

The Principles of New Associationist Movement (NAM)

新聯合主義

運動原則

中英
對照

柄谷行人著

鄧寧立譯

高華鑫校

By Kojin Karatani



STATION FOR
OPEN CULTURES
開放文化站

新聯合主義 運動原則

The Principles of New Associationist Movement (NAM)

柄谷行人 著 鄧寧立 譯 高華鑫 校
By Kojin Karatani

亞洲零年計劃

本中英對照版本由「副本製作」、「實踐論」與「同時」三方授權予開放文化站出版。禁止商業衍生。

© Kojin Karatani, 2001. All rights reserved. For Use at Princeton Symposium "Authenticities East and West" Only. Do not circulate, cite and/or quote without the permission of the author.

This bilingual edition is authorised by FuBenZhiZhuo, ShiJianLuen and HuangBianZhan to Station for Open Cultures. No commercial derivatives.

甲、前言

2000年的夏天，我們在日本開展了一項以廢除資本主義、民族和國家或它們的合並（資本主義＝民族＝國家）為目標的新聯合主義運動（New Associationist Movement）。我們稱之為NAM。作為布爾什維主義決定性失敗的結果之一，社會民主主義——在各種偽裝下——已經在今天的世界佔主導地位。我們在其中找不到任何真正變化的希望；這是資本主義＝民族＝國家為了自身生存所採取的存在方式。與此同時，無政府主義（或者說聯合主義）一直重新出現，我們的NAM可能屬於這一趨勢的一部分。然而，我們的出發點是徹底審查聯合主義本身——為什麼它迄今為止收效無幾？NAM意欲成為一場跨國運動，因此我們是在向世界人民談論這一運動的原則，他們在各種情況下作鬥爭，為了達成跨國團結和合作，廢除資本主義＝民族＝國家。

旨在廢除資本主義和國家的運動的歷史，延續了近兩個世紀，它們曾頂著烏托邦社會主義、共產主義或無政府主義的名義。在二十世紀末回顧歷史，我們不得不承認這些運動的慘敗。然而，只要資本主義和國家繼續存在——無論他們的意識形態如何宣稱並非如此——違背它們意志的反抗運動仍會不斷湧現。為了保持運動的年輕、新鮮和功能性，對先前運動的基本反思是絕對有必要的。

資本和國家的運作方式是不同的。資本基於交換原則，而國家基於掠奪和再分配原則。歷史上說，它們是在專制君主政體階段結合的。國家發展資本主義經濟，以生存和壯大自身；而資本主義經濟不得不依賴國家，因為它不能影響所有的生產並使它們成為它的一部分，更重要的是，它甚至繼續依賴非資本化的生產，例如人類和自然的再生產。因此，工業資本主義興起和國家資產階級革命後，兩者攜手形成不可分割的結合，同時又維持自己的自律性。

A. Preface

In the summer of the year 2000, we in Japan began a new associationist movement aimed at abolishing capitalism, nation, and state or their amalgamation (capitalism=nation=state). We call it NAM. As a consequence of the decisive failure of Bolshevism, social democracy—in any of its guises—has become dominant in the world today. In it we cannot find any hope for a real change; it is the way capitalism=nation=state has adapted itself for its own survival. At the same time, anarchism (or associationism) has been reemerging, and it might be that our NAM movement is part of this tendency. However, our starting point is a thorough scrutiny of associationism itself— why it has thus far been so ineffectual. NAM intends to be transnational. Thus we address the principles of our movement to the people of the world who struggle in various situations with the intention to abolish capitalism=nation=state, for a transnational solidarity and association.

The history of movements that have aimed at the abolition of capitalism and state stretches over nearly two centuries. They have gone under the names of utopian socialism, communism, or anarchism. Reviewing this history at the end of the 20th century we have to admit that the movements have failed miserably. However, so long as capitalism and state endure— no matter what their ideologues claim to the contrary—counter-movements against them will continue to appear and reappear. And for the movement to be young and fresh and functional, a fundamental reflection of the previous movements is a *sine qua non*.

Capital and state are two separate things in their *modus operandi*. Capital belongs to a principle of exchange, while state belongs to the principle of plunder and redistribution. Historically speaking, it was in the stage of the absolutist monarchical state that they were combined. The state necessitated the development of the capitalist economy in order to survive and strengthen itself; while the capitalist economy has had to rely on the state, because it has not been able to affect all productions to make them part of it, and what is more, it continues to be dependent even upon un-capitalized productions such as the reproduction of humans and nature. Thus, after the rise of industrial capitalism and bourgeois revolution of state, they two joined together and came to form an inseparable amalgamation, yet at the same time as sustaining their own autonomies.

所以，我們必須把對資本主義的反抗和對國家的反抗看作同一場運動。恩格斯以後的馬克思主義者試圖不再依靠暴力革命，而通過訴諸國家權威（即議會革命）來克服資本主義。但這不意味著後者就是非暴力的。由於依靠國家政權，暴力革命和議會革命同樣是暴力的。它們既對國家固有的權力無動於衷，又依靠這種權力。另一方面，烏托邦社會主義者和無政府主義者對國家的力量非常敏感，但對資本的力量不敏感。他們認為，只要國家消失，一個合作的社會則會由於民眾的自發的能力而形成。馬克思主義試圖通過國家權力抵制資本主義的力量，結果將自身轉變為一種國家權力。但我們怎樣才能反對資本而不訴諸國家？無政府主義者還沒有回答這個問題，只是指責馬克思主義的權力集中，在大多數情況下，他們只是在一種美學化的超越中，做著烏托邦到來的白日夢。保持這種立場，無政府主義將繼續默許或矛盾地肯定資本主義。

無政府主義在社會主義理想上肯定是無辜和純潔的，但這是因為它的無能。這種無能不能歸因於馬克思主義的暴政。必須自我反省其無能；由於我們說的聯合主義源於烏托邦主義和無政府主義，這種自我反省和批判就更加必要。然而，只有重審馬克思和巴枯寧生活過的時代的問題，才能找到對抗資本與國家的邏輯，而在他們死後確立的十九世紀社會民主主義中，是找不到這種可能性的。

二十世紀八十年代末馬克思主義崩潰之後，今天佔主導地位的是一種社會民主主義趨勢，即保存資本主義市場經濟的完整，通過國家控制和議會民主再分配的方式，解決它導致的不平等和矛盾。顯然，這裏完全沒有廢除資本主義和國家的想法——它只是重申了愛德華·伯恩斯坦¹在十九世紀末所倡導的東西。此外，正如第一次世界大戰清楚表明的，一個民族國家內的社會民主與其對外的國家主義和霸權並不矛盾。今日世界的社會民主趨勢將走上同樣的道路，如果它繼續忽略對悲慘過去的自我審查。我們看不到廢除資本主義和國家的運動的復蘇。社會民主的普及和滲透證明了這是資本 / 國家結合的最佳生存手段。

1 愛德華·伯恩斯坦，活躍於十九世紀末二十世紀初的德國社會民主主義理論家及政治家，是修正馬克思主義基本原則的第一批社會主義者中的一個。

So it is that we have to consider counteracts against capitalism and state as one and the same movement. Marxists after Engels sought to overcome capitalism by resorting to state authority (i.e., parliamentary revolution), rather than by means of violent revolution. Which does not mean, however, that this last was non-violent. Inasmuch as they were relying on state power, the revolution by violence and that by parliament were equally violent. They were insensitive to and dependent upon the power inherent in the state. On the other hand, utopian socialists and anarchists were sensitive par excellence to the power of the state, but insensitive to the power of capitalism. They held that if only the state would disappear, a society of association would form itself by the spontaneous potency of the mass. Marxism sought to counter the power of capitalism by way of state power, and consequently transformed itself into a state power. But how can we counter capital without resorting to state? Anarchists have not answered this aporia, while rebuking Marxism for its centralization of power and, in many cases, they only daydream about the coming of utopia in an aesthetic transcendence. Insofar as keeping such a stance, anarchism will continue to tacitly or paradoxically affirm capitalism.

It is certain that anarchism has been innocent and pure with respect to the ideal of socialism. But this was because it was powerless. This powerlessness cannot be ascribed to the tyranny of Marxism. There must be self-examination of its powerlessness; so much so that our associationism derived from utopianism and anarchism, the self-examination and critique are necessary. Still, the logic of the counter act against capitalism and state can be found only by examining the conjunctures of the age when Marx and Bakunin lived, since there is no possibility in the social democracy that was established in the 19th century after their deaths.

