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Abstract: This article investigates whether management techniques are universal or not, and whether capitalist means can be employed for socialist ends. Capitalist tools refer to Taylorism at the micro-level, and market at the macro-level. It will be discussed how the Soviet Union’s use of Taylorism is legitimated with reference to V.I. Lenin, and how socialist use of markets is legitimated with reference to market socialists. According to this article, neither Taylorism nor market is universal and objective though they have been used for different purposes. In order to use these tools for a different aim, primarily the nature of these tools must be changed and adjusted to the relevant aim. Moreover, even at this point, their implementation would still be problematic.
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The most basic issue, which will be discussed in this article, is whether (management) techniques or instruments are immune from ideology or not. When techniques are positioned by ideology, whether same instruments are used for different objectives should also be discussed. Praxis showed that Taylorism as a capitalist management technique was used by socialism in the case of Lenin. In that case, either the proposition that ideological nature of technique would be abandoned, or it would be necessary to show how the utilization of technique or instrument for different goals is legitimized. In this article, latter is advocated.

The use of socialism as an instrument by the market, which is one of the basic elements of the capitalist system, appears as a second discussion dimension. The market creates “exploitation” and uneven development, Then, how can socialism allow for this instrument, albeit temporarily?

It should be noted that even though the discussion here will be made in the context of capitalism and socialism, what should be understood from socialism is the dictatorship of proletariat and/or the first phase of communism. In that period, which is asserted to be temporary, the socialist state can use the instruments of capitalism (Taylorism and the market) for the sake of communism. Therefore, returning to the basic problematic, which this article aims to resolve; in what way instruments go through a transformation when they are used for different purposes so that for example, the capitalist techniques come together for the purpose of socialism/communism? A step further of this question is as follows: if capitalist techniques/methods can be used for socialist purposes, can it be argued that capitalist techniques/methods are universal and objective? In fact, this argument can also be regarded as the discussion of the view that business principles can apply to both the public and private sector at macro level. The context discussed is capitalism and socialism in a broader manner, rather than the public and private sector.

‘Real’ Socialism

When the experience of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) is on the carpet in the debates over socialism, the adjective ”real” is added as prefix to the concept of socialism. What is tried to be expressed by this concept is that the conditions of “real” socialism have not been formed as well as the emphasis laid on the “transition” period.

Lenin (2003: 96-105) clearly states that transition from capitalism to communism is impossible without “a political transition period”, i.e. the period of Dictatorship of Proletariat. Lenin argues that when there is freedom, there will be no state, and underlines that this period is not the period of freedoms. He says that communism has not only one phase, and emphasizes that there should,
in fact, be spoken about a first/lower phase and a higher phase. He adds that in the first phase of communism, “justice and equality” cannot be achieved. However, an important aspect of this period is the socialization of the ownership of means of production. He puts forth that in this stage, the socialist principles such as “he who does not work shall not eat” and "an equal amount of products for an equal amount of labor" are realized. The phase, where the principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" (Lenin: 2003: 105, 106) is if and only the higher phase of communism. Therefore, it should be underlined that the “real” socialism era is not the higher phase of communism. At this very point, use of the capitalist management techniques becomes legitimate in the proletarian revolution and/or in the first phase of communism; the reason is that during that phase, a construction must be placed on the ruins of capitalism; among those ruins, the most important are the bourgeoisie law and the bourgeoisie state: “It follows that under Communism, there remains for a time not only bourgeois right but even the bourgeois state–without the bourgeoisie!” (Lenin: 2003: 109). This context gives meaning to the Leninist practice of Taylorism: Taylorism without Taylor!

The Market and Self-Management

Eagleton, while explaining why socialism needs the capitalist techniques, refers to Marx: “Marx never imagined that socialism could be achieved in the impoverished conditions” (2011: 31). However, looking at the historical practice of socialism, Eagleton, after stating that there is need for capital accumulation, says that the most effective way of accumulating capital is through the profit motive (2011: 31). In this situation, let alone a capitalist technique’s gaining legitimacy, “profit”, which is by itself a capitalist value, also becomes legitimate; the reason is that with the market socialism, “profits would go to society, but production would be efficient in the sense of the market” (Desai, 2011: 298). Eagleton (2011: 39), going a step further, and referring to the market socialists’ interpretation of Marx, believed that the market would linger on during the transitional period … He also considered that markets had been emancipatory as well as exploitative”. A distinction should be made at this very point. Should the market be accepted specific to capitalism? Market socialists reject it, because according to them “economic accounting is unthinkable without market relations” (cited from Blackburn by Eagleton, 2011: 39).

