

剑桥政治思想史原著系列（影印本）

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

马克思晚期政治著作选

Marx

*Later Political
Writings*

Edited by

TERRELL

CARVER

中国政法大学出版社

MARX

马克思
晚期政治著作选
Later
Political Writings

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY

TERRELL CARVER

University of Bristol

中国政法大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

马克思晚期政治著作选/(德)马克思著. —北京:中国政法大学出版社,2003.7

剑桥政治思想史原著系列(影印本)

ISBN 7-5620-2410-3

I. 马... II. 马... III. 马克思著作—选集—英文 IV. A11

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2003)第062013号

* * * * *

书 名	《马克思晚期政治著作选》
出 版 人	李传敢
经 销	全国各地新华书店
出版发行	中国政法大学出版社
承 印	清华大学印刷厂
开 本	880×1230mm 1/32
印 张	9.625
版 本	2003年9月第1版 2003年9月第1次印刷
书 号	ISBN 7-5620-2410-3/D·2370
印 数	0 001-2 000
定 价	22.00元
社 址	北京市海淀区西土城路25号 邮政编码 100088
电 话	(010)62229563 (010)62229278 (010)62229803
电子信箱	zfs620@263.net
网 址	http://www.cupl.edu.cn/cbs/index.htm

本社法律顾问 北京地平线律师事务所

- 声 明
1. 版权所有,侵权必究。
 2. 如发现缺页、倒装问题,请与出版社联系调换。

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE
HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT



MARX
Later Political Writings

剑桥政治思想史原著系列

丛书编辑

Raymond Geuss

剑桥大学哲学高级讲师

Quentin Skinner

剑桥大学近代史讲座教授

在政治理论领域，“剑桥政治思想史原著系列”作为主要的学生教科书丛书，如今已牢固确立了其地位。本丛书旨在使学生能够获得从古希腊到 20 世纪初期西方政治思想史方面所有最为重要的原著。它囊括了所有著名的经典原著，但与此同时，它又扩展了传统的评价尺度，以便能够纳入范围广泛、不那么出名的作品。而在此之前，这些作品中有许多从未有过现代英文版本可资利用。只要可能，所选原著都会以完整而不删节的形式出版，其中的译作则是专门为本丛书的目的而安排。每一本书都有一个评论性的导言，加上历史年表、生平梗概、进一步阅读指南，以及必要的词汇表和原文注解。本丛书的最终目的是，为西方政治思想的整个发展脉络提供一个清晰的轮廓。

本丛书已出版著作的书目，请查阅书末。

CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF POLITICAL THOUGHT

Series editors

RAYMOND GEUSS

Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Cambridge

QUENTIN SKINNER

Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge

Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought is now firmly established as the major student textbook series in political theory. It aims to make available to students all the most important texts in the history of western political thought, from ancient Greece to the early twentieth century. All the familiar classic texts will be included, but the series seeks at the same time to enlarge the conventional canon by incorporating an extensive range of less well-known works, many of them never before available in a modern English edition. Wherever possible, texts are published in complete and unabridged form, and translations are specially commissioned for the series. Each volume contains a critical introduction together with chronologies, biographical sketches, a guide to further reading and any necessary glossaries and textual apparatus. When completed the series will aim to offer an outline of the entire evolution of western political thought.

For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book

for

Laurie Michael Carver

Acknowledgements

In preparing these translations I have consulted actual and facsimile first editions, as well as the texts established in the first and second versions of the *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe*. I have also made use of the *Marx-Engels Werke*, the *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, the Pelican *Marx Library* editions, and the annotated edition of the *Communist Manifesto* edited by Frederic L. Bender (New York: Norton, 1988) and I am indebted to the scholarly work in all of these.

I am grateful to the History of Ideas Unit of the Australian National University, Research School of Social Sciences, for a sabbatical grant from the History of Ideas Unit, and to the Department of Politics, University of Bristol, for the invaluable gift of time off teaching and administration. I am also indebted to the library staff at ANU for assistance, as well as to colleagues so easily accessible in the Coombes Building on campus in Canberra. I should also like to express my thanks to staff at the University of Bristol Arts and Social Sciences Library, and the British Library.