What is dominant today, after the collapse of Marxism in the late 1980s, is the tendency bundled generally under the term of social democracy, that is, the stance to leave the capitalist market economy intact, and solve the inequality and contradictions caused by it by way of state regulation and redistribution via the parliamentary democracy. Obviously this totally lacks the idea of abolishing capitalism and state—it is simply a reiteration of what Eduard Bernstein advocated in the late 19th century. Furthermore, as clearly exemplified by World War One, being social democratic within a nation-state is not contradictory to being statist and hegemonic toward foreign countries. Today's worldwide tendency of social democracy will tread the same path if it continues to omit a self-examination of its tragic past. We cannot see a recovery in the movement to abolish capitalism and state. The popularity and permeation of social democracy prove the fact that it is the best means for the survival of capital/state amalgamation.

與此同時，一些國家一直在推動非營利組織和區域貨幣，以及教育制度的自由化。這些行為看起來支持了聯合主義的傾向，但實際不是這樣。首先，國家、做這些事情只是因為希望擺脫本國經濟、社會福利和教育的負擔由於資本全球化，這些負擔正變得越來越重——將它們留給非政府企業。因此，期望非資本主義組織將擴張和取代資本主義是虛幻的，它們甚至無法削弱資本主義。它們越來越成為資本主義和國家延伸自我和永恆存在的手段。但儘管如此，我們也可以利用這種趨勢作為抵禦資本主義和國家的手段。

此外，保護地方經濟和文化，反對資本主義全球化的反彈性運動有所增加。它們有反資本主義動機，但不同於我們所說的對抗行為。這些打算對資本主義和國家採取反對行動的人往往落入 / 回歸到封閉共同體的陷阱。只有那些一度與傳統共同體隔絕的人才可以形成真正的協會。因此，針對資本主義和國家的反抗必須也包括對傳統共同體的反抗。

在這種情況下，我們必須重新考慮反對資本主義和國家的行為邏輯。在1968年之後，學生、女性、少數族裔和消費者的「反體系運動」（伊曼紐爾·沃勒斯坦²）已經取代了以先鋒隊和工人為中心的等級制革命運動。一方面，這是無政府主義（聯合主義）的再生，而且有同樣的弱點——為了避免權力集中，它們太分散和零碎，提供不了有效的反對行動。少數族裔、女權主義和環境問題的任務是至關重要的，但它們缺乏對資本主義提供的生產關係，以及發達國家和第三世界國家之間的生產關係的認識。這些「反體系運動」的論點已經得到資產階級革命的支持，現代國家沒法否定它們。也等於說，即使它們實現了，資本經濟中的生產關係也將保持不變。事實上，這些運動儘管取得一定的成功，但逐漸失去影響，並被納入社會民主主義。所以，現在至關重要的，仍然是如何獲得一種廢除資本主義和國家的明確前景，如何將這些分散的運動結合成一個，這正是新聯合主義運動的任務。

2 伊曼紐爾·沃勒斯坦，當代美國歷史學家、社會學家、政治經濟學家，世界體系理論的主要創始人。

Meanwhile, certain states have been promoting non-profit organizations and local currencies, as well as liberalizing their educational systems. These acts appear to support the tendency toward associationism, but they do not. In the first place, states do these things only because they want to free themselves from the charges of local economy, social welfare, and education—which are becoming heavier and heavier because of the globalization of capital—by leaving them to non-governmental businesses. Therefore, the expectation that these non-capitalist organizations would expand and replace capitalism is only illusory. Neither can they weaken capitalism. They appear increasingly as the means for capitalism and state to elongate and eternalize themselves. Nonetheless, we can also employ the tendency as a means to counter capitalism and state.

In addition, there has been an increase in the reflexive movements to protect national and local economies and culture against the globalization of capitalism. They have anti-capitalist motivations, yet are different from what we consider as counter-acts. The trap in which those who intend counter-acts against capitalism and state tend to be caught is a return to an enclosed community. Only those individuals who have once been cut off from traditional communities can form true associations. Thus counter-acts against capitalism and state must include counter-acts against traditional communities as well.

Under this light, we have to reconsider the logic of the counter-act against capitalism and state. After the occurrences of 1968, antisystemic movements (Wallerstein) of students, women, minorities, and consumers have replaced the hierarchical revolutionary movements centered on vanguard party and workers. In one aspect, these are a regeneration of anarchism (associationism), and sustain the same weakness—avoiding the centralization of power, they can only be too dispersed and fragmentary to render an effective counter-act. We consider the tasks of minorities, feminism, and environmental concerns as fatally important, but stress that they lack a recognition of the relation of production delivered by capitalism, and the relation of production between the advanced and the third world countries. The points of these antisystemic movements are already supported by the idea of bourgeois revolution, and modern states cannot negate them. That is to say that even after they are realized, the relation of production in the capitalist economy will remain intact. In actuality, these movements have achieved a certain success as they have gradually lost impact and been subsumed into social democracy. What is at stake now is still how to achieve a clear prospect about the abolition of capitalism and state, and how to combine these dispersed movements into one. This is the task of the New Associationist Movement.

乙、項目

新聯合主義運動（NAM）開始於對從十九世紀開始的所有社會主義運動的歷史經驗的審查。本項目可以簡要地用下面五個段落概括。一個人只要同意它們，他/她就可以根據個人的情況和創造力發展他/她的行為。

一、NAM是一種倫理的一經濟的運動。參考康德的術語，我們可以說，「沒有道德的經濟政策是盲目的，而沒有經濟關切的道德介入是空洞的」。

二、NAM組織對資本和國家的對抗行為。這是跨國工人作為消費者的運動，其中既包括在資本主義經濟內部的鬥爭，又包括在資本主義經濟外部的鬥爭。但嚴格意義上說，走出資本主義經濟當然是不可能的。資本主義經濟外部的鬥爭，旨在組織非資本主義的生產和消費；在內部的鬥爭，以流通過程（消費）中的抵制中心。

三、NAM是非暴力的。它不僅否認暴力革命，而且否認任何通過議會手段使用國家權力的方式。因為NAM的意圖是廢除資本主義貨幣經濟——它永遠不能被國家權力廢除——以及廢除國家權力本身。

四、NAM的組織和運動本身體現了它想要實現的目標。通過把抽籤引入選舉過程的方式（這一點將在下文解釋），它防止了官僚作風，同時保證了參與式民主。

五、NAM是一種消除現實矛盾的現實運動；它是在現前提下產生的。換句話說，它是利用資本主義發展所產生的社會效力，克服這種發展（已經達到信息資本主義階段）造成的社會矛盾的運動。因此，它需要審視歷史經驗，挑戰未知的一切。

B. The Program

The New Associationist Movement (NAM) begins based upon a scrutiny of the historical experience of all socialist movements beginning in the 19th century. The program can be quite simply summarized in the following five articles. Inasmuch as one agrees with them, s/he can develop his/her acts dependent upon individual situations and creativities.

(1) NAM is an economic-ethical movement. In reference to Kant's term, we might say, "economic policy without ethics is blind, while ethical intervention without economic concerns is empty."

(2) NAM organizes a counter-act against capital and state. This is a transnational worker as consumer movement. This is practiced, figuratively speaking, within and without the capitalist economy. But, of course, it is impossible in the strict sense to stand outside the capitalist economy. The struggle without aims at organizing an association of non-capitalist production and consumption; the struggle within is centered on boycotting in the process of circulation (consumption).

(3) NAM is non-violent. It not only denies violent revolution, but also negates any use of state power by parliamentary means. This is because what NAM intends is an abolition of the capitalist currency economy—that which state power can never abolish—and also the abolition of state power itself.

(4) NAM's organization and movement themselves embody what it intends to realize. Namely, by way of introducing the lottery into the election process (I will explain this later), it prevents a bureaucratic fixation while at the same time guaranteeing a participatory democracy.

(5) NAM is a realistic movement that abolishes real contradictions; it is born out of realistically existing premises. In other words, it is a movement to overcome the social contradictions caused by the development of capitalism (that has reached the stage of information capitalism) by way of employing the social potencies produced by the same development.