1Aren, while clearly arguing, “socialism does not exist at an undeveloped level where small farming is dominant”, advocates the validity of the thought of “transition” as follows: “In such a country, small private businesses continue to operate until big businesses that use advanced technology are established and operated by the state” (2009: 34).

2It should be noted that for market socialism, the objective of making profit is not of priority in terms of state investments. Thus, investment decisions “will not be left to private profit account” (Desai, 2011: 445).
39) to the extent that they consider central planning highly problematical an economic mechanism, and advocate that the market is essential for a viable socialism, albeit not a perfect means (Schweickart, 1998: 10). Then the market, while dividing into two as capitalist and socialist, all favorable connotations meet in the market socialism: “Market socialism does away with private property, social classes, and exploitation. It also places economic power into the hands of the actual producers” (Eagleton, 2011: 40). If the markets are considered specific to capitalism, then the ad hoc assumption should be used for “the period of transition”: “Even Trotsky, so some of his disciples may be surprised to hear, supported the market, though only in the period of transition to socialism and in combination with economic planning” (Eagleton, 2011: 39).

Lawler (1998), who, based on the assumption of the period of transition, declares Marx as “market socialist”, claims that communism will take place incrementally, and therefore, the market will/cannot not be instantly abolished. Lawler (1998: 44) shows the Paris Commune as an example, and says that there, the market was not abolished; instead, it was rendered subservient to human needs.

Capitalism is a profit-oriented economic system, where means of production are owned by private persons, and economic decisions are taken through price mechanism. At this point, the prerequisite of the operation of price mechanism is free market. Aren (2009:141) underlines that this is virtually impossible within the capitalist economy, and that perfectly competitive market is not the only form of market in the capitalist system. In this context, the main difference of socialist economy from capitalism is social or public ownership of means of production (not goods and services produced). In such a system, central planning determines the production, not the price mechanism. The third main difference apart from the ownership of means of production and the price mechanism is the “profit” motive. In an ideal socialist system, there will be no profit as there will not be “exploitation”. The main problematic can be revisited in the context of the existence of two systems conflicting in three main points systems: How and for what purpose does socialism use a tool specific to capitalism?

---

3 Miller (1989: 46) says that markets are necessary for economic objectives, but he also underlines that they should be supported by “democratic political institutions”. In other words, market is never immune from intervention, and cannot be left alone.

4“The case of consistency of supply with demand depending on price changes is called price mechanism or market mechanism” (Aren: 2009: 141).

5Besides, there are also monopoly market, oligopoly market and monopolistic competition market (Aren, 2009: 149).

6It should be noted that while central planning makes production decisions prior to production, the market mechanism becomes operative after the production of goods and services: “In other words, the price mechanism does not prevent the wrong use of economic resources; it prevents the continuance of this practice” (Aren, 2009: 144).
Boratav (2010: 261-262) suggests three models, where the market and planning can coexist. In the framework of these models, businesses can freely make decisions in the plan constraint, and can make profit-oriented production. Boratav’s (2010: 263-264) first model of profit-oriented business, which corresponds to the Yugoslavian self-management system, where ownership belongs to society, while management of businesses is conducted by the workers. The second model characterizes economic policies in some East European countries, Hungary in particular. Ownership, again, belongs to society. However, under this model, the executive cadre is appointed by central government. According to Boratav, who underlines an important problem in profit-oriented production to socialist principles, says:

“If the personnel of an enterprise equipped with decision-making freedom lay claim to profits partially or wholly, the said elements of profit reflect in individual incomes, the formation of the share of non-labor income in these becomes inevitable... When profits start to pass to the whole personnel of the enterprise or to a specific group as a distribution category, as is the case in the first two models, there appears the possibility to speak about distribution relations unfamiliar to the basic principles of socialism” (2010: 266).

