

东北大学技术哲学博士文库

牟焕森 著

马克思 技术哲学思想的 国际反响

东北大学出版社

·东北大学技术哲学博士文库

马克思技术哲学思想的国际反响

牟焕森 著

东北大学出版社

· 沈 阳 ·

© 牟焕森 2003

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

马克思技术哲学思想的国际反响 / 牟焕森著. — 沈阳 : 东北大学出版社, 2003.4

ISBN 7-81054-711-9

I. 马… II. 牟… III. 马克思主义—技术哲学—思想研究
IV. N02

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2003) 第 024430 号

出 版 者: 东北大学出版社

地址: 沈阳市和平区文化路 3 号巷 11 号

邮编: 110004

电话: 024—83687331 (市场部) 83680267 (社务室)

传真: 024—83680180 (市场部) 83680265 (社务室)

E-mail: neuph @ neupress.com

http: // www. neupress. com

印 刷 者: 沈阳农业大学印刷厂

发 行 者: 东北大学出版社

幅面尺寸: 140mm×203mm

印 张: 9

字 数: 234 千字

出版时间: 2003 年 4 月第 1 版

印刷时间: 2003 年 4 月第 1 次印刷

印 数: 1~1000 册

责任编辑: 刘振军

责任校对: 文 辰

封面设计: 唐敏智

责任出版: 杨华宁

定 价: 20.00 元

东北大学技术哲学博士文库编委会

主 编：陈昌曙

副主编：远德玉

编 委：(以姓氏笔画为序)

王 前 关士续 刘则渊

远德玉 佟晶石 李毓兴

陈昌曙 陈 凡

总 序

“技术哲学博士文库”在多方努力下终于出版了。这是东北大学文科建设史上的一件幸事，值得祝贺。

东北大学的科学技术哲学博士点自 1994 年开始招生以来，已有一批博士毕业。他们已经在《自然辩证法研究》、《自然辩证法通讯》、《科学技术与辩证法》等刊物上发表了一批文章，也有把论文补充修改成为专著出版的，但出书毕竟零散，机会也不多。文科博士论文的创新思想应当在刊物上发表，更为优秀者则应当作为专著出版。已经有不少大学出版了自己的博士文库。我们决定出版自己的博士文库，乃是步其后尘而已。

我们这个博士点是以技术哲学为主要研究方向的，因此名为“技术哲学博士文库”。出版这个文库的目的，一方面是为了保留和交流研究成果，经受社会检验，鼓励学术研究；另一方面也是为了博士生教育的制度化，推进学科建设。因此，并不是每一位博士的论文都可以成书进入本文库出版，进入本文库必须经过一定的评审程序。出于学科建设的需要，本文库也将把博士生导师有关技术哲学的优秀研究成果纳入本文库出版，当然也需经过评审。

在中国，技术哲学的研究方兴未艾，已有一批博士的研究成果作为专著纳入本文库出版，这是一件令人高兴的事，但这仅仅是开始。希望有更多博士的研究成果面世，这是我们的期待。

出版博士文库需要有好的稿源和认真编审，还需要有经费的支持乃至有人做组织工作。在本文库出版的时候，应该感谢佟晶石、丁云龙等同志，他们为筹措经费、搞好协调，做了大量工作。东北大学出版社为文科学术研究的发展，在经费等诸多方面给予了大力的支持，在此一并表示我们的谢意。

陈昌曙 远德玉

2001年3月19日

前 言

马克思技术哲学思想是技术哲学的重要研究领域。虽然学术界对该思想已进行了一些研究,但对该思想的国际反响的系统探讨至今仍然是不够充分的。加强这种探讨对促进我国的马克思技术哲学思想研究具有非常重要的价值。本书是进行这种探讨的一种尝试。

首先,本书对马克思技术哲学思想进行综述,探讨了研究它的国际反响的必要性,介绍了它的形成史、它的基本理论框架和它的国际学术地位。

(1) 我国研究马克思技术哲学思想的国际反响是非常必要的,这种研究对填补技术哲学学科本身中的学术空白——至今国内外仍然没有充分系统地探讨马克思技术哲学思想的国际反响,对完善我国的马克思主义研究——我国对马克思技术哲学思想的研究较马克思思想研究的其他许多领域明显落后,对明确我国技术哲学研究的指导规范——我国尚缺乏对马克思技术哲学思想内涵进行系统深入的剖析,对启发我国的现代化实践——理解和实施科教兴国战略和可持续发展战略需要比以往更为深刻的理论指导——有重要意义。

