



BOSHI WENKU

〔哲学〕

马克思主义哲学 与后现代主义比较

MAKESI ZHUYI ZHIXUE

YU HOU XIANDAI ZHUYI DE BIJIAO

徐飞 著

知识产权出版社



BOSHI WENKU
[哲学]

B0-0
121

马克思主义哲学 与后现代主义的比较

MAKESI ZHUYI ZHEXUE
YU HOU XIANDAI ZHUYI DE BIJIAO

徐飞 著

知识产权出版社

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

马克思主义哲学与后现代主义的比较/徐飞著. —北京: 知识
产权出版社, 2005.8

ISBN 7-80198-411-0

I. 马… II. 徐… III. 马克思主义哲学-对比研究-
后现代主义 IV. ①B0-0②B089

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2005) 第 099941 号

内容提要

本书对马克思主义哲学和后现代主义的产生背景、总体特征、本体论特征、历史观特征和发展趋势进行了对比研究, 认为: 马克思主义哲学具有后现代性, 后现代主义境遇中存在着马克思主义哲学; 而马克思主义哲学通过了解后现代主义的特征, 避免后现代主义的不足, 从而实际上又超越了“后现代”。

读者对象: 高等院校哲学专业师生及有关研究人员等。

马克思主义哲学与后现代主义的比较

徐飞 著

责任编辑: 汤腊冬 鲁瑞山

责任校对: 韩秀天

特约编辑: 卫金桂 王绪宏

责任出版: 杨宝林

出版发行: 知识产权出版社

社 址: 北京市海淀区马甸南村 1 号

邮 编: 100088

网 址: <http://www.cnipr.com>

邮 箱: BJB@cnipr.com

发行电话: 010-82000893 82000860 转 8101

传 真: 010-82000893

责编电话: 010-82000889 82000860-8108

传 真: 010-82000889

印 刷: 北京白帆印务有限公司

经 销: 新华书店及相关销售网点

开 本: 880mm × 1230mm 1/32

印 张: 7.375

版 次: 2006 年 1 月第一版

印 次: 2006 年 1 月第一次印刷

字 数: 180 千字

定 价: 18.00 元

ISBN 7-80198-411-0/C·044

如有印装质量问题, 本社负责调换。



摘 要

表面上看,马克思主义哲学和后现代主义产生于不同的时代,甚至是不同的世纪,它们不可能相遇。实则不然。马克思主义哲学和后现代主义不仅能够在当代相遇,而且双方在许多方面还存在着可比较性。

从双方产生的背景看,作为理论,后现代主义和马克思主义哲学都是历史的产物,都离不开社会现实的土壤——不论它是维护还是批判既存社会状况。虽然马克思恩格斯生活于其中的资本主义社会不同于当代资本主义社会,但它却是当代资本主义社会的早期形态,是当代资本主义社会得以发生的“根”,当代资本主义社会是它的继续与发展;虽然马克思主义是在对早期资本主义社会的批判中创立的,但马克思主义是开放的、发展的、面向未来的,它也关注当代资本主义社会的发展状况和规律,在理论和现实的不间断的双向运动中,不断地丰富自己、修正自己、发展自己和完善自己。可以说,马克思主义和后现代主义发生在同一个社会现实的土壤里。在理论资源上,后现代主义和马克思主义哲学都是源于对西方传统哲学的反叛,对形而上学的拒斥,只是马克思主义哲学与孔德所开创的现代西方哲学的发展路向迥然有异。因此,虽然马克思主义哲学和后现代主义在时间上和空间上相隔甚远,但它们必然会在当代相遇。它们之间的比较也就成为了一个有着重大实践意义和理论意义的课题。

后现代主义和马克思主义哲学在当代的相遇,为两者之间的理论比较提供了必然。本文除了对两者的产生背景进行对比研究外,还对两者的总体特征、本体论特征、历史观特征和发展趋势进行对比研究。