Nevertheless, according to Boratav (2010: 267), the socialist aspect of the first model is that “enterprise does not incorporate a continuous and systematic conflict of wage/profit”, in other words, “all laborers working in the enterprise are common interests”.

Boratav (2010: 263-264) says a third, hypothetical model should be adopted in order to reduce the likelihood of the contrariness of a profit-oriented business against the socialist principles. Under this model, again, ownership belongs to society. It is not important whether managers are appointed by the workers or central government. What is important here is profit is the indicator of the success of the business, thus, is a “calculative” category.

In conclusion, Boratav (2010: 270) says, “the distribution principles should be isolated from the market processes for the sake of the compatibility of commodity production with socialism”. It can be concluded based on Boratav that capitalist elements such as profit and market cannot be used for socialist purposes as long as their nature change. Nevertheless, two basic points come to the forefront: 1. Ownership will belong to society. 2. When businesses make profit-oriented production, those who produce (the workers or the appointed managers) will not be able to benefit from this profit directly, because in a

---

7Under this practice, “workers could own their firms, and hire and fire managers” (Desai, 2011: 446-447).
8Boratav (2010: 271) underlines that although the self-management model cannot prevent the emergence of hostile distribution relations, at some point. It is a model that prevents it from going further.
system, where employees benefit from profit, rather than “public ownership”, “group ownership” will come into prominence.

This conclusion shows that tool can be applied to different goals with a change in their nature. Before discussing Lenin’s views and practices of Taylorism, it is important to address the subject from a different point of view for the support of this argument. When self-management, which is a socialist tool, is applied to capitalism, it should change its nature. The reason is that self-management is not restricted merely to the field of the production of economic commodity; “it is a social construction system that allows, all people to take all ‘their’ works in ‘their’ hands directly and at all levels” (Cangizbay, 2003: 155). It is a clear that such a system suggests an egalitarian system in every field, and such an ideal of equality does not exist in the capitalist system9. Its capitalist application has to eliminate this inclusive nature. It makes it by reducing self-management to the workplace organization technique. Thus, self-management will be defined as “democratic management of a business by all its employees or workers” (Cangizbay, 2003: 155). This definition takes to the points such as “the participative management by objectives,” and “co-management”. However, “the participative management by objectives will be achieved by the inclusion of workers in an objective set excluding works afterward. In “co-management”, which is the next level, the participation of the workers in the formulation of policies via the vote mechanism can be ensured as well. At this point, not only the employee holds a secondary position against the employer, but also the principle is “cooperation in a field limited to private ownership” (Cangizbay, 2003: 153). However, socialist self-management suggests a system, where this duality and limitations are eliminated. For this very reason, a capitalist application can apply it only by changing the nature of self-management.10

It can be said in the light of this discussion that as a tool of the capitalist economic system, Taylorism cannot be applied in a socialist economic system

---

9However, practice is different from the theory: In the case of Yugoslavia, “in 1964, 15% tax on revenues of businesses and the state monopoly over investments were repealed. (...) The socialist market economy is adopted; now, the principle of rentability prevails in businesses and investments. Prices will be set by businesses according to market conditions; the principle, “equal wage to equal labor” is abandoned, and the Central Investment Fund aiming at eliminating is revoked” (Cangizbay, 2003: 285).

10A similar idea applies to planning as well. When socialist planning is applied to capitalism, not only its nature will change to direct towards strategic planning, but the also the objectives will shift from social-oriented to market-oriented. At this point, both the nature of instrument and goal will change. It should be noted to further clarify the matter that even the one-to-one application of two different techniques applied in different countries within the capitalist system in another country is debatable. The application of the Japanese management technique in the United States and the application of the American management technique in Japan will require certain technical adaptation, given the cultural differences. However, the point that should be considered here is the application of the Japanese management technique in the United States does not necessitate a qualitative change in the nature or goal of the technique. The goal is to increase the profit of the business, which is the same in both Japan and the United States.
unless it changes both its goal and nature. Lenin’s view and practice of Taylorism is a case that supports this argument.