丙、組織

一、如果有一定數量的參與者，則他們形成的一個組可以是新聯合主義運動（NAM）的一個單位，並且把自己稱作**NAM**。該單位在組織和經濟上都是獨立的實體。作為成員/參與者，該個人必須至少同時屬於以下三個領域：

1. 地區——他/她居住的地方；
2. 根據職業而劃分的社會階層——學生、上班族、家庭主婦、小企業主、作家等等；
3. 個人的主題興趣——這會在下面舉例說明。

一個領域可以認為是一個自主協會，而每位成員 / 參與者同時屬於多個領域。多維參與對避免領域的封閉性和排他性（特別是根據地區和階級劃分時）來說是必要的。許多市民行動是由自身的主題和目標構成和包含的。自主對於它們來說當然是必要的，如果它們無條件地添加其他維度，或者從屬於其他原則，將失去固有的特性。儘管如此，個人仍可以通過屬於其他維度而擺脫封閉性。例如，地區是生活環境的一個必須單位，但個人通過屬於其他維度而超越它。

階級領域及專題興趣可以認為是相空間³的區域，如果不是物理空間的話。NAM不宣揚「全球性思考，本土化行動」之類的口號，而是把這種要求貫徹在組織原則中。NAM開始於日本，但它打算成為超越日本邊界的跨國運動。即使NAM成為全球協會，上述原則還是一致的一屆時日本將會被視為一個地區。每個人都屬於一個地區，鑒於他 / 她的主題興趣以及階級 / 職業地位，他/她又屬於某個全球域。NAM是根莖式的聯合，由多個區域組成。它與「英特納雄耐爾」不同，後者以民族國家作為單位，前者由個人之間的國際網絡構成。

3 在數學與物理學中，相空間是一個用以表示出一系統所有可能狀態的空間；系統每個可能的狀態都有一相對應的相空間的點。

C. The Organization

1. If there are certain amount of participants, the group can be a unit of **NAM**, and call itself **NAM**. The unit is organizationally and economically an independent entity. In order to be a member / participant, however, the individual has to belong to at least three categories:

1. region—where one lives;
2. social class according to one’s occupation—student, office worker, homemaker, owner of small business, writer, etc;
3. the thematic of one’s interest—as exemplified below.

Each of the categories is considered as an autonomous association, yet every member belongs to multiple categories at the same time. Multi-dimensional participation is necessary to protect the categories from being enclosed and exclusive (especially according to region and class). Many civil acts are constituted and enclosed by their own themes and targets. Certainly, it is necessary for them to be autonomous. They would lose their inherent characteristics should they add other dimensions unconditionally, or belong to other principles. Nonetheless, individuals can get out of the enclosure by belonging to other dimensions. For instance, region has to be acknowledged as a unit of life circumstance, but an individual has to get beyond it by belonging to other dimensions.

The categories of class as well as thematic interest can be, for that matter, considered as regions of a phase space, if not of a physical space. In the place of orchestrating such a slogan as “Think Globally, Act Locally,” NAM realizes it as an organizational principle. NAM began in Japan, but it intends to be a transnational movement, going beyond the borders of Japan. Even when NAM becomes a global association, the above principle will be consistent—at that time Japan will be deemed a region. Every individual belongs to a region, while s/he belongs to a global domain in terms of his/her thematic interest as well as class/occupational position. NAM is a rhizomatic association, consisting of multiple regionalities. It is different from the “International,” that had nation-state as its unit, as well as from just an international network between individuals.

以下列表列出主題興趣的領域，它們根據內在和外在於資本主義經濟的反抗運動而粗略劃分。這些只是例子，可以成員自己的興趣而改變：

甲、內在性反抗

環境
勞動力
消費者
少數族裔
少數性取向
福利
出版
媒體
女權主義

乙、超越性反抗

合作社
LETS（本地交易所交易系統）
非營利組織
免費學校
對第三世界的援助

二、每個領域都有一位代表和一個秘書處——這不僅是地區，還包括階級 / 職業和主題興趣。一個階級 / 地區的代表不能同時持有另一個階級 / 地區的職位。所有領域選出的代表共同組成中央代表委員會——像過去一樣，這是協會的協會。中央代表委員會進一步選出自己的代表。在每個級別中，首先通過複數投票制度以不記名方式選出三位候選者，最後，通過抽籤選擇代表；其餘是副代表。任期為一年，如有罷免則任期終止。

中央代表委員會有一個中央秘書處，秘書長由中央代表委員會成員選出。同時，中央代表委員會有一個審計委員會，負責會計審查和中心管理並向所有成員報告。這個委員會也裁定各單元之間的矛盾和罷免行動，其成員從有經驗的代表或秘書長中選出。

The following list presents the categories of thematic interests. They can be roughly divided between the counter-movements immanent in the capitalist economy and that which is excendent to capitalist economy. They are just examples, and can be changed according to the members' own interests.

a) Immanent Counter Acts

Environment
Labor
Consumer
Racial Minority
Sexual Minority
Welfare
Publication
Media
Feminism

b) Excendent Counter Acts

Cooperatives
LETS (Local Exchange Trading System)
Non-Profit Organizations
Free Schools
Aid to The Third World

2. Each category/region has a representative and a secretariat—this not only the physical region but also the class/occupation and thematic interest. A representative of a category/region cannot hold the post of another. Among the representatives of all categories is the center—the representative council—which is, as it were, the association of associations. Within the center, again, representatives are elected. In each level, first, three candidates are elected by a secret vote (in a plural ballot system), and finally, the representative is chosen by lottery; the rest are vice representatives. The term of office is a year, but if there is a recall, it is terminated.

The central representative council holds a central secretariat. The secretary general is chosen by and among the members of the central representative council. At the same time, the central representative council has an auditors' committee, which inspects the accounting and management of the center and reports to all members. This committee also rules the contradictions between the units and recall actions. The members of the auditors' committee are chosen among those who have experience as representatives or secretary-generals.

除成員外，NAM還有準成員。他們可以參加會議，並按他們的意願發言，但不能參與決策，例如代表選舉。

NAM中沒有秘密；問題和爭議通報全體成員。為此，每位成員必須有電腦或能夠使用電腦。以及每個單位可以有或必須有自己的獨立主頁。

三、在NAM內，本國貨幣在本地交易所交易系統（LETS）——由邁克爾·林頓在1982年設計——的意義上使用。對於成員或準成員的勞動、捐贈和服務，NAM支付稱為nam的貨幣。這使志願活動不是單方面的饋贈或自我犧牲服務，而是主動、開放和互惠的交流。在這一意義上，NAM是內在的經濟倫理活動。使用LETS不只是為了將其作為地區貨幣，也是為了推動它成為各主題興趣領域的貨幣。

Aside from members, NAM has associate members. They can participate in conventions and speak as they wish, but cannot participate in decision-making, such as the election of representatives.

There are no secrets in NAM; all the issues and arguments are reported to all members. For this purpose, all members are required to have a computer or be accessible. For that matter, each unit can have an independent homepage or rather must have one.

3. Within NAM, local currency in the sense of the local exchange trading system (LETS), designed by Michael Linton in 1982, is used. For members' or associate members' labor, donation, and service, NAM pays with the currency called nam. This makes volunteer activities not one-sided gifts or self-sacrificial services, but subjective, open, and reciprocal exchanges. NAM is an immanently economic-ethical activity in this sense. Employing LETS is also important in order to spread this as a regional currency of thematic interest, not limited to the physical regional currency.

丁、項目說明

一、NAM是一種倫理的一經濟的運動。參考康德的術語，我們可以說，「沒有道德的經濟政策是盲目的，而沒有經濟關切的道德介入是空洞的」。

社會主義從一開始就是道德的。這不僅僅是為了追求經濟平等。這種道德與國家及共同體強加的道德不同，甚至相反。它意味著像康德說的那樣，成為自由的主體，同時也把他作為自由的主體，而不是手段來對待。這只有通過廢除將人視為手段的資本主義市場經濟成為可能，因此，社會主義似乎必然是一種倫理介入。當然，倫理動機不可能僅憑自身戰勝資本主義。但由於馬克思主義者忽略這一點，我們現在必須強調它。

《資本論》的序言中，馬克思闡明了他的立場：

為了避免可能產生的誤解，要說明一下。我決不用玫瑰色描繪資本家和地主的面貌。不過這裏涉及到的人，只是經濟範疇的人格化，是一定的階級關係和利益的承擔者。我的觀點是：社會經濟形態的發展是一種自然歷史過程。不管個人在主觀上怎樣超脫各種關係，他在社會意義上總是這些關係的產物。同其他任何觀點比起來，我的觀點是更不能要個人對這些關係負責的。⁴

馬克思從來沒從一個簡單的道德觀點來指責資本主義或資本家。他的倫理性在於他決定廢除資本主義的關係架構，而不是擺出一副在主觀上已經超越這種關係結構的態度。正是這個決定證明了馬克思倫理的存在。自然的歷史結構——如同資本和工資勞動之間的關係——如果被孤立起來，則永遠不能被廢除。如果不是因為我們的道德介入，資本主義經濟將永久持續。社會主義不是自然歷史的必然性，而是一場倫理介入。

4 《資本論》第一卷，第10頁，中央編譯局譯，人民出版社2004年版。

D. Explanation of the Program

(1) NAM is an economic-ethical movement. In reference to Kant's term, we might say, "economic policy without ethics is blind, while ethical intervention without economic concerns is empty."