在总体特征方面，后现代主义坚持了哲学的批判性和时代性，对资本主义社会片面追求经济增长、对社会的全面异化以及由此引起的人们心灵交流、语言交往的阻隔、对传统哲学的形而上学思维方式，都进行了批判和反思。但是，由于后现代主义把批判与解构当成了自身的立足点，最后，后现代主义在一味的批判与解构中走向了怀疑主义和虚无主义，并发生了分化和转向。后现代主义所批判的理论对象和现实对象也为马克思主义哲学所批判，然而，马克思主义哲学的批判建基于实践的基础上，在实践的基础上立足于“人类社会或社会化了的人类”，强调实践活动中的“环境的改变和人的活动或自我改变”的一致性，强调在批判旧世界中建立新世界，即在批判中致力于“立”，马克思主义哲学是开放的、发展的。因此，马克思主义哲学和后现代主义具有共同的批判对象，都拒斥形而上学，都具有批判性，但是，后现代主义的批判性被其虚无主义、相对主义和纷乱的论争所掩盖，并对虚无主义作了让步，而马克思主义哲学的批判性——在其本质上——是一种实践性和科学辩证法。

在哲学本体论方面，罗蒂的“后哲学文化”、德里达的解构主义、利奥塔的合法化危机、贝尔的资本主义文化断裂以及哈贝马斯与德里达、利奥塔的论战等表明，后现代主义反对形而上学的本体论，反对抽象的、僵死的同一性，反对基础主义和还原主义，反对人类中心论，但是，后现代主义把否定和反对推向了另一个极端，反对任何形式的本体论和共识，认为“存在就是差异”，一切都是文本的游戏。而马克思主义哲学首先承认一般唯物主义的天然前提，在此前提下，马克思主义哲学在实践的基础上实现了哲学对象的转换，建构了自己的哲学理论。马克思主义哲学批判了旧唯物主义、形而上学的思维方式以及抽象的本体论，在一定的程度上与后现代主义具有相同的本体论特征。但是，马克思主义哲学又不同于后现代主义，即主张在实践中把握和理解本体、基础、同一性和差异性等，坚持以人为本的本体

论。显然，后现代主义和马克思主义哲学的本体论之间既有区别又有联系。它们之间的区别是实质性的，它们之间的联系也是实质性的。我们必须坚持双方相联系的方面，否则，我们就会步形而上学的后尘，就会重蹈传统哲学的覆辙；我们也必须坚持双方相区别的方面，否则，我们就会像后现代主义那样，虽然对西方社会问题的“把脉”和对传统哲学症疾的判断是正确的，但却开错了处方，从而导致了自身的分化、转向与衰亡。

在历史观方面，后现代主义的哲学史编纂学探讨了“人如何认识历史”、“历史如何呈现”等历史观的关键问题，詹姆逊分析了生产结构之间的转换，贝尔强调了历史时代的“生长点”，以科技和知识为轴心，划分社会形态。可以说，后现代主义关注和探讨了历史观的主要问题。但是，后现代主义或者把历史看成是“文本”、“文件记录”，或者只强调社会结构之间的共时性转换或某一方面的特征，否认人的主体性，或者把历史的发展理解为“文化逻辑”并否认文化逻辑的反映特性，等等。马克思主义哲学的历史观同其本体论一样，以实践为基础，强调全部社会生活在本质上是实践的，强调在社会实践活动中考察人的发展及认识社会历史，强调从生产力和生产关系的相互作用中分析社会历史发展的动力和动因，以生产力和生产关系的结合体——生产方式划分社会形态，强调人的解放或人的自由、人的全面发展为社会历史发展的最高目标。因此，马克思主义哲学的历史观和后现代主义的历史观具有共同的理论热点，或者说，马克思主义哲学的历史观和后现代主义的历史观关注着共同的理论热点问题，并在某些问题上或某一问题的个别方面具有基本一致的答案，但是，全面地看或本质地看，两者的解答却又有着本质的区别。

在发展趋势方面，由于后现代主义和马克思主义哲学各自的产生背景、总体特征、本体论特征和历史观特征的异同，决定了它们各自的发展趋势。不容置疑，后现代主义具有很强的合理性，如后现代主义坚持了哲学的批判特性，坚持了哲学必须关注



