

## **An Important Problem in the Holistic Study of Marxist Doctrine —The Inner Logic and Implications of Marx’s Philosophical and Economic Revolution**

Ye Xianming

*Institute of Marxism, Zhejiang Normal University; Department of Philosophy, Capital Normal University*

马克思的哲学革命与经济学革命的内在逻辑联系，是关于马克思学说整体性研究中的一个关键性问题。马克思的哲学革命与经济学革命的内在逻辑联系是在马克思超越政治经济学领域的政治经济学批判和超越哲学领域的哲学批判的过程中展现出来的，即：在超越哲学领域的哲学批判中构建政治经济学的方法论系统，同时在超越政治经济学领域的政治经济学批判中丰富和发展初步完成的哲学革命的成果，最后在这两种“互动”的批判中基本完成经济学革命并使哲学革命的内容和形式趋于完善。马克思的哲学革命与经济学革命的内在逻辑联系对当代中国马克思主义哲学研究的重要方法论启示是：作为马克思主义创始人的马克思（和恩格斯），其学说的整体性实际上包含着对后人研究和发展其哲学的一个最为根本的方法论要求——从其学说的整体性出发来研究和发展其哲学。为此，就必须形成由批判理念、问题理念和时代理念构筑而成的跨学科意识。

关键词：哲学革命 政治经济学批判 跨学科意识

The inner logical connections between Marx’s philosophical and economic revolutions are a crucial issue in the study of Marx’s theory in its totality. They unfold in the course of Marx’s critique of political economy, which goes beyond the domain of political economy, and his critique of philosophy, which goes beyond the domain of philosophy. Specifically, Marx formulated his methodology for political economy in his critique of philosophy and at the same time expanded the achievement of his initial completion of a philosophical revolution in his critique of political economy. Finally, in these two “interactive” critiques, he basically accomplished his economic revolution and perfected both the substance and form of his philosophical revolution. The inner logic connecting Marx’s philosophical and economic revolutions offers important implications for research on Marxist philosophy in contemporary China. That is to say, the integrity of the theory of Marx (and Engels), the

---

ISSN 0252-9203

© 2011 Social Sciences in China Press

DOI: 10.1080/02529203.2011.548920

<http://www.informaworld.com>

founder(s) of Marxism, in fact implies a fundamental methodological requirement for later generations in studying and developing Marxist philosophy, namely, that they should always keep in mind the holistic nature of theory. Therefore, we need to have a cross-disciplinary consciousness which consists of critical awareness, problem awareness and awareness of the times.

**Keywords:** philosophical revolution, critique of political economy, cross-disciplinary consciousness

Once again we are compelled, by the complexity of the ever more striking “global problems” born of contemporary global developments, by the ever more striking tendency toward a high degree of “disaggregation” and “synthesis,” both co-existing in the contemporary structure of human knowledge, and by the ever more strikingly systemic nature of the practice of socialist reform in contemporary China, to rethink the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine. This holistic nature is not an abstract holism but one that is concrete. If divorced from in-depth and systematic study of the various structural elements that go to make up the totality of Marxist doctrine, any understanding of the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine can only be abstract, vague and even unscientific. The two revolutions carried out by Marx with regard to philosophy and economics stand as the most significant milestones in his life, and the internal logical connections between these two revolutions are related, in terms of methodology, to the various dimensions of “the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine.” The present paper proposes to illuminate, through a historical study and in a dynamic way, the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine and, on this basis, to expound the important methodological revelation inherent in the internal logical connection between Marx’s revolutions in the spheres of philosophy and economics.

This writer has argued, on the basis of an investigation into the cultural logic of Marx’s philosophical revolution, that what fundamentally differentiates Marxist philosophy from philosophies of the past is the fact that it came into being and developed not within the independent framework of traditional philosophy, but rather through the processes of historical critique, socialist critique and, especially, his critique of political economy.<sup>1</sup> It was these critiques—historical, socialist and, especially, political-economic—that bestowed on Marx’s philosophical critique a completely new significance, which was how the Marxist philosophical revolution came to pass. Although what Marx had achieved before the publication of *The Poverty of Philosophy* was but a preliminary critique of political economy and an initially completed philosophical revolution and his economic revolution was yet to be realized, it was bound to result from the extension of the logic of his philosophical reform and the systematic unfolding of his critique of political economy. Further, the initial completion of his revolution in philosophy would touch off, in terms of methodology, his

1 Ye Xianming, “The Cultural Logic of Marx’s Philosophical Revolution and Its Implications in Modern Times.”

economic revolution, while his economic revolution would necessarily foster the perfection of his philosophical revolution in both content and form; this constitutes the internal logical connection between his two revolutions. It has to be pointed out that this internal logical connection found in the development of Marx's thinking has hardly been given adequate attention, a situation that has brought about various misunderstandings in studies of Marxist philosophy and even Marxist doctrine as a whole.