Socialism was ethical at its outset. This was not just to pursue economic equality. Being ethical is different from and even opposite to the morality that state and community impose. It is, as Kant stated, to be a free subject and treat others not only as means but also as free agents. This is only possible by abolishing the capitalist market economy that treats people only as means. Thus socialism appeared necessarily as an ethical intervention. Of course, the ethical motivation cannot by itself overcome capitalism. But it is because Marxists have omitted it that we must stress it now.

In the preface of *Capital*, Marx clarified his stance as follows:

To prevent possible misunderstandings, let me say this. I do not by any means depict the capitalist and landowner in rosy colors. But individuals are dealt with here only in so far as they are the personifications of economic categories, the bearers [Träger] of particular class-relations and interests. My standpoint, from which the development of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history, can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he remains, socially speaking, however much he may subjectively raise himself above them.¹

Marx never accused capitalism or capitalists from a simple-minded moral viewpoint. His ethics existed in his decision to abolish the relational structure of capitalism; it was never in the morality that behaves as if it went beyond the relational structures subjectively. It is precisely in this decision that Marx's ethics existed. The natural historical structure—like the relation between capital and wage labor—can never be abolished if it is left alone. If not for our ethical intervention, the capitalist economy will endure permanently. Socialism is not a natural historical necessity, but an ethical intervention.

1 *Capital*, p.92

我們必須考慮在內的人——或者說，他者——不僅包括生者，還包括死者以及未出生的人（未來的他者）。無疑，如果資本主義經濟像現在這樣持續下去，一場全球危機將重創人類。借助公眾輿論，為了我們現在的幸福，犧牲「未來的他者」——是把其他人視為手段，而不是自由的主體。道德只有通過終止資本的無限積累才能成為可能。因此，我們的運動是政治—經濟運動。

NAM是個人的聯合，基於個人的倫理標準。或者說，本質上，倫理是一個個人問題。別說國家，任何組織——甚至反國家的社會或階級集會——都不包含內在的倫理本質。在日常生活中，個人屬於各種各樣的組織——政府機構、公司、工會、公民組織、政黨、共同體村落等等——NAM不是一個與其他組織並列的組織。參加NAM不需要退出其他組織。NAM是那些在屬於其他組織的同時又有倫理標準的人的聯合。畢竟，NAM的運動將封閉在組織內的人們聯繫在一起。

此外，說NAM開展了一個新運動是不正確的。在資本主義經濟的現實發展下，許多反抗運動已經出現。NAM的角色是中介，它將孤立的甚至有所沖突的各種運動聯繫起來。不過，並不意味著NAM統治他們。例如，假設某個組織的所有成員屬於NAM，但該組織是獨立於NAM的；或者假設某個組織與NAM無關，然而其實踐與NAM類似，我們將歡迎並且欣賞它。我們最終的意圖，不是NAM的擴展，而是一種類似NAM的趨勢的擴展。

二、NAM組織對資本和國家的對抗行為。這是跨國工人作為消費者的運動，其中既包括在資本主義經濟內部的鬥爭，又包括在資本主義經濟外部的鬥爭。但嚴格意義上說，走出資本主義經濟當然是不可能的。資本主義經濟外部的鬥爭，旨在組織非資本主義的生產和消費；在內部的鬥爭，以流過程（消費）中的抵制為中心。

The people—or the others—who we have to take into consideration must include not only the living but also the dead as well as the unborn (the future others). If the present capitalist economy endures as it is, a global crisis will undoubtedly hit humanity. Sacrificing 'future others' for the sake of our present happiness by public consensus—is to treat the others as only means, not as free agents. Being ethical is possible only by terminating capital's unrestricted accumulation. Thus our movement is politico-economic.

NAM is an association of individuals, and based upon the ethics of individuals. Or rather, ethics is an individual problem in essence. Not to mention the state, any organization—even anti-state society or class assembly—does not contain an immanent ethical nature. In their daily lives, individuals belong to various organizations—government offices, corporations, unions, civic organizations, political parties, village communities, and so on—while NAM is not another organization that stands side by side with others. To participate in NAM does not require breaking-away from others. NAM is an association of those individuals who intend to be ethical while belonging to the other existing organizations. After all, the movement of NAM associates people who are enclosed within organizations.

Furthermore, it is not correct to say that NAM begins a new movement. Within the real development of the capitalist economy, many counter movements have already arisen. The role of NAM is to become a mediator that associates various movements that are isolated or even in conflict. Which does not mean, however, that NAM rules them. For instance, suppose there is an organization all of whose members belong to NAM, but it is considered independent from NAM. Or suppose there is an organization that is unrelated to NAM yet whose practices are NAM-like, we welcome and appreciate it. What we intend is finally not an expansion of NAM, but an expansion of a NAM-like tendency.

(2) NAM organizes a counter-act against capital and state. This is a transnational worker as consumer movement. This is practiced, figuratively speaking, within and without the capitalist economy. But, of course, it is impossible to stand outside the capitalist economy. The struggle without aims at organizing an association of non-capitalist production and consumption; the struggle within is centered on the boycotting in the process of circulation (consumption).

「市場經濟」一詞通常用來掩蓋資本運作的事實。資本是M（貨幣）—C（商品）—M'（貨幣）的運動，另一面，也是C—M和M'—C的交換。如果市場經濟在價格調節方面是高效的，隱藏其中的則是資本運動。確切地說，資本主義市場經濟和市場經濟應該區分開來。廢除資本主義市場經濟不等於廢除市場經濟或貨幣。我們設想的消費者／生產者合作社的全球網絡不是要回到一個自給自足的共同體，而是要回到一種向所有自由、獨立的生產者開放的市場經濟。根據設想，在這種交換中，貨幣不生產剩餘價值；它將會成為像LETS一樣的東西，後者不轉化為資本。

然而，這不是一個在我們掌握國家政權的階段才會實現的幻想。它在資本主義經濟內部長起來，並且對抗資本主義經濟。卡爾·波蘭尼⁵把資本主義（市場經濟）比喻為癌症。在農業共同體和封建國家的夾縫中誕生，資本主義入侵內部細胞，並根據自己的生理機能改變它們的傾向。如果是這樣，NAM可以說就是抗癌細胞的培養物。它追蹤資本主義，並且逐漸蠶食它。

資本主義的動力是趨於永恆的自我複製。因此資本主義是無休止的，不管它多麼無用和有害，永遠不會結束。即使我們改變了想法，或者國家控制了它，它也不會結束。資本主義不是欲望的產物，欲望才是資本主義的產物。但儘管有這樣的力量，當（且僅當）它不能捕獲剩餘價值時，它便會消失。NAM不會「推翻」資本主義，只會使它寂然消逝。

5 卡爾·波蘭尼，二十世紀匈牙利政治經濟學家、社會學家，代表作為《巨變》。

The term “market economy” is often used in order to conceal the fact that what is going on is the act of capital. Capital is the movement M (Money)—C (Commodity)—M, yet in the reverse, it consists of the exchanges C—M and M’—C. When it is said that the market economy is efficient in terms of the adjustment of price, veiled behind it is the movement of capital. To be precise, the capitalist market economy and market economy in general should be distinguished. The abolition of the capitalist market economy is not equal to the abolition of the market economy or money. The global network of consumers/producers cooperatives that we envision is not a return to a self-sufficient community, but a market economy open to all the free, independent producers. According to our vision, in this exchange, currency would not engender surplus value; it would be something like LETS, which does not turn into capital.

However, this is not a fantasy to be realized at the stage when we seize state power. It is to grow within and against the capitalist economy. Karl Polanyi likened capitalism (the market economy) to cancer². Coming into existence in the interstice between agrarian communities and feudal states, capitalism invaded the internal cells and transformed their predispositions according to its own physiology. If so, NAM is a culture of anti-cancer cells, as it were. It dogs capitalism, and gradually encroaches upon it.

The drive of capitalism is that of an auto-reproduction toward its perpetuation. Capitalism is thus interminable. No matter how futile and harmful it is, it does not end. Even if our thought changes, or the state regulates it, it does not end. Capitalism is not a product of our desire, but our desire is the product of capitalism. Notwithstanding this power, however, if and only if it fails to capture surplus value, it will die out. NAM won’t ‘overthrow’ capitalism; it will just make it die out quietly.

