

Summaries

Thomas Seidl: *Materialist Theory of History - An Outline of the Problem* (p. 13)

The critique of political economy as a theory of history and of emancipation has been considered to be historically and logically false. This interpretation holds that a materialistic theory of revolution is logically impossible and thus reduces Marx's critique to a mere metaphysics of labour (Breuer). This view however, is founded on the untenable assumption that it is possible to transcend the infinite dialectical movement of the contradiction between value and use value in the system of real subsumption by means of moral dissent. Both the theoretical explanation of poverty and Habermas's theory of "communicative competence" are based on anthropological assumptions that are yet to be verified. In contrast, I argue that the so-called "crisis of Taylorism" is an indication of the immanent crisis of real subsumption and has created the historical conditions that could serve to verify Marx's theory of labour.

Thomas Lutz Schweier: *Marx's Historical Reflection. Theses on his Understanding of History* (p. 35)

In this article I present a number of theses indicating that Marx's works contain a specific approach and handling of history and science. In respect to historical reflection, I present arguments in refutation of the assertion that Marx had a *positive* relationship to any elements of philosophy of history. I therefore conclude, that even for "Das Kapital", the Marxian understanding of portrayal as critique of political economy directly points to the relationship between the logical and the historical, and vice versa. Furthermore, this could prove to be a crucial point for renewed discussion of Marx's relationship to history.

Christoph Lieber / Axel Otto: *Marx - a Philosopher of History? Some Sources of Continuous Aggravation with the Critique of Political Economy* (p. 53)

This article discusses the arguments held against the position, that the development of the capitalist mode of production would result in the transformation of society into one where people have conscious control over their means of reproduction and their essential conditions of life, and of the historical role of the working class in such an achievement. There is abundant evidence in Marx's manuscripts to show that with the establishment of the capitalist mode of production, social relationships are created, that make an unideological, encompassing understanding of history possible. Such an understanding presupposes a thorough critique of society's understanding of itself, of its structure of dependency, and of its relationship to nature. A knowledge of history obtained by analyzing the appropriation relationships in production lays the groundwork for an approach to history that has nothing to do with philosophy of history.

Michael Heinrich: *Marx and the Philosophy of History* (p. 62)

Whereas in the "Manuscripts of 1844", Marx used argumentation patterns of philosophy of history uncritically, the late Marx explicitly excluded philosophy of history from his analysis. On the other hand we do find some elements of philosophy of history in his writings after 1857, but they are not fundamental to his arguments. In the "Grundrisse", these are not systematically incorporated into the content of his main assertions and in "Capital" they are limited to the more declamatory parts, as in the section on the historical tendency of capitalist accumulation.

Helmut Reichelt: *Why Did Marx Conceal his Dialectical Method?* (p. 73)

Neither the dialectical method in the Marxian critique of political economy nor its significance have been clearly understood. Marx himself admitted that in "Das Kapital", he "concealed" his method more than in its drafts. In order to explain this, we must revert to the beginnings of Marx's studies. In his early works, beginning with his dissertation (including its preparatory research) up to the writing of the "Ökonomisch-philosophische Manuskripte", the articulation of his later concept of ideology is already clear. Through the differentiation of esoteric from exoteric consciousness, Marx creates a new theoretical opening for the exposition of the "truth" about the free, autonomous, and enlightened subject. On the basis of this assumption, I depict in the second part of this article the discrepancy between the concept of portrayal in the "Grundrisse" and in the completed critique of political economy. This has not yet been analyzed in the study of Marx's method. In essence, it is about the taxonomy in the presentation of the functions of money. We can clearly discern a specific principle of portrayal within the conceptual framework of the "Grundrisse": one could view it as Marx's theoretical articulation of the increasing autonomy of exchange value. In "Das Kapital", only its naked skeleton remains. Without reflecting on what Marx had in mind in the "Grundrisse", the concept in "Das Kapital" cannot be understood.

Peter Keiler: *What do Marx and Feuerbach Mean by "Reification"?* (p. 111)

The aim of this article is to explicate the original meaning of the term "objectification". Although this term has become quite popular in Marxist literature, it is often misused (being frequently confounded with concepts that play a key role in certain branches of post-Hegelian idealism). I argue that the concept of "objectification" in its primary sense (as used by its originator L. Feuerbach and adopted by the "early" Marx) is essential for the Feuerbachian view of the subject-object union, referring to the object (Gegenstand) as the "mirror" of the subject's essential capacities and needs. In addition, I document the expansion of the meaning of the term "objectification" by Feuerbach as well as by Marx.

Frank Kuhne: *"Automatic Subject" and "Living Subjects". Marx's Basis for Criticism of the Heteronomous Determinacy of Society* (p. 134)

In contrast to his early works, Marx does not develop a materialistic concept of history in "Das Kapital". The "Kritik der politischen Ökonomie" claims to explain the function of capital out of its fundamental concepts. Nevertheless, the analysis of capital as a social relation has also relevance for his philosophy of history. According to Marx, the first realization in history of man's freedom from the immediate forces of nature coincides with fully developed heteronomous social relations under the conditions of "production for production's sake".

Danga Vileisis: *Engels' Roll in the "Unhappy Relationship" of Marxism and Feminism: Marx and Engels on Gender Hierarchy and Domination in Precapitalist Society* (p. 149)

H. Hartmann (1981) has portrayed the relationship of Marxism and Feminism as an "unhappy marriage" (to which my title alludes). Since then, Marxism has been the object of much theoretical feminist criticism. In spite of their differences, there seems to be agreement on one point: Marxist theory of emancipation is reductionist because it confines its criticism of exploitation and alienation to the sphere of economic relations of production in a given society. It therefore excludes from its analysis the patriarchal gender relationship and those spheres of labor, cognition, love, knowledge, etc., which are historically associated with family or women's social activity. Such criticism often assumes that the theoretical positions of Marx and Engels are either the same or does not adequately differentiate between them. In the following, I present evidence to show that Marx and Engels differed particularly in their views on women's labor and on the historical development of gender hierarchy. My analysis of these positions develops arguments for a critical reconstruction of gender hierarchy as well as for a partial refutation of the mentioned criticism of Marx.

William Frederick Drischler: *Marxist State Theory Without Russenhas?* (p. 180)

In the related texts of "Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century" (1857) and "Herr Vogt" (1860), Marx asserts that the Petrine diplomacy of the Great Northern War between Russia and Sweden (1700-1721) and the Tartar Yoke (1241-1480) in Russia were decisive events in modern history. Both phenomena long preceded the appearance of a politically conscious working class in the 1830's. Thus for Marx, the East-West struggle (and collaboration) is prior to modern class struggle in the developed nations of the West. British diplomacy, as exemplified by Lord Palmerston - and exposed by Marx in the Essay ("Lord Palmerstone"), - in fact routinized a pre-capitalist (and sub-western) force in British Imperial politics that created an East-West "pluralism" in the hegemonic world power as a double polity ruled by two culturally heterogeneous dominant classes. The restoration of Marx's original emphasis on diplomatic history as the core of state theory could bring back into view Marx's assessment of the overwhelming (yet often secretive) influence of the Russians within the Western state system, not to mention his program for terminating (as opposed to reducing) that influence. Pretending that *Russenhas* hasn't influenced the inner structure of Marx's state theory is a luxury serious scholarship can no longer afford.