时代、关注现实的品格，反对甚至摧毁了长期占据着人们头脑的形而上学思维方式，等等。但是，由于后现代主义的虚无主义或怀疑主义的倾向，后现代主义从不轻言建立一个理论体系或追求一种普遍的共识，以免把自己推进解构的旋涡，后现代主义只能或不得不一路拆解下去，把自己放置在被自己解构的对象之列，成为文本游戏中的一部分或一个花絮，这也就使得后现代主义在经过一阵的宣泄之后，很快走向衰弱，并出现分化和转向。新历史主义和建设性的后现代主义即后现代科学的出现、詹姆逊以双重身份的登场等使后现代主义的分化和转向成为了现实。而马克思主义哲学自产生以来，经历了一个半世纪多的风风雨雨，其间，有过辉煌，也有过挫折，甚至有过生与死的抉择。如斯大林时期，马克思主义哲学被严重地教条化和僵化，并被当做一个经典的模式在社会主义阵营内随意套用和粘贴；1989年苏联解体、东欧巨变之时，似乎把马克思主义和社会主义推进了深渊，西方的一些思想家乘机叫嚷“马克思主义死亡了”、“社会主义失败了”。但是，由于马克思主义哲学自身的科学性以及科学的实践性、批判性、开放性和时代性等，马克思主义哲学不仅度过了一次又一次的危机，而且还从每一次的危机中把自身向前推进了一步。始于1995年并在1998年达到高潮的西方国家关于马克思或马克思主义的各种盛况空前的国际大会、德里达的《马克思的幽灵们——债务国家、哀悼活动及新国际》的出版，便是证明。

通过上述几方面的分析和批判，不难看出，后现代主义和马克思主义哲学的本质特征分别是后现代性和实践性。后现代性和实践性都秉有一种批判精神，当然，后现代性的批判精神需要作一定的限定和改造。正是双方都具有批判精神，所以，马克思主义哲学和后现代主义在当代可以达到“视界融合”：马克思主义哲学具有后现代性，后现代主义的境遇中存在着马克思主义哲学。这是本书在结束语中的结论。

最后，引用格里芬的一句话并稍做改动，以结束本书。格里



芬说：“我的出发点是：中国可以通过了解西方世界所做的错事，避免现代化带来的破坏性影响。这样做的话，中国实际上是‘后现代化了’。”那么，我们可以说：马克思主义哲学可以通过了解后现代主义的特点和特征，避免后现代主义的失足，这样，马克思主义哲学实际上就超越了“后现代”。这也正是本书的理论意义和现实意义所在。



Abstract

Judging from the surface, Marxism philosophy and Post-modernity were generated in different epochs, even in different centuries, therefore cannot interact, but the fact is on the contrary.

Regarding the backgrounds of both schools, both Post-modernity and Marxism as theories were derived from the history, rooted in the social reality—no matter whether they guard or criticize existing social conditions. Although the capitalist society Marx and Engels lived in is different from modern capitalist society, yet the latter is the consequence and development of the former, and the former was the “root” from which the modern capitalist society grows, the modern capitalist society is the consequence and development of earlier capitalist society; although Marxism was based on the critics against earlier capitalist society, yet Marxism is open and developing in the face of the future, so it also pays attention to the situation and rules of the development of the modern capitalist society, keeping to enrich, correct, develop and improve itself in the two-way movement between theory and the reality. It is safe to say that both Marxism and Post-modernity occur in the same soil of social reality. In theoretical sources, both Post-modernity and Marxism philosophy are a rebel against the western traditional philosophy, and a refusal to the metaphysics, only that the developing direction of Marxism is apparently different from that the modern western philosophy created by Conte, A. G. Therefore, the two are determined to meet in the temporary age though they are widely separated both in time and space. For this reason, the comparison of them becomes an important topic of both practical and theoretical meanings.



The encounter of Post-modernity and Marxism philosophy in the temporary age makes the theoretical comparison of the two a matter of course. This article compares the two's overall features, characteristics in ontology and the views of history, and the development trend as well as the comparative research of the backgrounds in which the two were generated.

With regards to general features, Post-modernity insists on the qualities of critics and times, criticizing and rethinking capitalist society's partial pursuit of economic growth, society's full-scale alienation and the hindrance caused by this alienation to people's soul communications and language association, and the metaphysics thinking manner of the traditional philosophies. But because post-modernity takes critics and dismantlement as its standpoint, it finally goes to skepticism and nihilism in the course of blindly critics and deconstruction and differentiation and turnaround. The theory and reality targets Post-modernity criticizes are also those Marxism philosophy does, however, the critics by Marxism philosophy is based on practices, based on the "human society or socialized mankind" on the basis of practices, emphasizing the "coincidence of the change of environment and man's activities or self-change" in the practice, emphasizing the establishment of a new world in the course of criticizing the old world, i. e., being exerted in "establishment" in the course of critics, therefore Marxism philosophy is open and developable. So, although both Marxism philosophy and post-modernity have the same criticized target and refuse metaphysics, and both have the qualities of critics, the quality of critics of Post-modernity is covered by its nihilism, relativism and confusing disputes, and surrendered to nihilism, while the quality of critics of Marxism philosophy is a kind of practice and scientific dialectics in nature.