2 See Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1944.

馬克思主義者一般認為資本主義是封建統治的欺騙性版本，也就是認為它騙取了工人的剩餘勞動力。這是早於馬克思的李嘉圖社會主義者（憲章運動）的想法，而不是馬克思的想法。另一方面，馬克思重視的是資本的本質存在於商業資本的形式中這一事實——從空間差獲得剩餘價值。同時，產業資本通過不斷地生產新的價值系統——也就是說，通過強制性的技術創新——達到剩餘價值（相對剩餘價值）。這種分類不妨礙工業資本從商業資本的活動中獲得剩餘價值。資本環遊世界，尋找更便宜的勞動力。最後，剩餘價值對於工業資本來說，則是工人回購的總額與生產總額的差異。正是由於這個原因，我們不能僅僅在個別企業或民族國家的有限領域內考慮剩餘價值，應該把它視為世界資本主義的剩餘價值總額。在這些有限領域，我們根據經驗只知道利潤。剩餘價值總是不可見的，像黑盒子裏的一件東西。

資本家和工人之間的關係本質上不同於主人和奴隸之間的關係。這是置身於貨幣形態（一般等價物形態）和商品形態（相對價值形態）之間的個體的關係。資本只存在於M—C—M'這個運動中，只有通過不斷變化（或者實體轉化），它才能自我再現。這一運動中，資本絕對是主體的（能動的）因素；但這個周期結束時，資本也必須站在相對價值（銷售）的位置，在且只在這一刻，工人處於主體位置。這是資本主義生產的商品被出售——消費一的地方；也是唯一一個，擁有購買力的整體工人處於購買位置的地方。馬克思闡明了這一點：「資本同〔資本主義前的〕統治關係的區別恰恰在於：工人是作為消費者和交換價值實現者與資本相對立，是作為貨幣所有者，作為貨幣，作為簡單的流通中心與資本相對立——他是無限多的流通中心之一，由此他作為工人的規定性便消失了。」⁶。對資本來說，消費是剩餘價值最終實現的地方，恰恰為了實現這個目標，它成為唯一一個受消費者/工人的意志支配的地方。

6 《政治經濟學批判（1857-1858年草稿）》，收於《馬克思|恩格斯全集》第四十六卷上，第407頁，中央編譯局譯，人民出版社1979年版。

Marxists in general basically saw capitalism as a deceptive version of feudal domination. That is to say, they saw that it cheated surplus labor from workers. This was the idea of the Ricardian Socialists (the Chartist Movement) before Marx, but not of Marx. Marx, on the other hand, attached importance to the fact that capital's essence was in the form of merchant capital—attaining surplus value from spatial difference. Meanwhile, industrial capital attains surplus value (relative surplus value in particular) by incessantly producing new value systems temporally—that is, with compulsive technological innovation. This categorical division does not prevent industrial capital from attaining surplus value from the activity of merchant capital. Capital constantly travels the world over, looking for cheaper labor power. And finally, the surplus value (for industrial See Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1944.) is attained as the difference in the process through which workers in sum buy back what they in sum have produced. For this reason precisely, surplus value cannot be taken into consideration within the limited realm of individual enterprises or nation-states. It should be grasped only as the total surplus value in world capitalism. Within these limited domains, what we know empirically is only profit. Surplus value is always invisible, like a thing in a black box.

The relationship between capitalist and worker is essentially different from that between master and slave. This is the relationship between those individuals who are placed in the money form (general equivalent form) and in the commodity form (relative value form). Capital exists only in the movement Money—Commodity—Money; only by the incessant metamorphosis (or trans-substantiation) can it self-reproduce. In this movement, capital is definitely the one that is subjective. But at the end of the cycle, capital, too, has to stand in the position of the relative form of value (selling), and it is precisely at this moment and this moment only that workers are in the subjective position. This is the place where the commodities of capitalist production are sold—the place of consumption. This is the only place where workers in totality with purchasing power are in the buying position. Marx articulated this: “What precisely distinguishes capital from the master-slave relation is that the worker confronts him as consumer and possessor of exchange values, and that in the form of the possessor of money, in the form of money he becomes a simple center of circulation—one of its infinitely many centers, in which his specificity as worker is extinguished.³” For capital, consumption is the place where surplus value is finally realized, and for this objective precisely, the only place where it is subordinated to the will of consumers/workers.

3 Marx, *Grundrisse*, Notebook IV, translated by Martin Nicolaus, Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, p. 420-421.

在貨幣經濟中，買與賣，和生產與消費一樣是互相分離的。這引起了工人主體的分化：作為工人（勞動力商品的賣家）和消費者（資本主義商品的買家）。結果企業和消費者似乎是經濟活動的唯一主體。它同樣隔離了勞動和消費者的運動。如今勞動運動陷入僵局，而消費者運動已蓬勃發展，經常包括了環境保護、女權主義和少數族裔等議題。一般來說，它們採取公民運動的形式，並且與勞動運動沒有聯繫，有時甚至是對立的。然而，歸根結底，消費者運動是改換了位置的勞動者的運動，而且正因為如此才具有重要性。反過來說，勞動運動可以超越它的「特定」界限而具有普遍性，只要它有意識地以消費者的身份運動。這是因為事實上，消費作為勞動力商品的再生產過程，包括了我們生活 / 世界的整個範圍，包括了兒童保育、教育、休閒和共同體活動，但其中的關鍵顯然與葛蘭西所說的再生產過程—文化意識形態設備，如家庭、學校、教會等——有關，即便明顯地有所不同。在我們的語境中，這一再生產過程首先是資本自我實現的必經過程，然後，也是工人成為主體的場所。

馬克思主義者未能掌握資本家和領薪工人之間的階級關係，尤其是資本主義經濟中的關係。他們認為在封建制度中顯而易見的，在資本主義商品經濟下被掩蓋了；因此，工人應該站起來，根據主人和奴隸的辯證法推翻資本主義制度。但在現實中，工人不站起來是因為——根據馬克思主義者的看法——商品經濟物化了意識，而馬克思主義者作為先鋒的任務是把工人從白日夢中喚醒。馬克思主義者認為，物化是由於消費主義社會的誘惑和/或文化霸權的操縱。因此，馬克思主義者首先該做的和可以做的，是批判性地闡明這種機制，或直接地說，那是今天的馬克思主義者唯一能做的。弗雷德里克·詹姆遜稱之為「文化轉折」的，是一種「絕望」形式，存在於馬克思主義實踐內。但其根底依然潛伏著生產過程中心主義的希望，即認為批判了文化上的「物化」，勞動者就會從生產領域掀起社會主義革命。那麼，市民行動的缺點是什麼？在與勞動運動保持距離的情況下，他們對資本主義生產關係缺乏深入的立場。他們傾向於被納入社會民主主義，後者贊同市場經濟，尋求通過國家管制及財富的再分配糾正其自身矛盾。

In the monetary economy, buying and selling as well as production and consumption are separated. This introduces a split in the workers' subject: as workers (the sellers of labor-power commodity) and consumers (the buyers of capitalist commodities). In consequence, it comes to appear as if corporations and consumers were the only subjects of economic activities. It also segregates the labor and consumers' movements. In recent history, while labor movements have been in a deadlock, consumers' movements have flourished, often incorporating issues of environmental protection, feminism, and minorities. Generally, they take the form of civil action, and are not connected to, or are sometimes even antagonistic to, the labor movement. After all, though, consumers' movements are laborers' movements in transposition, and are important only inasmuch as they are so. Conversely, the labor movement could go beyond the bounds of its 'specificity' and become universal inasmuch as it self-consciously acts the consumers' movement. For, in fact, the process of consumption as a reproduction of labor-power commodity covers a whole range of fronts of our life-world, including child-care, education, leisure, and community activities. But what is at stake here is obviously related to, yet clearly different from, the process of reproduction in the sense of Gramsci—the cultural ideological apparatus such as family, school, church, etc. In our context, it is first and foremost the process of the reproduction of labor-power as a topos of ordeal for capital's self-realization, and hence the position in which workers can finally be the subject.