**Taylorism Without Taylor, or Lenin’s View of Taylorism**

It has previously been stated that the bourgeoisie state without bourgeoisie is used in the first phase of communism, and making use of Taylorism without Taylor in the same phase is not senseless either. Here, discussing Lenin’s views of Taylorism is of importance.

First, a situational assessment should be made for Lenin’s views about Taylorism. Lenin, in his work of 1913, “A Scientific System of Sweating”, clearly puts forth his critical attitude towards Taylorism at the very start, by writing the word “scientific” in the title of the book in quotation marks. This short article, from the beginning to the end, was written in order to criticize Taylorism. Here, Lenin says what the European bourgeoisie wants to borrow from America is neither political liberty, nor the republican political regime, but “the latest methods of exploiting the workers”. The most debated and popular one among these latest methods is Taylor’s “scientific” method. For Lenin, this method aims to make the worker to spend three times more labor during a working day of the same length. This means draining the worker, who work three times more hours compared to the previous system, of all his strength and sucking out every drop of all physical energy. Lenin, arguing that the workers cannot endure such a treatment, sarcastically says that this would not be a problem for capitalism because of the reserve army of the unemployed within capitalism.11

The second point, which Lenin (1913) is opposed to, is those who are sacked due to redundant labor force arising from increased productivity: “The workers get a wage increase at first. But hundreds of workers get the sack.”12

Lenin, again, begins his work titled The Taylor System-Man’s Enslavement by the Machine of 1914 with a critical tone. He characterizes Taylor’s system as “Man’s enslavement by the machine”. Taylor’s system is again viewed as one of the means of reducing production costs and exploiting the worker, and thus, is consistent with the article of 1913 quoted above. Lenin describes how the worker will work harder without losing a second for rest by the example of an electric lamp attached to the worker’s arm. Lenin (1914) adds a new criticism to those he made in his earlier works. Accordingly, despite a four-fold increase in

---

11“And if he dies young? Well, there are many others waiting at the gate!” (Lenin 1913).
12According to an example given by Taylor, a work, which is previously done by 500 people, will be accomplished by 140 people under the new system. A worker, who previously earns average 2.30 rubles, will earn average 3.75 rubles according to the new system. As a natural outcome of this, the workers get a wage increase, but unneeded workers will be unemployed (Lenin, 1913).
production increase, the worker’s wage is increased only half as much again only for a short period of time.

In his article, Devinatz (2003) says that Lenin did not critically approach to Taylorism in 1914 either, states that Lenin believed that this technique would be helpful for the workers, if its attachment to capital was separated and its administration was delegated to the workers. However, the reference, which Devinatz made from Lenin (1914), is not convenient to allow us to reach a clear conclusion:

“The Taylor system—without its initiators knowing or wishing it—is preparing the time when the proletariat will take over all social production and appoint its own workers’ committees for the purpose of properly distributing and rationalising all social labour. Large-scale production, machinery, railways, telephone—all provide thousands of opportunities to cut by three-fourths the working time of the organised workers and make them four times better off than they are today. And these workers’ committees, assisted by the workers’ unions, will be able to apply these principles of rational distribution of social labour when the latter is freed from its enslavement by capital.”

Firstly, here, Lenin does not clearly say that the principles to be applied by workers’ committees were those of Taylor. Secondly, according to Lenin, large-scale production, machinery, etc. will already offer thousands of opportunity to reduce working hours of the worker. That is to say, implicitly, even though Taylor’s principles are not applied, he implies that there is such a possibility. Whether or not “the principles of rational distribution of social labor” are based on Taylorism, it is still possible to agree with Devinatz (2003) in the following point. The thought that social labor, which was detached from capital and is administered by the workers, should follow the rational principles existed in Lenin even in 1914. It can be asserted that Lenin came to the conclusion that these rational principles were actually those of suggested by Taylor not in 1914, but in 1918. This point allows us to understand why Lenin favored Taylorism in 1918 although he was opposed to it previously.

Summarizing Lenin’s criticisms of Taylor’s system, this system:
1. Makes the worker to do three or four times more labor during a working day of the same length.
3. Gives less wage increase for a short period of time, instead of increasing wage as much as the productivity increases.
4. Exploits the worker.