In the aspect of philosophical ontology, the Post-philosophical Culture of Rorty, the deconstruction of Derrida, the Legitimate Crisis of Ly-



otard, the rupture of capitalist culture of Bell, and Habermas's disputes with Derrida and Lyotard, etc. indicate that post-modernity opposes metaphysical ontology, abstract and dead oneness, foundationism, restorationism and anthropocentrism but post-modernity develops the deny and opposition to another extreme, opposing ontology and common views in any form, believing that "existence means differences only" and all are a game of text. But the philosophy of Marxism admits the natural premise of general materialism, and based on this premise, Marxism philosophy realizes its change of philosophical target and establishes its philosophical theory on the basis of practices. Marxism criticizes the thinking manner of old materialism and metaphysics and abstract ontology, largely having the same features as post-modernity in respect of the view of ontology. But Marxism philosophy is different from post-modernity, that is to say, the former advocates to grasp and understand the concepts such as noumenon, basis, identity and differences in the course of practices, and insists on the ontology taking man as a cause and purpose. Apparently, the ontology of post-modernity and Marxism philosophy are different while they are associated. The differences between them are substantial, so it is with the associations between the two. We must adhere to the associating areas of the two, or otherwise we will follow the step of metaphysics, making the mistakes traditional philosophies have done; meanwhile, we have to insist on their differences, or we will follow the example of post-modernity, diagnosed the issues of the western social problems and traditional philosophies correctly but giving out a wrong prescription, which resulted in its own polarization, turnaround and declination.

Regarding the views of history, the compilation studies of philosophical history of post-modernity discussed some key issues concerning the views of history, such as "how man cognizes history" and "how history manifests itself". Jameson analyzed the conversion between productive



structure, Bell emphasized the “growth point” of historic epochs, who classified societies in accordance with sciences, technology and knowledge. One can say that post-modernity discussed and paid attention to the key issues of historic views. But post-modernity either regarded history as “text” or “file record”, or emphasized only synchronic conversion within social structure or its feature in a certain aspect and denied human subjectivity, or understood the development of history as “cultural logic” and neglected the reflecting features of cultural logic, and so on. In contrast, Marxism philosophy’s view on history, like its ontology, takes practices as a basis, stressing that social life is practical in nature, that we should view on human development and understand the history through social practices, that the causes of the development of social history should be analyzed through the interaction of productivity and productive relations, that types of society should be divided by means of the combination of productivity and productive relations, i. e., productive manners, and that the final and highest goal of the development of social history should be man’s emancipation or free and full-scale development. So, there are the same theoretical hot points in both Marxism philosophy and post-modernity, or to say, Marxism philosophy and post-modernity have the same views on history pay attention to the same hot theoretical issues, and have largely the same answers for some questions or a certain aspect of a certain question but judging in a full scale or in nature, the explanations by the two are substantially different.

As for the trends of development, the differences of the both schools’ generating backgrounds, general features, features in ontology and views in history determine each own trend of development. Doubtlessly, post-modernity is reasonable in many areas, but because of its trend of nihilism or skepticism, post-modernity never mentioned to establish a theoretical system or pursue a general common view, in case it may be in-



volved into the vortex of deconstruction. All it did was to deconstruct all the way, placing itself outside the range of the targets it deconstructed and becoming a part or a titbit in the text game. In this way, post-modernity went quickly to decline and polarize and turn around after a short while of uproar. This polarization and turnaround became a reality due to the occurrence of neo-historianism and constructive post-modernity and the participation of Jameson with a double status. Marxism philosophy, however, since its birth, has weathered a hundred years, experiencing gloriousness and frustration, even a life or death choice. For example, during the Stalin period, Marxism philosophy was seriously dogmatized and stiffness; the dismantlement of the former Soviet Union in 1989 and the great changes in the Eastern Europe seemed to be lethal to Marxism, and some western thinkers seized the opportunity to clamor that "Marxism is dead" and that "Socialism has been frustrated". However, thanks to the scientific quality and the qualities of scientific practices, critics, openness and times of Marxism itself, the philosophy of Marxism once more went through the crises, and developed itself through the crises. Proofs are the unprecedented international conferences on Marx or Marxism in the western countries starting from the year 1995 and reaching the climax in 1998, and the publication of *Specters of Marx—Debt Countries, Mourning Activities and New Internationals* by Derrida.