(2) 马克思在不同时期以不同的研究向度来反思人类对自然的改造,形成了丰富的技术哲学思想。马克思技术哲学思想的演化大致可分为三个阶段,即它的诞生期——以人文主义的视角批判人类对自然的改造,发展期——实践唯物主义视域下的技术批

判,以及成熟期——成熟实践唯物主义基础上的工程学传统中的技术批判,这三个阶段递次呈现,构成马克思技术哲学思想的历史结构。

(3) 马克思技术哲学思想(广义的技术批判理论)的基本理论框架,由他对技术发展的一般理论的阐述和他对狭义的技术批判理论的论证这两部分组成。前者构成马克思技术哲学思想的理论基石,包括技术存在的合理性、技术与社会的互动、技术史的划分等三部分基本内容。后者是马克思以理论斗争的方式批判资本主义社会的重要武器和成果,它构成了马克思技术哲学思想的理论核心——批判资本主义对技术的应用方式,体现了马克思光辉思想的革命性。

(4) 马克思技术哲学思想在国际学术界享有崇高的学术声誉,许多技术哲学家重视对马克思的研究,认为马克思有丰富的技术哲学思想,认为马克思对技术哲学的产生和发展都有特别重要的贡献;认为马克思是技术哲学的创始人之一,认为存在着马克思主义的技术哲学并承认它是现代技术哲学的重要学派之一。

其次,本书开始进行专题研究,探讨国外学术界对马克思视野中技术与社会的关系、技术对人类文明的价值这两大类别观点的理论反应,具体分析了马克思技术哲学思想对国际技术本体论、技术决定论和社会决定论研究的学术影响,具体分析了马克思技术哲学思想对国外学术界的技术“正价值”论研究、“负价值”论研究——技术的社会批判和技术的生态批判——的学术影响。

(1) 前苏联东欧的技术本体论研究是在马克思主义的直接指导下进行的,许多学者剖析了马克思的技术概念,对技术进行了一定的分类;日本20世纪著名的三次技术论之争都是在马克思的生产力、劳动和技术理论的强烈影响下进行的,技术的“劳动手段体系说”和“客观规律应用说”各执一词,解释或引用马克

思的论述成为它们论战中的基本内容，有时甚至是核心内容；西方学术界虽然未形成如前二者那样集中热烈的学术争鸣，但也有众多学者深入分析了马克思的技术本质。本书总结了马克思技术哲学思想对国际技术本体论研究的影响——“弱影响力”和“强影响力”的两类作用，简要述评了国外学者视野中关于马克思的技术本质的三种看法，指出并论证了马克思的“技术是一种实践过程”的技术本质观。

(2) 国外学者对马克思是不是技术决定论者一直争论不休，其不同观点大致有三种：马克思是技术决定论者，这种观点采用四种策略来坚持己见；马克思不是技术决定论者，这种观点采用五种策略来驳斥前者的论证；马克思“既是又不是”技术决定论者，这种观点认为马克思在不同的理论视野中持不同的观点，有的视野中马克思持技术决定论观点，有的则不是。持不同意见者的广泛争论构成 20 世纪技术哲学研究最重要的内容之一，对技术决定论研究产生深远的影响，从而构成马克思技术哲学思想对技术哲学产生影响的最重要内容之一。本书总结分析了相关的研究现状，认为学术界至今还没有确定大家一致认同的技术决定论的思想内涵，人们对它的认识还很混乱，在这种前提下再讨论马克思的技术决定论者的角色问题是无益的；论文着重指出并分析了马克思的“技术对社会有决定性作用”的思想。

(3) 国外学术界关注马克思对社会决定论思潮的影响，其观点不一，许多非社会决定论者认为马克思没有社会决定论思想，许多则持相左的意见；许多社会决定论者认为马克思有丰富的社会决定论思想，是社会决定论的理论先驱，也有学者认为马克思既是社会决定论者又是技术决定论者。这些讨论形成社会决定论研究中不可或缺的研究领域。本书认为“社会决定论”术语的内涵有其一定的合理性，但它的片面性也存在着，因此无法用它来正确描述马克思的技术哲学思想，但马克思确实有“社会对技术