Lenin’s criticisms are important, because these criticisms should be cleared up for the implementation of Taylorism in “real socialism”. It seems the second
and third criticisms has solution, because the issues of unemployment or wage may not be regarded as “problem” in the socialist system. The exploitation of the worker (by capital), too, should not be a problem, as workers work for themselves. However, any change in the matter of making workers work more is out of question. In the 1918 text, more work is legitimized by the concept of “disciplined labor”. Here, Lenin (1918a) does not seem opposed to increased productivity, i.e. more work, of the worker.

Now, Lenin, while talking about Taylor’s scientific system, does not use inverted commas in a critical manner. He even emphasizes the need to apply what is scientific and progressive in Taylor’s system. He does not speak about the productivity of labor in a critical manner either. Instead; he talks about the measures such as the elimination of “superfluous and awkward” motions and “the elaboration of correct methods of work”. Lenin (1918a) clearly underlines the need “to adopt all that is valuable in the achievements of science and technology in this field” at all costs. Lenin, while explaining the difference between the favorable and the unfavorable, Lenin, in fact, draws attention to the dual aspects of the Taylor system. The first and unfavorable aspect of this system is that it is the refined form of brutal bourgeois exploitation. Its second and favorable aspect is its great scientific achievements. At this very point, while saying the favorable aspect, Lenin wants to put forth the “technical and scientific” context; according to him, its unfavorable aspect is “exploitation”. Accordingly, Lenin actually declares that they will apply its favorable aspect of the Taylor system, and will avoid its unfavorable aspect.

According to Lenin (1918a), “the possibility of building socialism depends exactly upon the success in combining the Soviet power and the Soviet organization of administration with the up-to-date achievements of capitalism”. That is to say, he will get help from capitalism to build socialism. This means nothing but making use of this scientific technique (Taylorism) for socialist goals. Thus, Lenin is clear on the adaptation of the Taylor system “to their objectives”. While doing it, he considers it necessary to take into account the characteristics of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and to lay the foundations of the socialist organization of competition.

Lenin (1918b), in his address, which he makes additions and explanations, feels the need to re-touch on Taylorism. He opposes to criticisms of Taylorism and the system of piecework, even to the views that it should be rejected. Lenin blames those who make these criticisms by not understanding the dictatorship of proletariat: “Our dictatorship of the proletariat is the establishment of order, discipline, labour productivity, accounting, and control by the proletarian Soviet power.” Lenin says neither Taylorism nor capitalists, who are brought for the sake of socialism, should be afraid of, because “Yes, they are being brought in
because in the matter of practical organisation they have knowledge that we do not possess.” Lenin concludes his address with the following slogan that took loud applause: “We conquered capital; we shall conquer also our own lack of organisation”. Only then shall we reach the full victory of socialism!”

Bailes (1981: 426), referring to Lenin, attributes the adoption of “the most advanced technology” to the experience of the First World War. According to Lenin, what war teaches is the need for having the most advanced technology: “It is essential to learn that without machines, without discipline, it is impossible to live in modern society. It is necessary to master the highest technology or be crushed” (cited by Bailes, 1981: 427). Lenin states that because of this very reason, they need American industrial goods (locomotives, automobiles, etc.) more than those of any other country. Thus, according to Bailes, what lies behind this, along with Lenin’s endorsement of Taylorism, is that he is prepared to pay American capitalists. Here, an interesting anecdote from Bailes (1981: 428, 429) can be given: after the Revolution, the Soviets bought and supported American technology and experience much more than had the Tsarist Period, which supported the German Model.

Here it is understood that for Lenin, utilization of capitalist techniques specific to Taylorism and use of capitalists personally for the sake of socialism is not only necessary, but also essential to build socialism. Lenin wants to build socialism via the knowledge and technique of capitalism. Devinatz (2003: 516) says Lenin acknowledges that this is a step back, but also emphasizes that it is a temporary measure. Devinatz (2003: 519), underlining that state capitalism is temporary in achieving socialism, sees New Economic Program that involves capitalist elements as one of temporary policies like Taylorism.