Marxists failed to grasp the class relationship between capitalist and wage-worker particular to the capitalist economy. They believed that what had been evident in the feudal system came to be veiled under the capitalist commodity economy; therefore, the workers were supposed to stand up and overthrow the capitalist system according to the dialectic of master and slave. But in reality, workers do not stand up at all, because, Marxists believe, the workers' consciousness is reified by the commodity economy, and Marxists' task, as the vanguard, is to awaken workers from the daydream. Marxists believe that the reification is caused by the seduction of consumerist society and/or manipulation by cultural hegemony. Thus, to begin with, what Marxists should and can do is to critically elucidate the mechanism. Or to say it outright, that is the only business left for Marxists today. What Fredric Jameson calls "the cultural turn" is a form of 'despair' inherent in the Marxist practice. But lurking in its core is a production-process- centrist hope. Then, what is the shortcoming of civil acts? In keeping a distance from labor movements, they lack a penetrating stance toward the capitalist relation of production. They tend to be absorbed into the social democracy that, approving the market economy, seeks to correct its contradictions through state regulations as well as the redistribution of wealth.

最後，有兩種阻止資本主義經濟的永恒運動的方法。一種是資本主義經濟內部的鬥爭，以抵制運動為中心，我們稱作內在性的鬥爭；另一種是擴大非資本主義市場經濟（生產者/消費者合作社和LETS）我們稱作超越性的鬥爭。在M—C—M'過程中，有兩個資本必須面對的關鍵時刻；購買勞動力商品，向工人銷售產品。任意一個時刻的失敗都會使資本無法實現剩餘價值，換句話說，無法成為資本。也就是說，在這些時刻，工人可以反抗資本。第一個時刻，用安東尼奧·奈格裏的話來說，就是「不要工作！」，在我們這篇文章裏意味著「不要賣你的勞動力商品！」或「不要作為工資勞動者工作！」；第二個時刻，像聖雄甘地說的那樣，「不買資本主義產品」。兩種情況都可以在工人能夠作為主體的立場下發生，但為了工人/消費者能「不工作」和「不買」，必須存在一張安全網，在那裏他們仍然可以工作並且通過購買生活。這就是涉及生產者/消費合作社的外部鬥爭。內在性鬥爭中，不可避免地需要合作社和LETS的形成；超越性鬥爭則可以加速資本主義公司重組為合作實體。NAM打算組織內在和外在於資本主義生產/消費模式的鬥爭之間的互動。

重複一遍，馬克思主義者普遍認為，反對資本主義的鬥爭應該以工人通過罷工奪取權力為中心。相反，我們強調工人作為消費者鬥爭的重要性。這不是因為勞動運動在歷史上衰落的事實，而是因為剩餘價值被資本利用的方式的性質——在廣泛的流通領域，它就像一個黑盒。如果這樣，反資本主義的鬥爭就應該在黑盒裏進行。該原則不僅關係到現在未來，而且關係到過去。

Finally, there are two ways to stop the perpetual movement of the capitalist economy. One is the struggle immanent in the capitalist economy. This is centered on boycott movements. Another struggle is to expand the non-capitalist market economy (producers/consumers cooperative and local currency). We call the latter an exscendent struggle. In the process $M-C-M'$, there are two critical moments that capital has to confront: buying labor-power commodity and selling products to workers. Failure in either moment disables capital from achieving surplus value. In other words, it fails to be capital. That is to say that in these moments, workers can counter capital. The first moment is, in Antonio Negri's phrase, "Don't Work!" This really signifies, in our context, "Don't Sell Your Labor-Power Commodity!" or "Don't Work as a Wage Laborer!" The second moment says, like Mahatma Gandhi, "Don't Buy Capitalist Products!" Both of them can occur in the position in which workers can be the subject. But in order for workers/consumers to be able 'not to work' and 'not to buy', there must be a safety net whereupon they can still work and buy to live. This is the very exscendent struggle involving the producers/consumers cooperatives. The struggle within inexorably requires these cooperatives and the formation of LETS (Local Exchange Trading System). Furthermore, the exscendent struggle can accelerate the reorganization of the capitalist corporation into cooperative entity. NAM intends to organize the interaction between the one immanent in and the one exscendent to the capitalist mode of production/consumption.

To repeat, it has been widely believed among Marxists that the struggle against capitalism should be centered on the seizure of power by workers by means of strikes. In contradistinction to this, we stress the importance of the struggle of workers as consumers; and this is not because of the fact that the labor movement has historically declined. This is because of the nature of the way surplus value is exploited by capital—within a vast domain of circulation that is like a black box. If so, the struggle against capitalism should be done within the black box. This principle is pertinent not only to the present/future, but also to the past.

在十九世紀後期，伯恩斯坦和考茨基的議會主義⁷崛起，羅莎·盧森堡和列寧否定它，並提出了一個戰略，以總罷工和政治起義為中心。然而，他們都未能防止帝國主義戰爭。事實是，如果工人有能力防止國家戰爭，他們的革命會比戰敗後的動亂中發生的革命（俄國十月革命）更先進，更強大。如果允許進一步假設的話：假設那時候的工人開展了這裏建議的運動——在抵制資本主義產品的同時正常地工作和生活——而不是開展危害他們生計的罷工運動，會怎樣呢？如果全民杯葛（general boycott）已經在第二國際的領導下在全世界範圍內完成了，會怎樣呢？我相信，資本和國家不可能反擊了。總結十九世紀以來的馬克思主義運動，我們可以得出結論，它主要的錯誤在於缺乏對資本主義經濟與國家之間的關係的認識。只有承認這一點，新聯合主義運動才能開始。

葛蘭西以軍事策略為比喻談論革命運動：運動戰（正面攻擊）和陣地戰。運動戰意味著與國家政府的正面對抗和直接戰鬥，而陣地戰意味著內部的鬥爭，反對國家政府背後的文明社會霸權機器。在這種情況下，他清楚地指出，在俄國革命中起作用的一切，不會對西方文明社會起作用。「在俄國，國家就是一切，市民社會處於原始狀態，尚未開化；在西方，國家和市民社會關係得當，國家一旦動搖，穩定的市民社會結構立即就會顯露。國家不過是外在的壕溝，其背後是強大的堡壘和工事……」⁸在國家背後的文明社會進行陣地戰的壓力，為專註於當今文化批判的人提供了基礎。然而葛蘭西的陣地戰不僅意味著對文化霸權的鬥爭，他與甘地的會面記錄中表現了這一點：「甘地領導的消極抵抗屬於陣地戰，到一定的時機又轉化為運動戰，然後又轉化為地下戰。聯合抵制是陣地戰，罷工是運動戰，秘密籌備武器和作戰部隊是地下戰。」⁹他顯然尋求抵制運動中陣地戰的關鍵。

7 議會主義的主張，是無產階級可以通過參與長期的議會鬥爭，成為多數派後和平奪取國家政權並長入社會主義。

8 《獄中札記》，第34頁，曹雷雨、姜麗、張躡譯，河南大學出版社2014年版。

9 《獄中札記》，第292頁，同上。

In the late 19th century, when the parliamentarianism of Bernstein and Kautsky was on the rise, Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin denied it and proposed a strategy centered on workers' general strike and political uprising. Neither of them could even prevent the imperialist war. The truth is that if workers had had the power to prevent the war of state, it could have been much more advanced and powerful as a social revolution than the political revolution (the Russian Revolution) that actually occurred, thanks to the turmoil of defeat. And if I can continue the subjunctive mode further: what if the workers of the time had conducted the movement that I propose—boycotting capitalist products while working and living normally—in the place of the strikes that jeopardized their lives? What if the general boycott had been done worldwide under the leadership of the Second International. I believe that the capitals and states could not have countered it. Summarizing the Marxist movement since the 19th century, we can conclude that its main mistake was due to its ignorance of the relation between the capitalist economy and the state. Only by acknowledging this experience, can the new associationist movement begin.

Gramsci spoke of revolutionary movements using figures of military tactics: the war of maneuver (frontal attack) and the war of position. The war of maneuver signifies a confrontational and direct fight with the state government, while the war of position indicates a struggle within and against the hegemonic apparatuses of civil society, residing behind the state governmental apparatus. In this context, he clearly stated that what had worked in the Russian Revolution would not work for Western civil societies. "In Russia, the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous; in the West, there was a proper relation between State and civil society, and when the State trembled a sturdy structure of civil society was at once revealed. The State was only an outer ditch, behind which there stood a powerful system of fortresses and earthworks . . ."⁴ This stress of the war of position in civil society residing behind the state offers the basis for those who focus on the critique of culture today. Yet Gramsci's war of position cannot simply mean the struggle over the cultural hegemony. It shows in the passage of Gramsci vis-à-vis Gandhi. "Gandhi's passive resistance is a war of position, which at certain moments becomes a war of movement, and at others underground warfare. Boycotts are a form of war of position, strikes of war of movement, the secret preparation of weapons and combat troops belongs to underground warfare."⁵ He evidently sought the crux of the war of position in boycott movement.