For materials, suggestions and encouragement I should like to acknowledge help from Joseph O'Malley, editor of the companion volume in this series *Marx: Early Political Writings*; from James Farr (University of Minnesota), Lawrence Wilde (Nottingham Trent University), and James Martin (Queen's University, Belfast); and from the Marx-Haus in Trier.

Editor's introduction

Karl Marx (1818–83) did not write a comprehensive or even exemplary work of political theory. Instead he addressed himself as a political agent to a politics of democratic constitutionalism and revolutionary communism, and to a detailed critique of the economics of the day. It is from those works that his contributions to political theory can be constructed and assessed.

Manifesto of the Communist Party

Marx has left us one work that outlines his views – *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, first published in 1848. This small pamphlet appeared quite fortuitously on the very eve of democratic upheaval and constitutional revolution. His previous writings, largely unavailable to the nineteenth-century audience, play a role in our reading of the *Manifesto* today, and they amplify, as well as explain, some of the arguments made in its pages. For Marx's political writings before 1848, the reader should consult the companion volume in this series, *Marx: Early Political Writings*, edited and introduced by Joseph O'Malley with Richard A. Davis. The *Manifesto* is particularly useful in structuring a reading of Marx's later writings, such as those contained in the present volume, since it introduces and develops a perspective without which the detailed propositions that may be abstracted from Marx's subsequent works are of little use.

Ostensibly the *Manifesto* was written for a small group of self-styled communists who considered themselves representative of

discontented workers. Marx and his friend the journalist and businessman Friedrich Engels (1820–95) saw political possibilities in the Communist League, successor to an even more shadowy League of the Just, and they wanted its international imprimatur for their ideas. They manoeuvred its two ‘congresses’ of 1847 into giving them responsibility for a manifesto, which Engels duly drafted (twice) and Marx ultimately produced – late for the printers, as was his habit – in January 1848.

Although very much a joint composition, Marx had the text last and took responsibility for its production. It was published in London in German for distribution throughout western Europe, and, as the document proudly boasts, for immediate translation into other European languages. Such early translations as were undertaken, including an English one of 1850, were not widely circulated, nor did the Communist League play an important role as such in the national revolutions of 1848 and 1849.

Communist politics, in the *Manifesto* and in practice, was conceived in national terms and left to ‘members’ in local circumstances. Some were so conventionally democratic as to stand for the Frankfurt parliament, which sat as a constituent assembly for all of Germany. Others pursued armed action against monarchical armies, who sought to restore the old regime of kingdoms and principalities, almost all non-constitutional in character. Marx and Engels edited a liberal newspaper in the Rhineland which supported constitutional democracy until, in the teeth of political reaction, they as editors advised communists and other readers to fight on alone. The *Manifesto* achieved its widest circulation as the source for a flysheet of demands posted throughout Germany, which Marx and Engels signed. The original document, incidentally, was published anonymously as a statement by the ‘party’.

Marx placed social class at the centre of his conception of politics, but did not venture a comprehensive definition or thorough-going analysis of the term. Generally he argued that classes are defined by differential modes of access to productive resources, and that any given *distribution* of goods and services to individuals is a necessary result of arrangements in the sphere of *production*. In his view, the division of society into classes has been a central feature of human existence, and it is the major problem of modern times. A class-divided society is in a state of ‘more or less veiled civil war’.

Intriguingly Marx suggests in the *Manifesto* that this is true whether political participants acknowledge it or not, and whether or not there is any overt struggle to be observed. Property relations are the key to the way that productive resources are controlled, and the *Manifesto* provides examples of different types. One of Marx's most important claims is that property relations, forms of the state and politics, indeed social institutions in general, are highly variable and have changed from one epoch to another. Thus there can be no timeless and universal deductive account of human society, most particularly one that presumes or argues the necessity of private property as a universal phenomenon. For Marx civilisation is built on the shifting sands of class struggle, and government has been a device employed by the well-off and powerful to contain the poor and exploited.