Important methodological inspiration exists in the internal logical connections between Marx's philosophical and economic revolutions for studies in Marxist philosophy in China today.

### **I. Studies in Marx's Philosophy Have to Set Out from the Holistic Nature of Marxist Doctrine**

"Marx's philosophy" here refers to the philosophy that stands as the very origin of Marxist philosophy. The internal logical connections between Marx's revolutions in philosophy and in economics highlight the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine. The "holistic nature" embodied in the internal logical connections between Marx's two revolutions is defined, in terms of methodology, as a "totality" made up of its various elements and their mutual relations. Thus to study this "totality" one can adopt neither the holistic nor the individualist approach. Methodologically it is all the same whether one studies Marxist doctrine as a totality or studies a certain theory or theories in this totality by setting out from the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine; neither can deviate, in methodological terms, from the fundamental stipulation of "the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine." This fundamental methodological stipulation requires that attention be paid, throughout our research work, to two related problems. The first is that when the totality of Marxist doctrine is taken as the object of study, one must make sure that the totality is taken as a concrete totality, not an abstract one; that is, not as a kind of totality that is deprived of its various structural components and their mutual relations as represented in human thinking; if this occurs, students would tend to "generalize" and "simplify" the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine comprising its various structural components and their mutual relations. Methodologically, "abstract totality" readily tends to simplify the study of the "totality of Marxist doctrine," a tendency found in our academic circles at present and marked mainly by the attempt to seek a "line" that promises to run through and string together in a direct and simple manner all the complex links in the theories of Marxist doctrine, so as to simplify as much as possible Marxist doctrine as a totality. As is well known, doing so may create even greater misunderstandings of the "holistic nature of Marxist doctrine." As I see it, so far as this topic is concerned, the most important point at present is to rethink in depth the internal logical connections embodied in the interactive relationship between Marx's philosophical and economic revolutions. And so their degree of mastery of a certain theory or theories making up this totality is crucial for researchers who take the totality of Marxist

doctrine as their object of study, since otherwise they cannot possibly be considered qualified for the task; of course, even the relative mastery of a particular theory or theories of Marxist doctrine constitutes only one among the necessary conditions rather than the sufficient condition for the holistic study of Marxism.

In the second place, when a certain theory or theories from the totality of Marxist doctrine is taken as the object of study, logically it must be ensured that this theory or these theories constitute a part of the totality of Marxist doctrine. Otherwise researchers would tend to “individualize” or “fragment” a certain theory or theories from the totality of this doctrine, thus losing the “original character” defined by the totality.<sup>2</sup> Thus it follows that for researchers, their degree of mastery of this totality is crucial when they take as their topic a certain theory or theories in this totality. In short, to overlook, in terms of logic, or depart from the holism of Marxist doctrine will lead, inevitably, to the study’s “misrepresentation of the truth,” a problem found in our present research work in Marxist philosophy.

Up till now, for various reasons, research work done in this country in Marxist philosophy has not yet transcended the framework of traditional philosophy, and so is tinged to a greater or lesser degree with pure speculation and mysticism. For Marx, pure speculation divorced from reality was marked by three characteristics: the first was transcending reality, which does not mean being critical of reality or superseding it in a dialectical manner, but evading reality or pretending to have got rid of it. The second was historical transcendency, which does not mean a huge span in terms of historical time but rather the lack of a historical definition; one of its main expressions is to take an isolated “event” or judgment yet to be explained or established as something that is self-evident, that is, the basis on which the whole doctrine rests. The third is logical deduction of concepts, meaning “an abstraction is made from a fact; then it is declared that the fact is based upon the abstraction. A very cheap method to produce the semblance of being profound and speculative in the German manner.”<sup>3</sup>