4 Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, International Publishers, New York, 1971, P. 283.

5 *ibid.*, pp 229-230.

三、NAM是非暴力的。它不僅否認暴力革命，而且否認任何通過議會手段使用國家權力的方式。因為NAM的意圖是廢除資本主義貨幣經濟——它永遠不能被國家權力廢除——以及廢除國家權力本身。

馬克思主義者認為經濟領域是底部基礎，而國家和民族是上層建築。此外他們重申，上層建築雖然由經濟基礎所決定，卻是相對自主的。然而，資本主義經濟是基礎或基礎設施這種觀念本身是有問題的；幣和信用制度構成的世界毋寧說是一種幻覺，帶有特殊的宗教性質。從另一方面說，即使國家和民族是由共同幻覺構成的，它們也由於現實基礎而不可避免地存在，正如資本主義一樣。這正是我們不能僅靠說它們虛幻就能消解它們的原因。

在《政治經濟學批判》中有如下術語：基礎和上層建築。然而，馬克思從來沒有強調它們是一個公式。比起《資本論》裏的概念，它們沒那麼重要。此外，歷史唯物主義是恩格斯在馬克思之前發展起來的立場；可是馬克思死後，恩格斯聲稱是馬克思創造了它，人們便相信了這說法。如果歷史唯物主義等於馬克思主義，它可以不需要馬克思而存在，可沒有馬克思，《資本論》這樣一部作品就不可能存在。歷史唯物主義試圖從資本主義角度追溯以資本主義經濟告終的歷史。馬克思把這稱作「人的解剖學對猿的解剖有用」，也就是說，資本主義社會使我們能夠從經濟的角度回顧過往的社會，但是不能反過來理解資本主義社會。

在基礎和上層建築的體系中，我們應該認為資本、國家和民族以不同的交換原理為基礎。獨立看待它們的觀點不再有效，因為在資產階級現代國家，它們形成完美的三位一體。我們將它們分成三個不同的類別。

(3) NAM is non-violent. It not only denies violent revolution, but also negates any use of state power by parliamentary means. This is because what NAM intends is an abolition of capitalist currency economy—that which state power can never abolish—and also the abolition of state power itself.

Marxists held that the economic domain was a base structure, while state and nation were super structure. Furthermore, they restated that the super structure nevertheless was relatively autonomous to, though determined by, the economic base. First of all, the very notion that the capitalist economy is base or infrastructure is itself questionable. The world organized by money and credit is rather one of illusion, with a peculiarly religious nature. Saying this from the opposite view, even though state and nation are composed by communal illusion, precisely like capitalism, they inevitably exist thanks to their realistic grounds. So it is that we cannot dissolve them by saying that they are illusory.

In the *Outline of the Critique of Political Economy (Grundrisse)* are the expressions: base and superstructure. Yet Marx never emphasized them as a formulation. These concepts are not so crucial as compared with those in *Capital*. Furthermore, historical materialism was the stance that Engels developed before Marx; but, because Engels said, otherwise, that Marx formulated it first after Marx's death, it came to be believed that Marx coined it. If historical materialism were equal to Marxism, it could have always existed without Marx. Meanwhile, a work such as *Capital* could not have existed without Marx. Historical materialism seeks to understand the history that culminates in the capitalist economy from the vantage point of capitalism, retrospectively. Marx expresses this, as 'the anatomy of human is useful for the anatomy of apes'. That is to say, capitalist society makes it possible for us to see the previous societies from the economic viewpoint, but it is impossible to understand capitalist society the other way around.

In the place of base and superstructure scheme, we should think that capital, state, and nation are based upon different principles of exchange. The view to see them separately is lost because in the bourgeois modern state they form a perfect trinity. Let us separate them into three different categories.

《資本論》強調，商業開始於共同體之間；「商品交換是在共同體的盡頭，在它們與別的共同體或其成員接觸的地方開始的。但是物一旦對外成為商品，由於反作用力，它們在共同體內部生活中也成為商品。」¹⁰商品交換是一種與其他形式不同的特殊的交換，民族和國家則是另外兩種早就存在的交換。首先，一個共同體內存在著交換——禮尚往來的互酬式交換。雖然以互助為基礎，它也強加了共同體的行為準則和排他性——如果一個人不回禮，他／她將被排斥。第二，共同體間的原始交換是掠奪。這種掠奪是其他交換的基礎；其他交換只在掠奪被摒棄的地方存在；在這個意義上，掠奪被認為是一種交換。例如，為了不斷地掠奪，必須保護受害者不受其他掠奪者侵擾，甚至培育經濟／工業增長。這便是國家的原型。為了繼續掠奪，而且掠奪得越來越多，國家保證土地得到保護，通過再分配實現勞動力的再生產。它還通過公共事業手段促進農業生產，如通過公眾水利工程調節水的分配。因此，國家似乎並沒有教唆一個搶掠系統：農民把繳納稅款當做對領主的保護（責任）的回報；商人繳納稅款，回報對他們的交易和商業的庇護。最後，國家表現為一個超越階級的理性實體。

第三種形式是馬克思所說的共同體之間的商品交換。這種交換只在互相同意的基礎上發生，即國家和法律制度已經存在的情況下。如我在別處談到過的，這種交換產生剩餘價值或資本。剩餘價值（對於商人資本和工業資本來說，是通過剝削賺取的；它和封建國家的掠奪相似，但不完全相同。交換（商業上的）表面上由平等交換（在空間和時間上有所分化的系統之間）造成，但必然導致財富的不平等交換和不公平創造。

除了這三種，還有第四種交換，我們把它叫做聯合（association）或LETS。它基於不同的原則。它產生的交換，不像民族國家那樣具有剝削性，它的互換是自發和包容性的，不像農業共同體。

10 《資本論》第一卷，第107頁，同上。

The Marx of *Capital* stresses that commerce began in-between communities. “The exchange of commodities begins where communities have their boundaries, at their points of contact with other communities, or with members of the latter. However, as soon as products have become commodities in the external relations of a community, they also, by reaction, become commodities in the internal life of the community.”⁶ The commodity exchange is a peculiar form of exchange among other exchanges. And nation and state are those very two other preceding types of exchange. First, there is exchange within a community—reciprocity of gift and return. Though based upon mutual aid, it also imposes community’s code—if one does not return, s/he will be ostracized—and exclusivity. Second, the original exchange between communities is plunder. And rather it is this plunder that is the basis for other exchanges: Other exchanges begin only at the point where mutual plunder is given up. In this sense, plunder is deemed a type of exchange. For instance, in order to plunder continuously, it is necessary to protect the victims from other plunderers, and even nurture economic-industrial growth. This is the prototype of the state. In order to keep on robbing, and robbing more and more, the state guarantees the protection of land and the reproduction of labor-power by redistribution. It also promotes agricultural production by public undertakings such as regulating water distribution through public water works. It follows that the state does not appear to be abetting a system of robbery: farmers think of paying tax as a return (duty) for the protection of the lord; merchants pay tax as a return for the protection of their exchange and commerce. Finally, the state is represented as a supra-class entity of reason.

The third form is what Marx calls the commodity exchange between communities. This exchange occurs only where there is a mutual consent; and it is where state and legal system already exist. As I said elsewhere, this exchange engenders surplus value or capital. The surplus value (for both merchant capital and industrial capital) is earned by exploitation; it is similar to, yet different from the plunder by feudal state. The exchange (commerce) is rendered ostensibly by an equal exchange (between spatially as well as temporally differentiated systems), but definitely results in an unequal exchange and the unequal creation of wealth.

Aside from these three, there is the fourth exchange, what we call association or LETS. It is based upon different principles. This engenders exchanges that are not exploitative like those of the nation-state, and reciprocity that is spontaneous and inclusive unlike that of the agrarian community.