Marx argued that there is no credible and democratic solution to the problem of class-society that is exclusively political, rather than substantially economic. Abolition of private property, or 'bourgeois property' as he styled it, was the communist slogan that he proudly announced in the *Manifesto*. Specifically it was private property as capital – 'property which exploits wage-labour' – that communists should aim to replace with public control of productive resources.

The *Manifesto* argues that an analysis of property must precede, perhaps even supersede, an analysis of authority, legitimacy and other traditional concepts, and that a change to communism could only be the result of mass action and democratic politics. Fuller accounts of democratic institutions, political leadership, revolutionary organisation and communist social relations appeared in later works.

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte

The Eighteenth Brumaire helps to fill out the views outlined in the *Manifesto*. It was also an attempt at consolation – a major theme in the later Marx – for the failure of even democratic constitutionalism, to say nothing of the communist movement. Of more theoretical interest today is the way that Marx handled the indeterminacy of human actions, arguing an overall structure of economic motivation in individuals, and of economic crisis in the social system, whilst sketching in the varied complexity of French political life.

In the early 1850s Marx published a series of articles in German on contemporary French politics for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung-Revue*, a short-lived left-liberal newspaper that he and Engels edited in London, and *The Eighteenth Brumaire* was written as a follow-up. The paper was intended for German-speaking readers at home and in exile. *The Eighteenth Brumaire* was first published by an emigrant '48er in New York, and it represents Marx's most sustained mature effort at satire, parody and invective. It must count as the best argued defence ever of the view that 'history is the history of class struggles', even if in it not all action in politics is traceable to social class, nor all outcomes to revolutionary action presented as advances towards communism.

For Marx a political theory was supposed to have an overtly self-fulfilling quality, as it was no mere reflection of what was supposed to be the case. In his view no theorist can really be just a theorist, all theorists are participants in some political process, and denials of political intent merely disguise an inevitable political content.

The Louis Bonaparte of the title was a nephew of the great emperor, sometime soldier and president of the republic established in 1848 after the overthrow of the 'July Monarchy' of Louis Philippe, king of the French. Marx was furious that Bonaparte was elected head of state in a national vote, and even more enraged when he mounted a *coup d'état* in December 1851 and suspended the republic indefinitely. The 'eighteenth Brumaire' of the title is a reference to the date (according to the revolutionary calendar) of the coup executed by the first Bonaparte against the Directory.

Behind the scorn and invective heaped on the admittedly somewhat comic Louis Bonaparte, Marx traced a process of liberal regression. As the democratic left and authoritarian right disagreed on 'the property question', so elements in the political centre were forced to choose. The 'party of order' figures large in Marx's account and represents a broad coalition of middle-class or 'bourgeois' forces, with the peasantry as a crucial ally. In striking language Marx dramatised the way that democrats, advocating redistributive economic policies, were smeared as communists and extremists. Conversely those democrats who feared for their economic interests were attracted by the wily Bonaparte, and Marx chronicles their ruin when a military dictatorship was declared.

In the light of *The Eighteenth Brumaire* it cannot be said that Marx's understanding of politics was reductionist and determinist. His more abstract theorisations of politics, as in the texts which follow, need to be interpreted in conjunction with the detailed analyses that he actually undertook.

'Introduction' to the *Grundrisse*

The 'Introduction' (1857) to the *Grundrisse* shows Marx enquiring into the specifics of how to study the property relations of modern society. This is an uncorrected manuscript that has had extensive attention only since the 1970s, but it has been widely read since then as a key link between the Marx's 'philosophical' methods and his 'economic' analysis. A number of important methodological problems are discussed there in novel ways.

Having argued that politics must be analysed in an economic setting, Marx strove to find the best way of doing this for the economic order that was displacing all others globally. That, of course, was 'the capitalist mode of production', or 'modern bourgeois society', so vividly described in the *Manifesto*.

