sympathy towards them, as Bukharin seemed to have had. On the contrary, this volume further demonstrates Preobrazhensky’s *instrumental* fascination with the peasantry as revealed in his theory of primitive accumulation. The documents in fact further *reinforce* the technocratic image of Preobrazhensky as an unwavering, and hence uncompromising, figure whose theories are ultimately responsible for the costly (in terms of human life) path taken towards the industrialization of the USSR. But given that in his preface Day states that the forthcoming volume “will have much more to say about economics than the current one” (1), we must wait and see if there is something new that is yet to be discovered about the ethical side of E. A. Preobrazhensky.

Hamid Sakhai

c/o Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology
Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4R2
Canada
hsakhai@dal.ca


This massive book packs an astounding amount of analysis of Marx into its pages. Three contributions are here noteworthy: 1) Zhang presents one of the most extensive overviews on Marx’s entire work; 2) he provides good reasons to think that some of the standard readings are uncharitable, if not entirely inconsistent; 3) he holds that the late Marx’s world outlook is to be considered as a historical phenomenology.

1) Marx’s work has usually been divided into early and late, or immature and mature periods. Zhang believes that this oversimplifies the issue. In fact, there are several intellectual shifts to be noted. Based on the textual evidence, Marx’s first period is to be located in 1838–1844, when he turned from Young Hegelianism to Feuerbach’s general materialism, as documented in his *Kreuznach Notes, Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, On the Jewish Question* and the *1844 Manuscripts.* Zhang underlines that, starting from the *Comments on Mill* and the *1844 Manuscripts,* Marx enters a second stage that lasts until the end of 1846 (*Theses on Feuerbach, The German Ideology,* his drafts of letters to Annenkov as well as the *Brussels Notes* and *Manchester Notes*). This is when Marx starts working on establishing a new understanding of historical materialism. The period between 1847 and 1853, when he wrote *The Poverty*
of Philosophy and took his London Notes 1850–53, marks out his third stage. This is followed by Marx’s final stage beginning in 1857–58: Grundrisse, and later works leading to Capital.

Unlike most of the Marx literature that deals with Marx’s completed works, Zhang’s inquiry involves Marx’s excerpts, notes and records as well. These records include research theses, bibliographies, and theoretical musings. There are about 250 notebooks that have been published and indexed, of which 60,000 pages of text were annotated and commented on by Marx and Engels, not to mention the large amount of unpublished material in their collected works (MEGA²). Zhang asserts that these notebooks, kept by Marx throughout his life, require particular attention in order to trace his theoretical intentions, thought experiments and intellectual intuitions that form the backdrop for his completed works.

2) The 1924–32 publication of The German Ideology as well as of a large number of Marx’s pre-1845 works, including Reflections of a Young Man on the Choice of a Profession, Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophies of Nature, the Bonn Notes, Berlin Notes, Kreuznach Notes, Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, and 1844 Manuscripts — all this reshaped scholarly understanding of Marx’s theoretical development. Based on these materials, Maximilien Rubel and Irving Fetscher, for instance, found a humanist Marx in the early period that they played off against Soviet Marxism, while Lukács, Korsch, and Gramsci followed a pattern that embraces both Marx’s early humanism and his late conception of subjectivity. For scholars like the early Fromm, Marcuse, and Lefebvre, as well as the late Sartre, the 1844 Manuscripts alone represent the young Marx. The argument about this “humanist Marx” led the Yugoslavian Praxis Group to refute an alleged “Engelsism”: that “Marxism is an economic determinism” “absent of humanism” (xxiv). Althusser’s rupture theory followed in this matter a radically different line that portrays a young Marx with humanist ideology, and a mature Marx with a brand new scientific worldview. Then there is the Soviet evolutionary model, identifying the period before 1844 as a Young Hegelian Marx and locating Marx’s turn to materialism from the summer of 1845 (Theses on Feuerbach) until the publishing of The German Ideology in the autumn of 1846.

