

September 1994

Review of *Marx versus Markets*. Stanley Moore. Reviewed by Cecil L. Eubanks, Louisiana State University.

Cecil L. Eubanks
Louisiana State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Eubanks, Cecil L. (1994) "Review of *Marx versus Markets*. Stanley Moore. Reviewed by Cecil L. Eubanks, Louisiana State University.," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 21: Iss. 3, Article 19.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.2174>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol21/iss3/19>

This Book Review is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



While Choudhury's analysis is notably lacking in critical analysis, it makes a significant contribution to the literature by showing that alternative systems of economic thought do have currency in non-Western societies. The book is well written, easy to read and highly informative.

The author's *Comparative Development Studies* is a wide ranging book which surveys the broad field of development studies. While several surveys of this kind have been published before, Choudhury's book is up to date and includes material on recent developments in the field. For example, the book offers useful summaries of the work of Sen on entitlements, the emergence and formulation of the concept of 'sustainable development' and the fate of the basic needs approach which first emerged in the 1970 under the guidance of the International Labor Office. Of particular interest is a summary of major reports on development questions such as the South Commission report, the World Bank's annual *World Development Reports* and the *Human Development Reports* published by UNDP. While Choudhury's book is not highly original, it is a useful resource which will be of value to students of development studies.

James Midgley
Louisiana State University

Stanley Moore. *Marx versus Markets*. University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 1993. \$22.50 hardcover.

Neither Marx nor Engels ever provided a precise characterization of future communism. *The German Ideology* curiously described communism in the pastoral imagery of the fisherman, the herdsman, the hunter and the critic, hardly suitable for an advanced industrial society, but pointed in its assurance that a fixed division of labor would be a thing of the past. *The Grundrisse*, a long series of manuscripts Marx prepared for his planned six volume work on economics (*Capital* was to have been volume one!), gave rare glimpses into the future with vague musings about the universal individual and the notion of free time. Finally, *The Critique of the Gotha Programme* made a distinction between lower and higher communism. Lower or

vulgar communism might have to allocate goods according to the amount of labor each citizen contributes, whereas in higher communism the operating principle shall be "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

It fell, then, to Marxist practitioners and to academic scholars of Marx, to fill in the gaps and to attempt what Marx and Engels had not done. Since 1989, of course, the practitioners have largely abandoned the field and former communist regimes are, with some trepidation, embracing political economies they had long criticized. Not surprisingly, the academicians keep the inquiry alive. Stanley Moore is a good candidate for this task, since twelve years ago he wrote an interesting essay entitled, *Marx on the Choice between Socialism and Communism*. Now, in *Marx versus Markets*, he has returned to the issue of the nature of communism with what he terms a "radical revision" of that earlier work.

The key element in Marx's arguments about and for communism, Moore contends, are essentially moral and philosophical. They focus on the distinction between classless economies with commodity exchange and classless economies without commodity exchange, the latter, in Marx's view, being superior to the former. Moore traces the development of Marx's arguments from the early *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* through *Capital*. In that survey, an altogether too brief and cryptic eighty-eight pages of text, we are presented with a Marx at odds with himself. The moral argument of philosophical communism, as Moore calls it, is that estrangement and dehumanization will cease only when division of labor and commodity exchange are abandoned. Yet, the premises of historical materialism allow only that capitalist societies will evolve into classless economies with two possible choices, one in which "rent, profit, and interest are collectivized, [and] markets are combined with planning, the other where rent, profit, and interest are eliminated, [and] markets are replaced by planning." In other words, Marx's own economic analysis did not require the abandonment of a market economy. Yet, his moral and philosophical arguments, drawn largely from Feuerbach and Hegel, do require that commodity exchange should disappear. Thus, in Moore's opinion Marx was blinded by his desire to maintain his moral arguments and

did not sufficiently understand that his economic arguments led to the conclusion that "the only workable complex classless economies are socialist economies with competitive markets."

The idea that scientific socialism was often at odds with the moral and philosophical presuppositions of Marx is hardly new. Scholars are disparate as Mircea Eliade and Robert Tucker have long argued that Marx was essentially a mythopoeic thinker, a moral philosopher, and not an economist or a sociologist. Moore adds a clever twist to this perspective, however, by focussing on the issue of commodity exchange, or markets, and provocatively demonstrating that Marx's theory of communism without markets is a moral goal without substance and an empirical theory without sufficient foundation. Implicit in Moore's analysis is the notion that communist regimes since Lenin have all too willingly accepted Marx's dismissal of the socialism of his major French rivals, a socialism that sought to create a classless economy that was both planned and driven by market concerns and to construct a political regime that recognized both the rule of law and individual rights.

Cecil L. Eubanks
Louisiana State University

Jukka Pekkarinen, Matti Pohjola and Bob Rowthorn (Eds.).
Social Corporatism: A Superior Economic System. New York:
Oxford University Press, 1992. \$95.00 hardcover.

Social scientists working within the traditions of political economy have over the years created diverse conceptual models of Western societies which project images not only of their structural organization but of the way their political and economic systems operate. Pluralism, capitalism, liberal democracy, social democracy and similar terms are now widely used in everyday language to connote different social, economic and political arrangements in different nations and regions of the world and to explicate their dynamics. The identification of corporatism as yet another category suggests that the creative process in social science thinking on issues of political economy continues to be vibrant. It also suggests that the process of change which