---

13. The production mechanism taken over from capitalists – in the meantime, work organization will be preserved as it is, and will be operated in a stricter discipline. To this end, former employers, managers, and technicians will be employed: “The working class has many things to learn from capitalists” (Cangızbay, 2003: 233).

14. Bailes (1981: 430) attributes the reason for giving weight to mining, metallurgy and machine production in investment plans to the American choice. Bailes (1981: 436), in order to indicate the influence of the American Ford tractors, gives the following figures: while in 1913, there had been 660 tractors in Russia, mostly of German manufacture, this figure reached 60,000 tractors in 1930, three-fourth of which were American make. According to Wren (1980: 3-4), the adoption of private sector-oriented new economic policies and drought suffered in the Soviet Union in 1921 also became influential.

15. There are many authors, who do not agree with Devinatz (2033: 518-519) that Taylorism is temporary. For example, Scoville (2001: 625) says there are two reasons for the application of Taylorism within socialism as well. First, the need for productivity increase in order to build socialism, and second, about the scientific understanding. He says that Marx scientifically analyzed capitalism and put forth the scientific foundations of socialism. He argues that non-scientific organization of work cannot be Marxist at the same time. Hence, Taylor’s “scientific” method is actually not unfamiliar to socialism.
Taylorism and ‘Real’ Socialism

Behind the idea of the possibility of use of the latest capitalist techniques in the socialist system lies the following thought of the Bolsheviks: “The Soviet enterprise is formally similar to the capitalist firm, they are essentially the same” (Atta, 1986: 327). According to Atta, if Taylorism was merely a set of techniques for increasing the productivity through the workers, this view could be correct. But Taylor conceived of his system as a method for reorganizing the entire capitalist firm” (Atta, 1986: 327). Thus, Atta argues that it is not possible to implement Taylorism in its real sense, unless the system of all organizations in the Soviet Union is reorganized consistent with the capitalist logic.

In the Soviet Union, there are two distinct positions about Taylorism (Sochor, 1981): Ideologues (Kerzhentse) and pragmatists (Gastev). The basic premise of pragmatists was that as Lenin stated, capitalism would be welcomed during the transition to communism. In other words, capitalist techniques would be used to overcome capitalism. This raises two basic questions: 1. What is the Marxist input in Soviet Taylorism? 2. What makes Soviet Taylorism “unique”? it is underlined, while putting forth the difference between Leninism and Taylorism, that whereas Taylorism is a factory-oriented system, Leninism is about the society as a whole (Sochor, 1981: 248). Thus, Lenin implies that Taylor should be restricted merely to factory, and that it can be used for socialist goals. A production and social system led not by the bourgeoisie but by the proletariat would distinguish Taylorism from American Taylorism (Sochor, 1981: 252). Pragmatists, who distinguished profit/exploitative aspect of Taylorism and its technical/scientific/productive aspect, thought that in the development of socialist culture, its technical/scientific/productive aspect could be focused on and used, discarding its first aspect (Sochor, 1981: 247, 250).

There already existed a Taylor-like practice in the Soviet Union with the Stakhhanovite movement. This movement was principally based on technical innovation, labor-intensive forms of work and piece work (Atta, 1986: 331). However, such movements were regarded as sabotage in terms of labor. Stakhanov’s plans could not be implemented anyway; not only the workers could not keep the pace set by him, but also the piece work system did not work out as intended due to the worker-foreman solidarity (Atta, 1986: 331). Even though there were individual records, these never attained to a level of general success. Thus, the decline in both production and living standards of workers indicated that this system did not produce successful results (Atta, 1986: 331-332).

As Atta (1986: 332-333) stated, the logic of Taylorism primarily relied on the reserve army of the unemployed. However, unemployment is prohibited in
the Soviet Union. While in Taylorism, labor discipline is ensured by the fear of being unemployed, in the Soviet Union, quitting work is restricted. Thus, in the Soviet Union, workers have to go to work even if there is no work to be done. In addition, even if there is work to do, the discipline mechanism to increase their productivity cannot be operated. There will be an unnecessary increase in labor force, where a certain work order is not established. A system, which is based on employing more workers, rather than getting the workers to work harder, cannot be Taylorist in full sense. Thus, the implementation of Taylorism in the Soviet Union is bound by “the guarantee of full employment” (Atta, 1986: 335). It should be added that

“The communist boss replaces the capitalist boss; the only difference is that strike against this new boss is out of question. The factory manager represents the state; the employer is the state; the state is the State of the Working Class; That is to say, the real employer is the working class; it cannot be thought that the working class has the right to strike against the working class, i.e. against itself” (Cangızbay, 2003: 233).