The young-vs.-late issue centers on the question of where to locate Marx’s theoretical shifts. The inversion of his philosophical premise and early understanding of empirical perception as something non-historical represents his first turn from Young Hegelianism to Feuerbach’s materialism. Oscillation between these two poles, as Zhang puts it, is evident in his 1844 Manuscripts (115). In 1847, Marx starts focusing on social reality from a historical angle. The late 1850s, when he started writing Grundrisse, document his “phenomenological inversion” of reification, alienation and objectification within the
economic context (487). The final shift consists of systematic inversions of theoretical representations of economics in *Capital*.

3) For Zhang, the ultimate result of Marx’s entire work is his “historical phenomenology that unified essence and phenomenon, that was founded on the special theory of historical materialism and historical epistemology” (353). This “historical phenomenology” originates from Marx’s early economic studies in the *Paris Notes*, particularly around 1842, when he first seized upon the conception of material production in bourgeois political economy under the humanist influence and political critique of his contemporaries. This is when he produced a social materialism that is closely tied to the alienation concept.

Zhang holds that a purely economist reading of Marx’s work is to be resisted: one must consider not only *what* but also *how* Marx achieved the foundation of and progress in his social theory. The latter aspect presumes Marx’s developing theory-laden view of empirical reality and social history. The method of questioning the appearance forms of social reality and its representational forms in the history of theoretical thinking is acquired, Zhang argues, by an approach called historical and critical phenomenology. The term “phenomenology” refers to the dual roots of Marx’s theory in the constant motion of history: theory and empiricism. However, the particular case Zhang studies is Marx’s path towards *Capital*. The book aims to reconstruct Marx’s phenomenology “in the context of economics.”

Marx’s theoretical approach evolves in his *Comments on Mill*, “Elements of Political Economy” at the end of the *Paris Notes*, and the *1844 Manuscripts*, toward a particular understanding of historical dialectics. In his later *Brussels Notes, Theses on Feuerbach*, and the draft of an article on Friedrich List’s book, *National System of Political Economy*, Marx develops his conception of industrial productive forces at an ontological level, which he pursues then in the first chapter of *The German Ideology*. Zhang argues that Marx establishes here his philosophical logic and economic criticism of social reality. Between 1845 and 1847, Marx begins to abandon his previous humanism-based argument and the positivist–idealist legacy of uncritical phenomenology, and develops a new understanding of social reality in the *1850–53 London Notes*. Here Marx realizes for the first time that the inversions and reified structures of economic relations go back to the fundamental structures of the capitalist mode of production. The 1857–58 *Grundrisse* is a product of his broader confrontation with forms of representation of objectified and reified relations in capitalist society, which, in Zhang’s opinion, makes up Marx’s “critical, historical phenomenology” (389).

Zhang stresses that his “Back to Marx” project does not represent any attempt to solidify a dogmatic precept, but rather tries to put special aspects
of Marx’s entire work up for discussion. His meticulous investigation concentrates on the ignored record, now being published in the German and Chinese editions of MEGA², and brings missing pieces of standard Marx historiographies together. Thus, this contribution should help to break, at least in the Chinese context, the personality cult built around Marx, and to demystify different Marxes turned against each other.
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“I have a dream”: Every schoolchild in the United States can identify the author of this famous assertion, and many can associate it with Martin Luther King’s speech at the August 1963 March on Washington. (Well, almost every: we should not forget that the history of the Civil Rights Movement is glossed over in many school systems, and that some states still do not call off classes on King’s birthday.)

W. Jason Miller’s book locates the origins of King’s well-worn phrase in the poetry of Langston Hughes, and in the process proposes that “King’s engagement with Hughes’ poems resulted in the 20th century’s most visible integration of poetry with politics.” This politics was, he argues, a radical politics. While it is often thought that King’s red-baiting by the FBI during the early 1960s was grounded simply in J. Edgar Hoover’s personal antipathy to King, Miller reveals that the young preacher noted, “I am convinced that capitalism has seen its best days in America . . . and in the entire world. . . . It has failed to meet the needs of the masses.” It was the pressure to safeguard each and every one of King’s sentences from possible misquotation that motivated him — at the urging of his editor — to write, “my response to communism was and is negative.” “How much of King’s deepest influences and Marxist sympathies,” Miller asks, “have been lost to us by way of self-reflexive editing done in the anticipation of political backlash?” King’s anti-capitalism, Miller argues, was to a significant degree compatible with the political leftism of