

# UCLA

## UCLA Historical Journal

### Title

*The History of Marxism. Vol. I: Marxism in Marx's Day.* Edited by E. J. HOBSEBAWM. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982. Pp. xxiv + 349. Notes, bibliography, index. \$25.00.

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/69f97225>

### Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 3(0)

### Author

Morot, John

### Publication Date

1982

### Copyright Information

Copyright 1982 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

argument, in Rom Harré's essay "Knowledge," weaken the editors' assertion that history of science is now "part of history itself" (p. 2).

One hesitates to blame the editors for the deficiencies of their contributors, but it appears that the authors' failure to engage in constructive debate is in part an effect of the division of the essays into different subject-areas. Thus, whatever Schaffer and Heilbron's different perspectives might have had to say to one another is left unsaid, and the essays are separated to different parts of the book, though their respective titles differ by only one word. In addition, the editors admit to having placed few restrictions on their authors, and although one would not want complete uniformity, it may be that there is a certain lack of a clear editorial perspective and direction. Rousseau's individual essay "Psychology" is diffuse and rambling. Porter's "The Terraqueous Globe" is stimulating, in its attempt to identify a unity among discourses about the earth, but fails to pursue the theoretical question of the specification and location of this unity. Furthermore, as Jacques Roger's "The Living World" suggests, attitudes to historiography are also in part attitudes to the recent past of history of science as a field. The account offered by the editors' introduction, of the recent "revolution" in the historiography of science (p. 2), is simply too brief and too sketchy to provide adequate orientation on historiographical questions.

As a series of review essays, *The Ferment of Knowledge* will unquestionably be of value, and it certainly demonstrates a lively historiographical diversity in current history of science. If one senses an unfortunate lack of productive interaction between the various approaches represented, one should perhaps refer to the dust-jacket, where it is said that the authors aim "to stimulate fresh debate." To this extent, the book may be as provocative by its failures as by its successes.

Jan Golinski  
University of Leeds

*The History of Marxism*. Vol. I: *Marxism in Marx's Day*.

Edited by E. J. HOBBSBAWM. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982. Pp. xxiv + 349. Notes, bibliography, index. \$25.00.

This is the first of a four volume survey of the history of Marxism which was originally published in Italy in 1978. Subsequent volumes will continue the survey up to the present time. Each will consist of a series of essays written from a Marxist perspective and oriented toward those "with a powerful desire to discover what, if anything, Marxist thought contributes to the solution of present problems" (p. viii).

In the opening essay, E. J. Hobsbawm discloses Marxism's indebtedness to pre-Marxist socialism and highlights

its originality. Hobsbawm notes that Marx and Engels developed a comprehensive critique of bourgeois society; they grounded the necessity of socialism not on timeless notions of justice, equality, and morality but on the historically specific needs of the working class which capitalist society was incapable of satisfying in a rational, consistent, and systematic manner. Above all they showed that the emancipation of the workers must be the task of the workers themselves. Their liberation could not be handed to them from above by a philanthropic bourgeoisie as the utopian socialists believed, nor organized behind their backs by small conspiratorial cliques as the school of Blanqui and company taught.

In a less satisfactory essay David McClellan tackles the question of Marx's relationship to Feuerbach and Hegel in the genesis of historical materialism. He adheres rather closely to the problematical account given by Engels late in his life. To assert that the way forward for Marx merely "lay in an application to the 'real' world of the principles Hegel had discovered" (p. 31) is a simplification. This difficult matter is analyzed in a far more insightful fashion by István Mészáros in his "Marx 'Philosopher.'" While not assenting to all the author writes, particularly with regard to the modern natural sciences, Meszaros shows how mistaken it is to believe, as McClellan and others do, that there is a "break" between the "philosophical" young Marx operating with the concepts of alienation and species-being and the "scientific" mature Marx who speaks only of class struggle, exploitation, and surplus value. While a Marxist's conception of socialism is possible without inquiring into the nature of the conditions most appropriate to human beings, it is made all the poorer for it. Socialism is not merely assuring everyone a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage. Otherwise Trotsky's vision of a society in which the average human being "will rise to the heights of an Aristotle, a Goethe, or a Marx" must be dismissed as a piece of senseless daydreaming. The transcendence of alienation, allegedly a pre-Marxist concept, is central to the "mature" Marx as well.

At a more immediately political level, another essay by Hobsbawm notes the lack of a fully worked out theory of politics by Marx and Engels which would show exactly how the workers were to make their revolution and establish socialism. At the time they were writing, no mass political organizations of the working class had yet formed. The description of the proletariat's political and organizational development, sketched out in the *Communist Manifesto*, saw no conflict, in principle, between the workers' daily struggle to improve their conditions and the formation of revolutionary, socialist class consciousness. The one developed side-by-side with the other. Subsequent developments partly vitiated this schematic analysis. The phenomenon of reformism, in particular, was never adequately treated in theory because it had yet to arise in practice. It would be left to Lenin, Trotsky, and Rosa Luxemburg to develop an analysis of the roots of reformism and a strategy to combat it.

Not all of the essays are of the same caliber as Hobsbawm's and Mészáros's. Pierre Vilar seems to have written "Marx and the Concept of History" for his self-clarification--and no one else's. Maurice Dobb's "Marx's Critique of Political Economy" is far too superficial.

Lawrence Krader's discussion of Marx's relationship to Darwin, Carlyle, Morgan, Maine, and Kovalevsky is simply bad. To apply the categories of surplus value and exchange value to pre-capitalist societies betrays a fundamentally flawed understanding of historical materialism. The essay is also a good example of a desiccated, mechanical Marxism contaminated by a strong dose of Darwinism.

For regular readers of *New Left Review*, this anthology does not break new ground in either the selection of themes or their treatment. For Marxists, this should not come as a surprise. It is difficult to make breakthroughs in the realm of theory when they have yet to be made in the realm of practice. This will undoubtedly change if socialism becomes a real historical alternative in the advanced capitalist countries of the West.

John Morot  
University of California, Los Angeles

*Women, War and Revolution*. Edited by CAROL R. BERKIN and CLARA M. LOVETT. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980. Pp. xiii + 310. Illustrations, annotated bibliography, index. \$9.75 (paper).

Vast numbers of women have been mobilized in modern wars and revolutions. Their non-domestic, public activities as concerned citizens, agitators, teachers, industrial workers, and soldiers have been accepted and even encouraged by those in power. At the same time, particularly in revolutions, millions of women have embraced egalitarian principles and discovered the eminently finite and changeable character of human institutions, including those most directly restricting their rights. The changes in women's prescribed and actual roles, from exclusively domestic to more public and political ones, compose the basic theme of this anthology.

Carol R. Berkin and Clara M. Lovett have selected eleven articles from a May 1978 conference on "Women, War, and Revolution" to further the comparative dimension of current research on women's status during and after major social crises. Five deal with episodes from bourgeois democratic revolutions, three with world wars, and three with socialist revolutions. The articles embrace the United States, France, Italy, Germany, Russia, China, and Cuba.

The result is more a collection of disparate articles --some excellent--than an attempt to test the validity of a clear thesis in a variety of situations. Some contributions are synthetic and theoretically stimulating, others narrowly focused and narrative. The editors' three brief introductions attempt to define the issues raised by the relation between women, war, and revolution. But most contributors do not address these issues directly. As the editors freely admit, this unevenness reflects the state of research and theoretical elaboration on the subject. The book's value lies in the quality of several articles and the impetus it