, headed by revolutionary intellectuals, which could lead and educate workers and would rule by dictatorial methods until socialist consciousness is established. This strategy proved technically efficient but socially self-defeating. It generated etatism, not socialism.

The second strategy is to look for another revolutionary force outside the proletariat. This force is found in students, radical intellectuals and exploited minority groups in the developed countries and in peasants in the undeveloped countries. Leaving the problem of peasants for later discussion, the second strategy is well-represented by the work of Herbert Marcuse. "By virtue of its basic position in the production process — argues Marcuse — by virtue of its numerical weight and the weight of exploitation, the working class is still the historical agent of revolution; by virtue of its shaming the stabilizing needs of the sy-

stem, it has become a conservative, even counter-revolutionary force. Objectively, "in itself", labour is still the potentially revolutionary class; subjectively, "for itself", it is not.¹⁸ While workers are becoming conservative, small and weakly-organized groups of militant intelligentsia, cut loose from the middle class, and the ghetto population, similarly cut loose from the organized working class, "by virtue of their consciousness and their need function as potential catalysts of rebellion within majorities to which, by their class origin, they belong."¹⁹ Elaborating this idea to its final consequences, Marcuse ends in an impasse: "...the established democracy still provides the only legitimate framework for change and must therefore be defended against all attempts on the Right and the Centre to restrict this framework, but at the same time, preservation of the established democracy preserves the *status quo* and the containment of change. Another aspect of the same ambiguity: radical change depends on a mass basis, but every step in the struggle for radical change isolates the opposition from the masses and provokes intensified repression... thus further diminishing the prospects for radical change... Thus, the radical is guilty — either for surrendering to the power the *status quo*, or of violating the Law and Order of the *status quo*."²⁰ Unlike Lenin's, Marcuse's strategy has not proved successful and, clearly, never will.

Where do we go from here? Is socialist transformation intrinsically impossible like squaring a circle? If a particular solution fails, it is always a good rule to look first for the reasons of the failure. Since the (blue collar) working class represents one-half of the population, an exploited half at that, no socialist transformation is possible without the working class. Both Lenin and Marcuse would agree with this proposition and it is, in fact, generally accepted. Here, however, the agreement also ends. Where Lenin and the Old Left err is — not withstanding all verbal pronouncements to the contrary — to treat the proletariat as an *object* of change; the proletariat has to be taught and led. While, in fact, the emancipation of the working class must be brought about — not by inspired leaders or an elite party but — by the workers themselves and this in the most real sense of the word. Where Marcuse and the New Left err is a simplified dichotomizing of reality: either Law and Order or a radical change. Why not use Law and Order for the change?

A historical parallel will clarify the issue. Suppose we find ourselves in a feudal society and contemplate how to speed up capitalist transformation. What do we do? The most sensible thing to do is to

¹⁸ H. Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation*, Penguin, 1972, p. 25. Another representative writer is Norman Bimbaum: "As for the proletariat, it is neither in its culture nor in its politics a harbinger of the future or a revolutionary force. Today's avant-grade in industrial societies will be found amongst the young, particularly students (that is to say, those without immediate responsibilities or bondages to the existing order), and amongst intellectuals, those with a certain freedom from routine and a certain proclivity to employ their critical faculties" (*The Crisis of Industrial Society*, Library, New York, 1937, pp. 387 and 391).

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 71—73.

discover the fundamental capitalist institution — the one that essentially governs the system — and try to transplant it into the feudal environment. The institution we are looking for is clearly universal market, i. e., free market for both products and factors. The transplantation, of course, has its problems and the social body may reject the transplant. But, suppose, we succeed. The institution will gradually corrode the feudal structure from the inside and the structure will begin to crumble. If everything can be bought and sold, then feudal estates and aristocratic titles will be soon offered for sale and the lords will soon prefer to receive money rents from free tenants rather than labour services from their serfs. This thought experiment is, of course, not fully invented. To a certain extent European absolute monarchies did in fact behave in the way described. In the process feudal lords lost their power. As Adam Smith observed "...for the gratification of the most childish, the meanest and the most sordid of all vanities they gradually bartered their whole power and authority" and "became as insignificant as any substantial burgher or tradesman in a city."²¹

The fundamental institution of socialism is self-management. The main task of the present study was, in fact, to examine and validate this proposition. If universal self-management (in both market and non-market sectors) is introduced to either capitalist or statist societies, it will gradually resolve the old production relations and eventually the disintegrating system will have to be replaced by something more compatible with the institution. By participating in management (and in local government), by fighting for the continuous extension of participation until it reaches full self-management, workers learn in their daily lives how to control their destiny, how to overcome fragmentation and decomposition of labour, how to achieve meaningful social equality, how to destroy antiquated hierarchies. They do that without the tutelage of omniscient leaders. They prepare themselves for self-determination. And they use Law and Order for exactly that purpose. Self-management clearly cannot be established overnight. But neither was the capitalist market. And similarly, as the development of the market, however gradual or irregular, could not be anti-capitalist, the growth of participation from its primitive forms of joint consultation towards full-fledged self-management cannot be anti-socialist in spite of the attempts to misuse it for the preservation of the *status quo*.