“Pure speculation” is one of the chief features of traditional philosophy (with German philosophy its most typical representative). To study Marx’s philosophy by forcing it into the framework of the traditional philosophy that it transcended necessarily seriously hampers a correct understanding and grasp of the philosophy of Marx, the origin of the philosophy of Marxism, since any “philosophy of Marx” found in the framework of traditional philosophy would no longer be Marx’s philosophy. A most “economical” approach it is to study Marx’s philosophy by forcing it into the framework of traditional philosophy, yet it is also the most “thoughtless;” at best, it is “talking to oneself.” This is diametrically opposite to the holistic

2 It has to be noted here that a focus on the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine does not imply negating the significance of studies of any part of that doctrine (such as Marxist philosophy, political economy, etc.). Rather, it simply emphasizes that the study should be on the totality or on a given part of Marxist doctrine and that it can never be overlooked that logically, Marxist doctrine is made up its various elements and the relations between them; otherwise one is liable to fall into the trap set by the methodology of either holism or individualism.

3 Karl Marx, “The German Ideology,” p. 569.

nature of Marxist doctrine. Such an approach robs Marx's philosophy of its "holistic definition" by isolating it from the totality of Marxist doctrine and, in so doing, transforms it into a type of traditional philosophy. We can see clearly in the logical connections between Marx's philosophical revolution and his economic revolution how philosophy and economics developed in Marxist doctrine as a totality, and how Marx's critiques of philosophy and political economy unfolded and interacted from *The Poverty of Philosophy* to *London Notes* to *Economic Manuscripts (1857-1858)* and *A Critique of Political Economy* (Volume 1), evolving and developing step by step. As the creator of Marxism, Marx (and Engels also) provides, in the holistic nature of his doctrine, a fundamental methodological requirement for those coming after to study and develop his philosophy: this philosophy must be approached, studied and developed by setting out from its holistic essence. A "Marxist philosophy" presented through a method that contradicts the "methodological essence" of Marxist doctrine can never be the philosophy of Marx himself, and even less can it enrich and develop it.

It has to be admitted that taken individually, neither the knowledge structure nor the ability to grasp Marxist doctrine as a totality found among those who are engaged in the study of Marxist theory and philosophy admits of much enthusiasm. The reasons of this state of affairs are objective as well as subjective and historical as well as contemporary; I do not intend to go into them. Rather, I should like to raise a question here: Why is it possible for researchers to engage in the study of Marxist theories and Marx's philosophy when their knowledge structure has been found to be rather narrow and their ability to grasp the totality of Marxist doctrine rather wanting? The question was put to me at a symposium by a fellow scholar; it is one to which I failed to respond in detail at the time. Emphasis on our (including this writer's) inadequacy, as individuals, in terms of knowledge structure and grasp of Marxist doctrine in its totality does not mean that we are, as a whole, constantly incapable and inactive, nor that we have no possibility of studying and developing Marx's philosophy by setting out from the totality of his doctrine. Being clear about one's limitations is aimed at striving to overcome those limitations. As I see it, so long as we strive to reflect on the following interrelated problems and make ceaseless efforts in our related work in theoretical research, we constantly increase the possibility of overcoming these limits.

## **II. On the Re-cognition of Cross-disciplinary Consciousness**

Methodologically, the internal logical connections between Marx's two revolutions—that in philosophy and that in economics—has established to the full that these two revolutions are none other than the products of his cross-disciplinary consciousness, cross-disciplinary method and cross-disciplinary research. These two revolutions and their internal logical interrelations directly involve, at the least, philosophy, economics, history, jurisprudence, political science, anthropology, cultural studies and other disciplines (not to mention those

disciplines in the sphere of natural science). One can believe that Marx would not have been able to set off and ultimately complete his revolutions in philosophy and economics without a thorough mastery of those disciplines listed above, or the ability to freely integrate them in a dialectical manner (which would have involved methodological transplantation, permeation, merging, etc. among the disciplines).