The 1857 'Introduction' demonstrates a linkage between specialist works of political economy and the ordinary concepts and behaviour that occur in real life. The linkage is one of mutual reflection: the inequalities and exploitation of real life are mirrored in economic science, and the 'market' behaviour traced abstractly in works of political economy emerges eventually in the reality of wages, employment and property. Thus a close philosophical dissection of leading political economists, and a refutation of their doctrines, was politically crucial to the communist project.

In the 'Introduction' (1857) Marx recorded a decision to focus on the concept 'capital' in his analysis, making it his implied point of departure and actual point of completion. 'Capital', he wrote, 'was the power ruling over everything.' Though when he came to publish his 'critique of the economic categories' as *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, he omitted the 'Introduction' (1857), the work is notable for revealing that wide-ranging explorations of method and substance preceded the more dogmatic summary statements he offered to the public two years later.

'Preface' to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*

The 'Preface' of 1859 to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* represents a very brief introduction to the first instalment of Marx's political analysis of capitalist society, but it does this in a curiously de-politicised form. Indeed the choice of title reveals an interesting strategic ploy, in that Marx aimed to address a specialist audience in political economy. His overarching project was to reveal to them, through unimpeachable argument, that class struggle was serious, worsening and yet the bearer of its own resolution in the 'classless' society of communism. All three of those claims, so he argued, had been denied by the galaxy of respected authors whom he termed collectively 'the political economists'.

The propositions of the 'guide for my studies' that Marx included in the 'Preface' are amongst the most enigmatic passages that he ever wrote. As a statement of his 'outlook' they reappeared in a footnote to the first volume of *Capital* at its publication in 1867, and there they might have rested. The little critique of 1859 was never widely circulated, and most of the material in it was incorporated into the later opening volume of Marx's *magnum opus*.

One person, though, was gripped by Marx's text, and used it extensively at the time in reviews and in later years in explicating Marx. That was Engels, whose own presentation of Marx and his work was founded in part on the propositional generalisations that feature uniquely in the 'Preface'. Engels' reading of them as scientific laws, or law-like tendencies, became authoritative for both pro- and anti-Marxists. When in the twentieth century Marx was selected and collected as an academic writer, the 1859 'Preface' became in that context the centrepiece for inquiry. How were these propositions to be understood and tested? Their role in introducing Marx's detailed inquiries took second place, and metonymically they came to stand for his thought as a whole. The better-illustrated discussions of the *Manifesto*, the more intensely political analysis in *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, and the more exploratory conceptual studies in the economic works, from the *Grundrisse* through the various drafts and published volumes of *Capital*, were then 'rigorously' judged against Marx's 'guiding' insights.

'Guiding' these insights may have been, but what Marx actually wrote and published contradicts them in detail often enough to put

paid to any notion that they were supposed to be true in some necessary or invariable sense. Indeed the propositions themselves display an ambiguity that reflects haste and inattention – Marx was late to the press as usual. Reading the supposedly central ‘Preface’ in the light of the other materials collected in the present volume, and in the companion volume of earlier writings, will make it easier to make some sense of the mixed metaphors Marx employs. These are now world famous, but are arguably confused even in the original. Marx did not seem to see these propositions as the foundations for a doctrine, but even if he did, he would surely have expected readers to move well beyond them in seeking to understand what he had to say.

However, it must be said that the 1859 ‘Preface’ represents the traditional and by far the most influential and familiar way of approaching Marx. That text can be read as the doctrinal foundation for Marxism, a science of law-like tendencies in economic and political life guaranteed by abstractly formulated ‘materialist premises’ or concretely perceived ‘class struggle’. The traditional Marxist reading, however, is not the only one. The same propositions can also be examined as ‘empirical’ propositions in social science, or as attempts at such. Thus they have been criticised as unfalsifiable, and so unworthy of scientific notice (by Sir Karl Popper); or as falsifiable, but proven false through close investigation of historical and contemporary circumstances (by G.A. Cohen). Both readings are at the heart of the academic enterprise that Marxology has become, and both have generated intensely interesting intellectual debate. Neither puts Marx into perspective as a political theorist, particularly one who expected to contribute to contemporary accounts of ‘the social question’ in the context of both industrially developed, and newly industrialising countries.