Through analysis and critics above, it can easily be seen that the essential characters of post-modernity and Marxism are respectively post-modernity and the quality of practice. Both post-modernity and the quality of practice contain a spirit of critics, but the critical spirit needs to be restricted and reformed in a certain degree, of course. It is because both have critical spirits that Marxism philosophy and post-modernity can achieve an amalgamation in the contemporary era: Marxism philosophy has a feature of post-modernity, and Post-modernity has an experience Marx-



ism do. That is the conclusion this paper drew in its conclusive words.

Finally, I would like cite a line from Griffin to end this paper. Griffin said: "My start point is: China can avoid many destructive influences caused by modernization through the knowledge of the mistakes the Western has made. In doing so, China is 'being post-modernized' actually." Then, we can say that Marxism philosophy can avoid the mistakes of Post-modernity through the knowledge of Post-modernity's features and characteristics, by this way, Marxism philosophy becomes a "Post-modernity". Herein lie the theoretical and real meanings of this paper.



目 录

导言 马克思主义哲学与后现代主义的当代相遇	(1)
第一节 工业时代的“单面”社会——后现代主义的社会背景	(1)
第二节 哲学的反思与转向——后现代主义的哲学背景与资源	(8)
第三节 工业时代的“异化”社会——马克思主义哲学的社会背景	(18)
小 结	(20)
第一章 解构、摧毁与批判性、实践性：后现代主义与马克思主义哲学的总体特性比较	(22)
第一节 继承与反叛：现代主义到后现代主义	(22)
第二节 解构与摧毁：后现代主义的理论特征	(29)
第三节 实践性与批判性：马克思主义哲学的理论特征	(38)
小 结	(44)
第二章 “在场”与“出场”：后现代主义与马克思主义哲学的本体论比较	(47)
第一节 “消亡”与“出场”：后现代主义的本体论特征	(47)
第二节 “以人为本”与“在场”：马克思主义哲学的本体论特征	(95)
小 结	(120)
第三章 文本、话语的滑动与实践、人的展开：后现代主义与马克思主义哲学的历史观比较	(124)



第一节 文本、话语的滑动：后现代主义的历史观特征	(124)
第二节 实践、人的展开：马克思主义哲学的历史观特征	(153)
小 结	(186)
第四章 救助与趋向：后现代主义与马克思主义哲学命运的比较	(188)
第一节 激活的思维与怀疑后的疲惫：后现代主义的合理性与缺陷	(188)
第二节 分化与转向：后现代主义的趋势	(192)
第三节 挫折与前进：马克思主义哲学的生命力	(200)
结束语 跋涉后的沉思：后现代主义与马克思主义哲学再认识	(208)
第一节 后现代性：后现代主义的批判精神	(208)
第二节 实践批判性：马克思主义哲学的批判精神	(210)
第三节 批判性或批判精神：后现代性与实践性的“视界融合”	(213)
主要参考书目	(216)



导言 马克思主义哲学与后现代主义的当代相遇

“路漫漫其修远兮”。

刚刚过去的千年是不同寻常、波澜壮阔的千年，其中，有社会的政治大变革、体制大转型，也有思想观念、文化观念、哲学观念和宗教信仰的大转变，尤其是在 20 世纪最后的 20 年，针对现代化问题及科学知识的合法性问题，哲学观念转变之快、动荡之剧烈，“破”之彻底与“立”之滞后，是以往任何时代所不可比拟的。

关注西方社会现实，分析西方哲学发展历程，无疑是我们立论的出发点。

第一节 工业时代的“单面”社会—— 后现代主义的社会背景

西方社会的现状既是西方千年历史发展的集聚——各种社会、经济、政治和文化问题及冲突在这里融为一炉、互相冲撞，也是西方当今哲学的原本。

在经历了漫长苦难的古代世界、越过了黑暗残酷的中世纪之后，西方社会借助近代自然科学的建立，进入了近代社会。而现代社会同样是借助于近代科学而逐渐发展强大却又逐渐走向了其反面。近代科学的确立不仅推翻了神权，恢复了人权，而且同时提出了“知识就是力量”（培根语）的宏伟口号和宣言。各种科学及科学技术的确立与发明，也使得资本主义凭恃科技踏遍全球，向自然、向其他民族贪婪地攫取，聚敛财富。发家致富的雄