This involves the issue of “cross-disciplinary research,” which has for many years been the subject of international discussion. Under this topic, with its very broad contents, quite a few influential works have already been published, such as *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory and Practice* by J.T. Klein of the U.S. and *The Cross-Disciplinary Method (La méthode interdisciplinaire)* by J.-P. Resweber of France. <sup>4</sup> In China, societies, symposiums, topics and works having to do with “interdisciplinarity” have also appeared one after another in recent years. However, instead of dwelling on these here, I should like to limit my discussion to the methodological inspiration bestowed upon us by the internal logical connections between the two revolutions of Marx, in philosophy and in economics. As I see it, while it would seem that in recent years “cross-disciplinary” research has been made much of in our academic circles in formal terms, in effect little has actually been achieved. Reasons for this include the narrow knowledge base of the scholars thus engaged and their failure to deal with the paradox brought about by such research,<sup>5</sup> but probably the main reason is their weak cross-disciplinary consciousness. In order to qualify to do “cross-disciplinary” research in the true sense of the term, scholars need to have mastered two or more related disciplines (generally speaking, the more disciplines they have mastered, the more readily they can undertake “cross-disciplinary” research); however, what counts first and foremost is a strong cross-disciplinary consciousness. This term is not used here in a general sense, but rather in a specific way to refer to what was distinctive about Marx: a cross-disciplinary consciousness constructed of the idea of criticism, the idea of the problem and the idea of the times. Only when armed with such a powerful cross-disciplinary consciousness can researchers’ knowledge structure be reasonable and comprehensive. Speaking of knowledge structure, Marx himself was not “born versatile.” Each step in the development of his critiques of philosophy and political economy and the internal logical connections between the two contains the qualitative sublation of the

---

4 The term “supra-disciplinary” began to become current in academic circles abroad in the 1980s and the first cross-disciplinary research institute was set up in the early 1990s. At present, “supra-disciplinary” has been summed up as possessing four aspects: it engages mainly with problems of the real world; it integrates and transcends disciplinary approaches; it stresses participatory work; and it seeks union with extra-disciplinary knowledge. (See Jiang Yimin: “Supra-disciplinary Research as a New form of Research,” *Zhejiang Social Sciences*, 2009, vol. 1.) However, as I see it, “supra-disciplinary” and “cross-disciplinary” don’t really differ in essence; supra-disciplinary is but the unfolding and deepening of the concept of cross-disciplinary.

5 The paradox brought about by “cross-disciplinary” refers to the fact that views on the same issue may differ markedly under given conditions of knowledge between different disciplines or between different fields in the same discipline. Such a paradox can either obstruct or assist the development of “cross-disciplinary” studies; the key lies in how we use the dynamic force this produces.

relevant knowledge structure. One of the important motive forces behind such sublation was Marx's cross-disciplinary consciousness, structured as it was by the idea of criticism, the idea of the problem and the idea of the times. For example, in the preface to his *Critique of Political Economy* Marx says, recalling his study of "materials on economic history collected in the British Museum" during his "London period," "These studies led partly of their own accord to apparently quite remote subjects on which I had to spend a certain amount of time."<sup>6</sup> In terms of methodology, it was his powerful cross-disciplinary consciousness that made Marx work so hard on disciplines in which he then had no expertise.

In a certain sense, Marx's revolutions in philosophy and economics were not grand projects planned out in advance; rather, they were the logical outcome of the guidance of his cross-disciplinary consciousness, an outcome that even he himself probably did not anticipate. From the methodological angle, it was because of his powerful cross-disciplinary consciousness that Marx was able to both achieve the preliminary completion of the first stage of his revolution in philosophy in the course of a critique of political economy that transcended (and must transcend) the sphere of political economy and to construct his methodology for political economy in the course of a critique of philosophy that transcended the sphere of philosophy, as well as obtaining initial results in constructing a scientific theory for political economy while progressing his critique of political economy. At the same time, he was enriching and developing the results of his preliminarily completed philosophical revolution; and finally, he was fundamentally completing his economic revolution and perfecting his philosophical revolution in form as well as content in the course of these two "interactive" critiques. Without a philosophical critique transcending the philosophical sphere and a critique of political economy transcending the sphere of political economy and their interactive development, Marx's philosophical and economic revolutions would never have taken place. Between these revolutions, these two "interactive" critiques play an important role, like the needle that leads the thread. While as a matter of course we cannot demand of ourselves the cross-disciplinary proficiency of Marx, this should not prevent us from conscientiously following his example and cultivating a cross-disciplinary consciousness, which is a must, as I see it, for anyone aiming at cross-disciplinary work.