有重要影响”的思想，本书对马克思这一思想的内容进行了一些解读。

(4) 国外学者重视对马克思的技术的正社会价值——技术的人本价值、经济价值、政治价值等——和生态价值思想的研究且成果颇丰。许多学者认为，马克思把技术与人的本质直接联系在一起，认为马克思强调技术对人的解放和发展、对共产主义的实现有决定性作用；许多学者认为马克思有非常丰富的技术的经济价值思想，认为马克思强调技术对经济有重要影响乃至决定性作用；许多学者认为马克思承认技术负荷一定的政治价值，讨论了马克思与技术统治论可能有的两种关系；许多学者认为马克思不但看到了技术有生态价值，而且相信技术对人类能够生存于自然界之中有决定性的作用；马克思对弗洛姆、熊彼特、凡伯伦等著名思想家的可能影响是其中引人注目的研究方向。本书阐述了马克思的技术社会价值思想和生态价值思想，认为马克思重视技术对人类社会发展的积极作用和协调人与自然之间关系的关键角色。

(5) 马克思的技术批判理论的影响非常之大，这是马克思技术哲学思想对技术哲学产生影响的另一种最重要的内容。法兰克福学派和芬伯格——芬伯格是20世纪下半叶著名的技术哲学家，他对技术批判理论有深入的研究——的批判理论在一定程度上秉承了马克思社会视角的技术批判的传统，他们的学术成果在学术界影响很大。国际技术生态批判理论的发展始终把马克思的理论作为指导或重要研究内容，生态学马克思主义和生态社会主义思潮的产生和发展以及它们理论观点之间差异的存在，是马克思对现代生态技术批判理论产生影响的突出表现。本书认为马克思主张造成异化——工人被技术活动奴役从而沦为抽象的活动和胃，土地遭到破坏产生生态危机等——的元凶是技术的资本主义应用方式而不是技术本身的性质，分析了马克思是人类中心主义者的

理由，强调马克思视野中的共产主义是无剥削无生态危机的“绿色社会”，在其中人人平等并实现了人的充分的全面的发展，人与自然关系和谐，人与自然共同进化。

最后，本书从国外学者研究马克思技术哲学思想的目的、态度、强度和规模等多角度对该思想巨大的国际反响进行反思，分析了该思想有如此巨大国际反响的多种原因及意义。对比之下，分析了我国对马克思技术哲学思想的研究现状，认为我国的相应研究非常落后于国外，进而分析了造成这种不尽人意的研究现状的几种主要原因，探讨了该思想的如此国际反响对我国的马克思技术哲学思想研究应有的触动，呼吁我国实在有必要加强相应研究，并提出力图改变现状的若干建议。

作 者

2003年3月

ABSTRACT

Marx's thought of technological philosophy is an important part in the field of philosophy of technology. Although the academia has done many researches on it, it is still insufficient for concerning about the systematic study of its international repercussions. To strengthen it is of great value for our country to stimulate the researches in this area. While this paper is such a kind of attempt.

First this paper presents a comprehensive account on Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology, and then discusses the necessity of the research on its international repercussions, its forming history, its fundamental theoretical framework, and its international academic status.

(1) The research on the international repercussions of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology is of great necessity and significance. It will fill a blank in the field of the philosophy of technology — up to now it has not been fully developed at home and abroad, enrich domestic Marxist Research — our domestic research on Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology is far lagged behind compared with the other aspects of Marxist Research, clarify the guiding norms of domestic research on the philosophy of technology — a systematic and profound analysis of the denotation of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology is lacked domestically, and stimulates

domestic practice of modernization — a more profound theoretical guidance is needed in the understanding and implementation of the strategies of sustainable development and the national vitalization by means of science and education.

(2) Marx reflected the human remaking of nature from different perspectives in different times and thus formed rich thought on the philosophy of technology. The formation of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology can be roughly divided into three phases, namely, its starting phase — reflecting the human remaking of nature from the perspective of humanism, its developing phase — the technical analysis of practical Materialism, and its mature phase — the technical critique in the tradition of engineering science based on mature practical Materialism. These three phases emerge successively, thus forming the historical structure of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology.

(3) The basic theoretical frame of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology (the technical critique theory in broad sense) is composed of his exposition of general theory of technology development and his demonstration of the technical critique theory in narrow sense). The former constitutes the corner stone of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology, including the rationality of technology existence, the interplay between technology and society, the division of history of technology. And the latter constitutes the theoretical core of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology — the application way to technology by critical capitalism, which is the important weapon and fruit of Marx's criticizing the society of

capitalism by means of theory struggle and reflects the revolutionary character of Marx's splendor thought.