The Civil War in France

In *The Civil War in France* Marx reluctantly brought his work on French politics up to date in the 1870s. The occasion was another unhappy setback for democratic forces, socialists and communists amongst them. Consolation and inspiration were major themes again, as in *The Eighteenth Brumaire*. *The Civil War in France* represents a kind of sequel.

The French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 had been followed by an insurrection in Paris. Resistance to the Prussians, and to a Prussian-imposed settlement, marked the uprising as a nationalist one. This rebellion arose out of disgust with the politicians who spoke for the French after the capture of the Emperor Napoleon III (the Louis Bonaparte of Marx's earlier broadside) at the humiliating battle of Sedan.

The form of domestic government that was to succeed the defunct Second Empire was of necessity an issue in the major cities, and in Paris above all, with its history of democratic revolutionary action. In his writings of the period Marx advised against a democratic rebellion, arguing rightly that forces combining liberals, who were opposed to socialist 'extremism', with the Prussians, who wanted a 'stable' France, would overpower any Parisian experiment in communal democracy and economic cooperation.

However, once the Commune was founded Marx did what he could in terms of international publicity and assistance – as always from London. *The Civil War in France* emerged as an encomium for an event that had attracted extreme notoriety in Europe. Marx's comments were published anonymously in London for distribution in Europe and the United States, and this text was his most extended attempt to write in English. It was swiftly translated into German by Engels.

Marx aimed to set the record straight, as he saw it, and to find some hope for the future – though the bloodbath visited on the Communards in 1871 was hardly inspirational. In the twentieth-century context it is his sketchy comments on communist society that have attracted attention to this text, together with his spirited defence of democratic forms of political organisation. The form of the 'ideal society' is a question familiar within political theory, and the way that representative democracy aims to bridge the gap between the individual will and collective decision-making is similarly a well-known problem.

Although Marx was an anti-utopian thinker who refused to generate detailed schemes and models for future communist society, he nonetheless vouchsafed some views on what communism was actually going to be (other than 'a historical movement that is proceeding under our own eyes', as it says in the *Manifesto*), and on how decisions would be made concerning collectively controlled

resources (other than the 'free development of each is the condition for the free development of all', in the same text). Hence the interest that *The Civil War in France* has aroused centres chiefly on the view, propounded by Engels, that for Marx the Paris Commune represented the 'advancement of the proletariat to ruling class, [the] victory for democracy', mentioned in the famous pamphlet of 1848.

Many of the critical comments directed at Marx's admittedly brief account of the political 'secret' of the Commune make the economic regulation and political institutions of modern 'welfare democracy' sound impossible on any terms, let alone his. It must be said, however, that Marx's communism required the eventual abolition of the money economy altogether, as he argued in the opening chapter of *Capital*, but it is not clear under those circumstances how economic information is to be transmitted through democratic institutions to the spheres of production and consumption. Ultimately democratic institutions were to take responsibility for authoritative plans, but such plans were not to be authoritarian, precisely because they were to be the outcome of democratic decision-making. However, there are no practical clues or examples given by Marx to support these particular views.

In Marx's admittedly selective account of politics under the Commune he praised the institution of municipal councillors, chosen by universal manhood suffrage, responsible to the electorate, and revocable by them if mandated instructions were not obeyed. He envisaged a hierarchy of local and district communes, each sending representatives to a higher body, culminating in a national one handling the 'few but important' functions of central government. Unlike the 'democracies' of Marx's time or ours, these representatives and their paid officials were to be awarded only working-class wages. The standing army was to be abolished, the people were to be armed as a militia, and the police were to be responsible to their communes. Marx had no faith in an 'independent' judiciary and argued that magistrates and judges were to be made elective. The church was to be disestablished, though religious belief could evidently have survived, and free education was to be made available to all.

It takes considerable imagination to see all this in the actual Commune itself, especially given the character of the reports that Marx received in the press. Eyewitnesses, of course, may have told him