There is, in our academic circles at present, a tendency that contravenes Marxist cross-disciplinary consciousness; that is, researchers' consciousness is, in most cases, cooped up in their own fields or even a given area of that field. As a result, powerful barriers between disciplines or research fields have come into existence, forcing related research work into dead ends. For example, not a few scholars engaged in the study of Marxist philosophy have in this way turned such concepts as "practice," "being" and "perceptual activity" into bombastic mysteries, so much so that studies in Marxist philosophy have been transformed into a kind of "conceptual game;" also, not a few scholars working on economics imitate the West in a simplistic manner and run after the Western fashion for the quantification of

---

6 Karl Marx, preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, p. 34.

economics.<sup>7</sup> Such “fashionable studies,” however, can hardly be said to shed light on any real-life economic problems, still less to provide guidance for their solution. And again, not a few scholars who look as if they are engaged in “cross-disciplinary” work are found to be pitifully ignorant in their own professional field or to look down on theoretical thinking, and so on. Such cases are too common to enumerate. Thus cultivating and establishing a cross-disciplinary consciousness like that of Marx is extraordinarily significant for study and development of Marx’s philosophy that sets out from the holistic nature of his doctrine.

### III. Re-cognition of Cross-disciplinary Dialogue and Exchange and Absorption of the Achievements of Various Disciplines

This is an issue that directly involves “cross-disciplinary” research. Such research can be done individually or as a community. The latter can to a large extent make up for the deficiencies of the former. With Marx (and Engels, too), “cross-disciplinary” mostly involved individual action. We are unlikely to attain their level. Of course, we can somewhat make up for our deficiencies through strengthening dialogue and exchange among various disciplines. The problem is, however, that we are besieged today with one difficulty after another when it comes to dialogue and exchange in the sphere of philosophy and the social sciences (we shall not consider the natural sciences here). Cross-disciplinary dialogue and exchange that has been comparatively influential in Chinese philosophical and social science circles in recent years include the “Dialogue between Philosophy and History” and the “Dialogue between Philosophy and Economics,” both sponsored by *Zhongguo Shehui Kexue*. Both, as I see it, were more significant than effective. Why so? Roughly, there are three interrelated reasons: first, rejection and exclusion of research results from other disciplines owing to disciplinary prejudice; second, contradictions among the discourse systems and modes of thinking of different disciplines; and the third, want of the ability to absorb achievements from other disciplines. However, strengthening dialogue and exchange among disciplines has become an unstoppable trend that will be in constant conflict with any consciousness that runs counter to “cross-disciplinary” research. Surely, in the long term, strengthening dialogue and exchange among disciplines will play an important role in cultivating a “cross-disciplinary” orientation in our academic circles. For the present, at least, we have to be suspicious of the depth and effectiveness of “cross-disciplinary” research carried out in academia that is not based on dialogue and exchange.

Here there is a misunderstanding that has to be cleared up: the idea that the “cross-disciplinary” research being promoted by dialogue and exchange among disciplines will weaken or even sweep away relatively independent disciplinary research. In fact, the opposite is true, for cross-disciplinary work will provide a powerful impetus to such research rather

---

7 This writer is not opposed to the quantification approach in economics, but wishes to stress that a research method will transform into its opposite if it is made absolute or raised too high.

than doing away with it. Cross-disciplinary research, roughly speaking, has two research modes. One is synthesizing multi-disciplinary research, or the organic integration of theories and methods from different disciplines to form a new mode or kind of disciplinary research, as in peripheral disciplines, overlapping disciplines, cross-sectional disciplines, etc. The other is synthesizing research from relatively independent disciplines, or conditional use and transformation of theories and methods from other disciplines to study problems specific to one's own discipline. Such research has already transcended the existing theories and methods of the original discipline.

Both types of "cross-disciplinary" research can be found in Marx's philosophical and political-economic critiques and their interactive development; both these critiques fall into the category of "cross-disciplinary" research, and both his philosophical and economic revolutions were of course products of cross-disciplinary research.

What we should oppose resolutely today is the tendency to entrench ourselves behind disciplinary walls and be rigidly confined by the knowledge, language and mode of thinking of our own discipline in our research work. One might say that in the contemporary world, there cannot be any progress in scientific research without a "cross-disciplinary" approach, and this applies also to disciplines that are relatively independent.