(4) Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology gains high scholarly reputation in the international academy. Many philosophers of technology pay great attention to the research into Marx and they deem that Marx has profuse thought on the philosophy of technology and special contribution to the birth and development of philosophy of technology, that Marx is one of the initiators of philosophy of technology, and that there exists Marxist philosophy of technology and concede that it is one of the significant schools of modern philosophy of technology.

And then the paper comes into special subject research that discusses the theoretical responses to the relation between technology and society from Marx's perspective in academy abroad and to the values of human civilization from technology. Specifically, it analyzes the scholarly influences of Marx's thought on technical philosophy on the researches into international technical ontology, technology-determinism and society-determinism, and the scholarly influences of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology upon the "positive" and "negative" axiology researches — criticism of technology from social and ecological standpoint — in the academy abroad.

(1) The researches into technology ontology in the former Soviet Union and East Europe were under the direct guidance of Marxism. Lots of scholars analyze Marx's concept of technology and make some classification of it. In 20th century in Japan, the three famous disputes of technology were carried out under the intense influences of Marx's theory of productivity, labor

and technology. The technical "theory of laboring artifices system" and "theory of objective rules application" each sticks to its argument and explained or quoted Marx's discussion as the main content — sometimes the core content — during their controversy. Though the academy in western countries has not formed the passionate centralized academic contend, numerous scholars analyzed Marx's technical essence deeply. This paper briefly summarizes the influences of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology on the international technology ontology — The two kinds of functions of "weak influences" and "strong influences"; reviews three opinions about Marx's technical essence in the scholars's perspectives abroad; points out and demonstrates Marx's view of technical essence — technology is a process as well.

(2) The scholars abroad dispute continuously on whether Marx is a technology determinist. There are about three different opinions: One view is that Marx is a technology determinist and insists on its opinion by introducing four strategies; another is that Marx is not a technology determinist and refutes the argumentation of the former by adopting five strategies; the third is that Marx "is or isn't" a technology determinist and believes Marx's views differ in different theoretical horizons, in some of which Marx holds the view of technical-determinism but in some of which he doesn't. The comprehensive discussions form one of the critical issues in the researches into philosophy of technology in 20th century. This paper briefly summarizes correlative study status quo and figures out that the academy hasn't confirmed the ideological denotation of technology-de-

terminism everybody agrees. People feel confused with it, so it is worthless to discuss the issue of the role Marx, a technology-determinist, plays; it also points out and analyzes Marx's thought on "technology's determinant function on the society".

(3) Academy abroad keeps a close eye on Marx's influence over society determinism and forms different viewpoints. Many of non-society determinists hold that there is no society determinism in Marx's thought and the others don't agree; many society determinists assert that there is an abundant society determinism in Marx's thought and that Marx is the theoretical pioneer of society determinism; still the others believe that Marx is both a technology determinist and a society determinist. These discussions form an indispensable field among the researches on society determinism. This paper holds that the denotation of society determinism is to some extent reasonable, but there are still some biases in it, and thus that Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology cannot be described by it. Nevertheless, Marx indeed had some ideas that society had an important influence on technology and this paper sheds some light on them.

(4) Academy abroad stresses the research into Marx's thought on the positive value and ecological value of technology and there is plenty of literature about it. Many of them believe that Marx directly connected technology with the nature of mankind, and that Marx emphasized the critical role technology played on the liberation and development of man himself and the realization of communism. Many hold that Marx had rich thought on the economical value of technology and that

Marx emphasized technology had important influences and even decisive effects on economy. Many believe that Marx admitted technology carried certain political values and discuss the two possible kinds of relations between Marx and technocracy; many others hold that Marx was not only aware that technology had ecological value but also believed that technology had a decisive role in the human existence in nature; the possible influences of Marx over the famous thinkers such as E. Fromm, J. Schumpeter and T. Veblen are the remarkable research area in this respect. This paper expounds Marx's thought on the social value and ecological value of technology and holds that Marx stressed the positive role technology played in the development of human society and the vital role in coordinating the relationship between man and nature.

(5) The far-reaching influences of Marx's critical theory of technology is another important content of the influences of Marx's thought on the philosophy of technology over the philosophy of technology. Frankfurt school and A. Feenberg's — Feenberg is a famous philosopher of technology in the second half of 20th century and has had a deep study on the critical theory of technology — critical theory to some extent inherit the tradition of technology criticism in Marx's social perspective. Their academic achievements exert strong influences in the academic field. The development of international Ecological Criticism Theory always considers Marx's theory as its theoretical guide or important research areas. The emergence and development of Marxist Ecology and Ecological Socialism and the differences between their theoretical points of view are