

Manifesto of the Communist Party and Political Movement towards Post-capitalism
Hideto Akashi (Komazawa University)

Abstract

Kevin B. Anderson investigated Marx's works from the viewpoint of Nationalism, Ethnicity and Non-Western societies. He emphasized Marx's later works focused upon the political and social chains which would connect the class struggle with anti-racism movements etc. But he insisted that Marx and Engels had espoused 'unilinear concept' of social progress in *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. In my view Marx and Engels discussed the possibilities of social integrated movement in Manifesto, which included not only various domestic groups, but also overseas groups, for example, a Polish party that insisted on an agrarian revolution as the prime condition for national emancipation.

My chief aim is to find out Marx's theory of hegemonic articulation (Laclau & Mouffe) in *Manifesto*. We can see a lot of descriptions about political alliances that should be called hegemonic articulations among some different fractions.

According to the first section of *Manifesto*, the bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first it fights against aristocracy, and later on against those portions of the bourgeoisie itself whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry. In these battles, it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for help and to drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education. This is the hegemonic practice in the term of *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* by Laclau & Mouffe.

In *Manifesto* Marx and Engels show two types of hegemonic articulation. At the beginning of modern class struggle, the laborers still formed an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country. Even if they united to form more compact bodies, this was not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie. At this stage the proletariat does not fight its enemies, but the enemies of the enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie.

Contrastingly, in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour, the progress of dissolution goes on within the ruling class and small sections of the ruling class cut themselves adrift and join the revolutionary class.

The lower middle class, in the form of the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan and so on, can be conservative and reactionary. But they can be also

revolutionary, if they are in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat. In order to understand the political position of the lower middle class, we must pay attention to the descriptions of the French and German middle classes in the third section of *Manifesto*. We can see different possibilities of hegemonic practice including the lower middle classes there.

Marx and Engels analyzed the complicated political situation at that time in Europe. They didn't have any simple framework of class struggle between the two major classes. I don't think that Marx and Engels had a 'unilinear concept' of social progress in *Manifesto*.