One of the most important functions in dialogue and exchange among disciplines is the timely understanding and sharing of research achievements (including new ideas, methods, perspectives, materials, etc.), making them common property. "Timeliness" is especially important in this instance; without this, those scholars involved may not only fail to recognize the positions and roles of other disciplines in related scientific research and not treat them objectively and fairly, they may even misjudge important issues in their own disciplines. As an example, we can cite the fact that certain fellow scholars of ours, mistaking some twenty year old philosophical viewpoints for mainstream contemporary ones, criticized them erroneously, resulting in a number of unscientific views on the relationship between historical materialism and historical methodology. Furthermore, quite a few materials and viewpoints having to do with history, economics, political science, etc., that have long been obsolete or corrected in related disciplines, are still frequently quoted at present and trotted out as being self-evident.

With regard to absorbing the research achievements of different disciplines, the need seems greatest with philosophical studies, and especially so with the study of Marxist philosophy. At present, if our study of Marxist philosophy is to really break away from the bondage of the framework of traditional philosophy, we must absorb the results of all the sciences—natural, social and humane. Otherwise, the study of Marxist philosophy will degenerate into a kind of conversion of abstract systems—conversion from one form of speculation far removed from the concrete achievements of science and the experience of practice into another form of speculation just as far removed from such achievement and experience. It has to be admitted that research in philosophy (including that in Marxist philosophy) does differ from research in other concrete sciences because of its unique feature—speculation. However, this speculation is

built on the basis of refining, reorganizing and summarizing the methodology of the scientific achievement and practical experience of one's era. Philosophical research will evolve into the senseless deduction of pure concepts whenever it is divorced from such refinement, reorganization and summarizing. Further, it has to be stressed that speculation, when built on the basis of the refinement, reorganization and summarization of the methodology of concrete scientific achievements and the practical experience of one's era, differs in essence from any kind of speculation that is not carried out in this way. While the former constitutes a kind of unification of criticism and construction based on the development of the times yet transcending their limitations, the latter is a highly random conceptual game. If before the birth of Marxist philosophy a *raison d'être* could still be found for the framework of traditional philosophy, the re-appearance of that philosophical framework after the birth of Marxist philosophy, especially in the contemporary age, would serve only to indicate a backsliding in human thinking. In its reappearance today, the framework of traditional philosophy has completely lost the *raison d'être* it enjoyed before the birth of Marxist philosophy, the way alchemy has today lost the *raison d'être* it enjoyed in ancient times. It's both laughable and irritating that some scholars of Marxist philosophy hold the view that strengthening dialogue and exchange among disciplines and absorbing one another's research achievements means abolishing philosophical speculation. For philosophical circles in China today, at least, what is wanting is not formal speculation but speculation based on the refinement, reorganization and summarizing of the methodology of the research achievements of concrete sciences and practical experience; what is wanting is not formal philosophical learning, but the contents of that learning—such is the status quo. Yet philosophy has to absorb these research achievements if it is to be able to provide methodological support for concrete sciences. There is no reason for those who have taken up philosophy, especially Marxist philosophy, to complain that people engaged in research work in other disciplines have failed to take philosophy's role of methodological guidance seriously, since philosophy has provided no powerful methodological support to other disciplines. With regard to the Chinese academic world, it can be said that in a sense the slight suffered by philosophy in its role as provider of methodology is but the bitter fruit of its own making. Or, to be more precise, the bitter fruit produced by those who study philosophy, especially those who study Marxist philosophy. Having failed to absorb the achievements of the concrete sciences, it is but natural that philosophy should fail also to face up to reality. However, how to absorb the achievements of concrete sciences is another matter, one that calls for specialized discussions.

#### **IV. A Re-cognition of the Practical Spirit that Takes Remaking the Real World as Its Main Purpose**

The most important methodological inspiration left us by the inner logic of the connections between Marx's philosophical and economic revolutions is that the theories and doctrines of

science must, necessarily, possess the practical spirit that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose, and that, equally necessarily, the development of such theories and doctrines must ceaselessly meet the needs of activities for remaking the real world. As mentioned above, the fundamental reason for the fact that *The Poverty of Philosophy* became the starting point for the logical extension of Marx's philosophical revolution and also the logical starting point for his economic revolution does not lie in Marx's need for purely academic research but rather in his real need for the activities of revolutionary practice and criticism, that is, his need to criticize petty bourgeois economics with its heavy tinge of German speculation, so as to "win over as a whole the European proletariat, especially that of Germany." Consequently, if we are to study Marx's philosophy by setting out from the totality of Marxist doctrine in order to achieve our aim of enriching and developing Marxist philosophy, what is needed is not only the strengthening of cross-disciplinary consciousness and of dialogue and exchange among disciplines so as to absorb the achievements of different disciplines, but also establishment of the practical spirit that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose.