The problem of the fundamental strategy should not be interpreted in a simplistic fashion. In particular, social systems have a great capacity for incorporating glaring contradictions while continuing to exist and function for very long time periods. The capitalist system is characterized by political democracy and private ownership. But ownership implies autocracy at the place of work. The compatibility of political democracy and economic autocracy is rendered possible by compartmentalization of bourgeois life into separate spheres of activities, and of bourgeois personality into separate partial being known as citi-

²¹ A. Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776, Book III, Chapter 4, Modern Library, New York, 1937, pp. 387 and 391.

zen, producer and consumer. Instrumentality of work, passive consumerism and formal political liberties keep the spheres separated and the bourgeois individual schizophrenic. It is only after the three separate spheres begin to be reintegrated — which seems to be happening now — that the contradiction between democracy in one sphere and autocracy in the other becomes apparent and must be resolved.

A post-bourgeois society is not immune to similar contradictions. A less-developed country building socialism may be characterized by industrial democracy and political authoritarianism. Self-management at the place of work and hierarchy outside it are clearly contradictory. The two may be justified in the transition period for various reasons. However, if conscious effort is not made to resolve the contradiction, it may be preserved for a long time. The functional requirements of the system will be met by compartmentalization which, of course, implies alienation and delays the development of the socialist society. Self-management is the most powerful vehicle of socialist change available. But it is not a panacea.

Self-management reintegration is both possible and is facilitated by technological development. Although mass production involving less sophisticated technology of the capitalist era does not necessarily imply fragmentation of labour and destruction of skills, it at least makes them look rational in terms of cost. In such a situation, supervisors are coordinators of work who know all that workers know and a little more. The position of supervisors in the skill hierarchy seems to justify their position in the power hierarchy. The sophisticated technology of the post-capitalist era reverses the trend and contributes to skill creation. Simple production tasks are performed by machines; the automation renders work fragmentation both unnecessary and cost irrational. Unskilled, later also semi-skilled, workers begin to disappear. The coordinator is no longer in the position to master all the skills of his collaborators; he must rely on their advice and loses any objective basis for social superiority. The coordinator is now just one specialist among many. Although the new technology does not necessarily destroy the power hierarchy, it makes it look irrational. Self-management is clearly a more natural organization of production in a situation in which muscles are replaced by machines and participants are about equally educated.

Received 25. 3. 1980.

Revised 25. 5. 1980.

U POTRAZI ZA STRATEGIJOM PRIJELAZA

Branko HORVAT

S a ž e t a k

Sa stanovišta filozofske antropologije moguće je uočiti tri aspekta ljudske prirode. Čovjek je, prvo, biološko ili prirodno biće. On je, zatim, biće koje živi u zajednici sa sebi sličnim, dakle društveno biće. Na kraju, on ima određene specifične isključivo ljudske kvalitete. Kao

prirodno biće, čovek ima biološke potrebe. Kao biće zajednice, ima psihološke i društvene potrebe. Kao ljudsko biće on je karakteriziran svojstvima samostvaranja, samorealizacije i samoodređenja.

Navedenom filozofskom stajalištu odgovara, iako nije izvedena od njega, psihološka klasifikacija potreba Alderfera koji razlikuje tri osnovne ljudske potrebe: egzistenciju, odnošenje i razvoj. Ta je teorija empirijski dokumentirana.

Na razini društva problem se postavlja nešto drugačije. Analizirajući historijsko iskustvo, autor utvrđuje četiri makro potrebe: fizičke potrebe (hrana, odijelo i stan), kulturne potrebe (obrazovanje, razonoda, umjetnost i nauka), političke potrebe (sloboda savijesti, zbora i dogovora), i, na koncu, potreba za autentičnošću i samoodređenjem (tu su uključene i afektivne potrebe). Slično kao i kod klasifikacije na mikrorazini, i ovdje se javlja hijerarhija potreba (više potrebe pojačavaju intenzitet nakon što su niže zadovoljene) s time što, zavisno od društvenog sistema, potrebe na drugom i trećem mjestu mogu razmijeniti mjesta.

Različiti društveni sistemi različito zadovoljavaju ljudske potrebe. Očigledno je da ogromnu motivacionu prednost ima onaj sistem koji te potrebe zadovoljava potpunije. Zbog hijerarhije potreba, dovoljno je pažnju usmjeriti na najvišu potrebu: samoodređivanje. Očigledno je da samoupravljanje zadovoljava tu potrebu potpunije nego alternativni sistemi.

Potrebe se zadovoljavaju radom, a rad je prošao kroz historijski proces dezintegracije (odvajanje proizvođača od sirovina i mušterija, odvajanje proizvođača od sredstava za proizvodnju, razbijanje rada na manuelni i intelektualni, razbijanje intelektualnog rada na profesionalni i upravljački, odvajanje upravljačkog rada od vlasništva). Redosljedu dekompozicije rada odgovara hijerarhija društvenih slojeva, kod čega su niži slojevi orijentirani i na niže potrebe. Time klasna diferencijacija dobiva psihološku podršku. No, vrijedi i obrnuto. Kad su jednom niže potrebe relativno zadovoljene, alijenirani rad neće se više moći održati i pojaviti će se društveni pritisak u pravcu reintegracije. Ta reintegracija može se zasnivati samo na osnovi samoodređenja.

Prethodna analiza upućuje na fundamentalnu strategiju prijelaza u socijalističko društvo. Za svako društvo karakteristična je neka osnovna institucija koja generira odgovarajući društveni sistem. Razvoj tržišta (rada i sredstava) doveo je do razaranja feudalizma i izgrađnje kapitalizma. Slično tome samoupravljanje nužno ruši kapitalizam i etatizam i predstavlja osnovnu instituciju socijalizma.