In conclusion, based on these points, Atta (1986: 334) says in fact, “the logic of Taylorism fits badly with Soviet society”. Wren (1980: 4) goes a step further, and underlines that the Taylor system did not find a noteworthy application in the Lenin Era, albeit it was supported. However, it should be noted that Taylorism found support not only in the Lenin Era, but also later in the Soviet Union. As Khrushchev said to Dimock (1960: 139), Russia had two things to thank the United States, one of which was Taylorism.17

Sochor (1981: 260) summarizes the relationship between Taylorism and the Soviet Union in three points:
1. It was politically indefensible to reject Taylorism. Adaptation was seen as the only real solution.
2. The doubts about to what extent it was possible to build socialism by using capitalist means have not yet resolved.
3. The vision of a new socialist society and the vision of a rationalized society inspired by general Taylorist concepts were not clearly distinguished from each other.

In Lieu of Conclusion: Technology and Culture

In Turkey, Ziya Gökalp is the most important representative of the view that technology is objective and universal, whereas culture is subjective.

Gökalp (2010: 17) strictly distinguishes technique and spirit:

17The other was hybrid corn.
“Today, for us, modernizing is to manufacture and use armors, cars, and airplanes like Europeans; modernizing does not mean to look like Europeans in appearance and way of living ... The need to be modernized orders us to borrow from Europe only scientific and technical tools and scientific knowledge. ...We have a number of spiritual needs that here is no need to borrow them from the West like tools and sciences.”

The view of the objectivity of “civilization” lies in Gökalp’s argument. Accordingly, “scientific facts with an objective basis, principles about health, economy and public works, tools of agriculture and trade, the concepts of mainly mathematics and logic are the notions of a civilized community” (Gökalp, 2010: 29-30). The notions based on these concepts comprising civilization that emerge at “local” level spread among the people through interaction and gains a “universal” dimension. This why Gökalp favors “Western civilization”, “European experts” and “European capital”: “Not only civilization is international, but also real experts, who are its representatives are international people” (Gökalp, 2010: 101).

Gökalp sees the borrowability of techniques and its objectivity as an element of civilization. According to Gökalp (2007:18), “civilization is a set of concepts and techniques applied through methods that spread from one nation to another by means of imitation.” In Gökalpist sense, Taylorism is part of the Western technique, which is a component of the Western technique, and it is objective.

However, in this article, as discussed in the context of the market and Taylorism, techniques are neither objective nor universal. If they were objective and universal, they had to be applied under every condition and in every place without undergoing any change.

Regarding the fact that the technique is not objective, but contrarily is subjective, Marcuse implies that rationalization points to a political form of control, and therefore, it pursues the goal of dominating and controlling. “The very concept of technical reason is perhaps ideological. Not only the application of technology, but technology itself is domination (of nature and men) methodical, a scientific, calculated, calculating control.” (Marcuse, cited in Habermas, 2001: 34). The main striking point manifests itself in Marcuse’s following words: “Specific purposes and interests of domination are not foisted upon technology 'subsequently' and from the outside; they enter the very construction of the technical apparatus” (Marcuse, cited in Habermas, 2001: 34).

What is the purpose of using technique? When ideological immanence is taken into account, it can be said that it is the legitimization of political power or the establishment of obedience to the political power. When it is explained
from a macro perspective, it can be argued that the capitalist technique embodies the purpose of legitimizing obedience to the capitalist system.

The main problematic of the article comes out at this point. A technique specific to capitalism has been actually created for achieving capitalist goals. This technique is not imposed upon these goals from the outside; it is incorporated in the very construction of technical apparatus. For this very reason, it is not possible to use a technique without revealing the immanent relationship between the technique and goal and without modifying a technique created for a different goal/place.
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