Looking at from the angle of the core idea and basic spirit supporting Marx's thinking and doctrines, we can see the reason his theories and doctrines were so vital and shook the world so profoundly for so long: it is to be found in that basic spirit, a basic spirit made up of a specific practical spirit, critical spirit, scientific spirit and humane spirit, which ran through the totality of the doctrines of Marx as the creator of Marxism, clearly visible through his doctrine as a whole. The core of this basic spirit was the spirit of practice that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose. The real world being a system, remaking the real world was, of course, a system as well, involving various aspects and dimensions. With Marx, the systemic nature of remaking the real world was transformed, through the spirit of practice that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose, into the holistic nature of his doctrine and its development. And so I believe that in a certain sense it can also be said that the dialectical relationship between the systemic nature of remaking the real world and the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine is also the dialectical relationship between the practical spirit of Marxist doctrine that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose and the holistic nature of that doctrine.

On the one hand, we should never try to understand the practical spirit of Marxist doctrine that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose by departing from a comprehensive and correct grasp of the holistic nature of that doctrine, otherwise our understanding of that spirit of practice may well be fragmented and one-sided. Since "with Marx the systemic nature of remaking the real world" was "transformed, through the practical spirit holding remaking the real world as its main purpose," "into the holistic nature of his doctrine and its development," it follows that the practical spirit that had this "transforming" function necessarily also possessed this comprehensive nature. This comprehensive nature, which originated from the systemic nature of the remaking of the real world, finds direct expression in the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine. Further, the "comprehensive nature of the practical spirit" necessarily

relies on a doctrine with a holistic nature to reveal itself. And so, an accurate and profound understanding of Marx's doctrine, with its practical spirit that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose, has as its logical precondition a comprehensive and correct grasp of the holistic nature of that doctrine. An understanding limited to a general definition of Marxist doctrine as described above cannot attain an accurate and profound understanding of this spirit of practice. On the other hand, once one has departed from a comprehensive and correct grasp of Marxist doctrine, "the practical spirit that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose" may well degenerate in people's minds into an abstract, hollow and one-sided mental activity. Only with a comprehensive and correct grasp of the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine can we have an accurate and profound understanding of the practical spirit of Marxist doctrine that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose.

On the other hand, there can be no comprehensive and correct cognition and grasp of the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine without an accurate and profound understanding of the practical spirit of Marxist doctrine that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose. This is because the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine is not only a prerequisite for strictly academic research, but also, and more importantly, a prerequisite for the comprehensiveness of the practical spirit of Marx that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose. By "the comprehensiveness of the practical spirit" is meant the comprehensive way in which that spirit engages itself in activities to remake the real world. This comprehensiveness introduces the demand for the systemic nature of remaking the real world into the logic constructed by Marxist doctrine and in this way forms the holistic nature of Marxist theory. And so I believe that to insist that the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine cannot be grasped by an approach disassociated from an accurate and profound understanding of its spirit of practice is, in fact, to insist that the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine cannot be recognized and grasped by an approach disassociated from the systemic nature of remaking the real world. Otherwise, understanding of the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine would be entrapped in the context of "pure scholarship," which tends to distort it. Thus it follows that only with an accurate and profound understanding of the practical spirit running through the whole of Marxist doctrine (and of the comprehensiveness of that spirit) is it possible to comprehensively and correctly recognize and grasp the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine. The dialectical relations between the practical spirit of Marxist doctrine that takes the remaking of the real world as its main purpose and the totality of Marxist theory and doctrine is embodied in the internal logical connections between Marx's philosophical and economic revolution that I have mentioned above.

For us, one of the basic purposes of comprehensively and correctly recognizing and grasping the dialectical relationship between this practical spirit of Marxist doctrine and the holistic nature of Marxist theory is to set up in the contemporary world the practical Marxist spirit that takes remaking the world as the main purpose, strengthen a consciousness of studying Marxist philosophy by setting out from the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine, and

enrich and develop Marxist doctrine, including Marxist philosophy, in the course of Sinicizing Marxism. Here there is a methodological point that calls for attention: setting up in the contemporary world a Marxist practical spirit that takes the remaking of the real world as its main purpose differs somewhat from recognizing and grasping comprehensively and correctly the spirit of practice of Marxist doctrine in a general sense. The former is definitely not synonymous with the latter even though it is based on it. The setting up in the contemporary world of the spirit of practice of Marxist doctrine means the reappearance in the contemporary world of this spirit, a “reappearance” that is not abstract but concrete and historical. “Concrete and historical” here has two interrelated meanings. The first, the subject setting up this practical spirit of Marxist doctrine, is concrete and historical, and the second, the contents of this practical spirit, is also concrete and historical. For us, what needs to be stressed here is primarily that progressive Chinese in the contemporary world are the subjects who will set up the practical spirit of Marxist doctrine that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose. Such being the case, this practical spirit that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose and is to be set up by today’s progressive Chinese will necessarily coalesce in a Sinicized Marxism capable of exerting a profound influence upon the development of the contemporary Chinese society. A Sinicized Marxism alone can truly and comprehensively give expression to the re-presentation of this practical spirit of Marxist doctrine by today’s progressive Chinese. As I see it, the requirements of the re-appearance in the contemporary world of this practical spirit are: setting out from a firm stand of practice for the systemic remaking of contemporary Chinese society, unifying in an organic way the Chinese perspective on the world and the world’s perspective on China, striving to enrich and develop Marxist doctrine in its entirety through research on the weighty social issues (including those of China) raised by our times, and, through rethinking scientific theory on the weighty social issues of the world and of China, providing scientific explanations of the processes, mechanisms, features, laws and general trends of holistic development of contemporary Chinese society, so as to provide the support of scientific theory for China’s development in the contemporary world. Only through such an understanding of the reappearance or establishment in the contemporary world of this practical spirit of Marxist doctrine that takes remaking the real world as its main purpose will it be possible to really strengthen consciousness of setting out from the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine to study Marx’s philosophy and to enrich and develop Marxist doctrine, including Marxist philosophy, in the course of the Sinicization of Marxism.

To sum up: the internal logical relationship between Marx’s philosophical and economic revolutions is the key point in the holistic study of Marxist doctrine; for contemporary studies in the Marxist philosophy, an important methodological inspiration from this relationship is that only by setting out from the holistic nature of Marxist doctrine to study Marx’s philosophy will it be possible to enrich and develop that philosophy; and so, it is necessary to undertake a re-cognition of cross-disciplinary consciousness, dialogue and exchange among disciplines, absorption of their research achievements, and the practical spirit that takes on

remaking the real world as the main purpose and also necessary to make ceaseless efforts in related theoretical researches. Otherwise, there will be no way for us to change the status quo, in which research on Marxist theory and Marxist philosophy lag behind China's need to develop in the contemporary world.

### Notes on Contributor

Ye Xianming, Specially Invited Professor of the Institute of Marxism and Globalization, Zhejiang Normal University; Professor, Department of Philosophy, Capital Normal University. Research field: philosophy and theory of social development. Representative works: *Marx's World History Theory and Modern Times* (马克思的世界历史理论与现时代, Beijing: Tsinghua University Press, 1996); *Marx's Theory of the Industrial Revolution and the Present Epoch* (马克思的工业革命理论与现时代, Beijing: Beijing Publishing House, 2002); *A Critique of the "Knowledge Economy"* ("知识经济" 批判, Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2007), and *Philosophy in the Light of World History* (世界历史视野中的哲学, Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2008). Mobile phone: 13522735482. E-mail: yxmyxm2050@sina.com.

### References

- Marx, Karl. Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. In *Selected Works of Marx and Engels*, vol. 2. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995.
- Marx, Karl. "The German Ideology." In *Collected Works of Marx and Engels*, vol. 3. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1960.
- Ye Xianming. "The Cultural Logic of Marx's Philosophical Revolution and Its Implications in Modern Times" (马克思哲学革命的文化逻辑及其现代启示). *Zhongguo Shehui Kexue* (中国社会科学), 2007, no. 4.

—Translated by Feng Shize from  
*Zhongguo Shehui Kexue* (中国社会科学), 2010, no. 3  
 Revised by Sally Borthwick