6 *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 182.

a) 掠奪和再分配	b) 贈與的互酬制
c) 貨幣交換	d) 聯合

a) 封建國家	b) 農業共同體
c) 城市	d) 聯合

a) 國家	b) 民族
c) 資本（市場經濟）	d) 聯合

a) 平等	b) 友愛
c) 自由	d) 聯合

在本尼迪克特·安德森的著名的《想像的共同體》中，他提到民族國家是民族和國家的結合，兩者分屬不同類別。這當然是一條重要的建議，然而不應該忘記，以往在兩個完全不同的實體——國家與資本之間存在著另一種聯合。在封建社會時代，國家、資本和民族明顯是分開的，它們分別作為封建國家（領主、君王和皇帝），城市和農業共同體而存在，基於不同的交換原則。其中，國家基於掠奪和再分配原則，相互隔離和孤立的農業共同體由國家主導，但它們在內部是自主的，基於互助和互惠交換的原則。然後，在共同體之間，市場或城市成長起來，這基於在共識基礎上的貨幣交換。令封建制度崩潰的是資本主義市場經濟的滲透，另一方面這產生了專制主義君主制國家。通過與商人階級共謀，推翻了封建領主（貴族）的暴力壟斷手段，並最終廢除封建統治（超經濟統治）。這便是國家和資本之間的聯姻的故事。

a) plunder and redistribution	b) reciprocity of gift and return
c) exchange by money	d) association

a) feudal state	b) agrarian community
c) city	d) association

a) state	b) nation
c) capital (market economy)	d) association

a) equality	b) fraternity
c) liberty	d) association

In his famous book, *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson said that the nation-state is a marriage between nation and state that are originally different in kind. This was certainly an important suggestion. Yet it should not be forgotten that there was previously another marriage between two entities which were totally heterogeneous—that between state and capital. In the feudal ages, state, capital, and nation were clearly separated. They existed distinctively as feudal states (lords, kings, and emperors), cities, and agrarian communities, all based upon different principles of exchange. States were based upon the principles of plunder and redistribution. The agrarian communities that were mutually disconnected and isolated were dominated by states; but, within themselves, they were autonomous, based upon the principles of mutual aid and reciprocal exchange. Between these communities, markets or cities grew; these were based upon monetary exchange relying on mutual consent. What crumbled the feudal system was the permeation of the capitalist market economy. On the one hand, this engendered absolutist monarchical states that conspired with the merchant class, monopolized the means of violence by toppling feudal lords (aristocracy), and finally abolished feudal domination (extra-economic domination) entirely. This was the story of the wedding between state and capital.

封建地租成為國稅，官僚制度和現役部隊成為國家機器。那些屬於特定部落、特定氏族裏的人，現在變成了君主專制政體下的臣民，以一種日後被叫做民族認同的東西為根基。受到專制政權的保護，商人資本（資產階級）壯大並培育出民族身份，為了創造出一個統一的市場。然而，就民族的形成而言，這還不是全部。隨著市場經濟的滲透以及啟蒙文化的城市化而分解的農業共同體始終存在於民族的基礎上。雖然自給自足的個別農業共同體通過貨幣滲透分解，它們的共同體——互助互惠——則通過想象在民族的概念中復原。

安德森指出，宗教衰落之後，民族替代了宗教。在這種情況下，重要的是宗教作為農業共同體和在農業共同體內部存在的事實。宗教的衰落等於共同體的衰落。與黑格爾所說的理解狀態（精神缺乏）或霍布斯式國家不同，民族根植於產生於農業共同體的一種互助情懷。這種情緒被民族主義喚醒：屬於同一個國家，並且互相幫助友愛的情感。這就是所謂的民族與國家之間的結合。

在資產階級革命中，三者正式合為一體。如在法國革命中的三位一體——自由、平等、博愛——資本、國家、民族交織合併為一股不可分割的力量。故此現代國家必須被稱為狹義上的資本主義——國家——民族。它們互相補充，互相加強。當經濟自由變得過度，階級衝突加劇時，國家進行介入，以便再分配財富和調節經濟，同時，民族團結（互助）的情感彌補了裂縫。面對這個無畏的三位一體，破壞一個或另一個是行不通的。如果有人試圖只推翻資本主義，他必須適應中央集權，或被民族主義情懷所吞噬。毋庸贅言，前者意味著斯大林主義，後者則是法西斯主義。

Feudal ground rent became national tax, while bureaucracy and standing army became state apparatuses. Those who had belonged to certain tribes, in certain clans, now became subjects under the absolutist monarchy, grounding what would later be national identity. Protected by the absolutist state, merchant capital (bourgeoisie) grew up and nurtured the identity of the nation for the sake of creating a unified market. Yet this was not all in terms of the formation of the nation. Agrarian communities that were decomposed along with the permeation of market economy and by the urbanized culture of enlightenment always existed on the foundation of the nation. While individual agrarian communities that had been autarkic and autonomous were decomposed by the osmosis of money, their communalities—mutual aid and reciprocity—themselves were recovered imaginarily within the nation.

Anderson points out that the nation plays proxy for religion, after it has declined. In this situation, what is important is the fact that religion has existed as and in the agrarian community. The decline of religion is equal to the decline of community. In contradistinction from what Hegel called the state of understanding (lacking spirit), or the Hobbesian state, the nation is grounded upon the empathy of mutual aid descending from agrarian communities. And this emotion is awoken by nationalism: belonging to the same nation and helping each other—the emotion of fraternity. This is the so-called marriage between state and nation.

It was amidst the bourgeois revolution that these three were officially married. As in the trinity intoned in the French Revolution—liberty, equality, and fraternity—capital, state, and nation copulated and amalgamated themselves into a force as inseparable ever after. Hence the modern state must be called, *sensu stricto*, the capitalist-nation-state. They were made to be mutually complementary, reinforcing each other. When economic liberty becomes excessive and class conflict is sharpened, the state intervenes to redistribute wealth and regulate the economy, and at the same time, the emotion of national unity (mutual aid) fills up the cracks. When facing this fearless trinity, undermining one or the other does not work. If one attempts to overthrow capitalism alone, one has to adapt statism, or one is engulfed by nationalist empathy. It goes without saying that the former appeared as Stalinism and the latter as fascism.

在交換的三個原則中，在現代，商品交換（C類）擴大和超過其他類別。然而，由於它在三位一體內操作，資本主義商品交易不可能壟斷整個人類關係。在人類和自然的再生產方面，資本別無選擇，只能依靠家庭和農業共同體；在這個意義上，資本本質上依賴於前資本主義生產方式。這裏存在著民族的根基。另一方面，儘管君主專制政體由於資產階級革命而消失，國家本身存活了下來。國家永遠不能解散並歸入國民代表主權（政府）。對國家來說，無論什麼樣的國家，總是作為裸露的政權面對其他國家（如果不是對其自身的國家裸露）；在危機（戰爭）中，一個強大的領導者（決定的主體）總是被需要的，一如波拿巴主義和法西斯主義所證明的。

我們經常聽到，民族國家將逐漸被資本主義全球化解。但這是不可能的。當個別國家經濟受到全球市場（新自由主義的威脅時，他們要求國家（再分配）及 / 或經濟共同體的保護，同時求助於民族的文化身份。因此，任何對資本的反對也必須是針對國家和民族（共同體）的。資本主義民族國家是無畏的，因為它是三位一體的。在三位一體內，對其中一體的否認導致被另外兩者的力量所吸收。這是因為每一體都基於不同的交換原則，儘管看上去是虛幻的。它不會被任何開明的批評消滅，除非被合作交換所取代，否則它會持續下去。

正如我所證明，葛蘭西聲稱，在俄羅斯，國家便是一切，文明社會呈原始和未開化狀；在西方，國家與文明社會之間存在著一種適當的關係；因此他建議，陣地戰應該取代運動戰（前線出擊）。「國家與文明社會之間是否存在適當的關係」，即「是否存在一個成熟的文明社會」，在我們的文章裏應該重新表述為，「資本 / 民族國家之間是否存在適當的結合 / 合併」。

Among the three principles of exchange, in the modern period, commodity exchange (the c type) expanded and overpowered the others. Inasmuch as it operated within the trinity, however, it is impossible that the capitalist commodity exchange could monopolize the whole of human relation. With respect to the reproduction of humans and nature, capital has no choice but to rely on the family and agrarian community; in this sense capital is essentially dependent upon the pre-capitalist mode of production. Herein exists the ground of the nation. On the other hand, while absolutist monarchs disappeared at the hand of bourgeois revolutions, the state itself has remained. The state can never be dissolved and subsumed into the representatives of national sovereignty (=government). For the state, no matter what kind, always exists as the bare sovereign vis-à-vis other states (if not always to its nation); in crises (wars), a powerful leader (the subject of determination) is always called for, as evidenced in Bonapartism and fascism.

We frequently hear today that the nation-state will be gradually decomposed by the globalization of capitalism. This is impossible. When individual national economies are threatened by the global market (neo-liberalism), they demand the protection (redistribution) of the state and/or bloc economy, at the same time as appealing to national cultural identity. So it is that any counter-act to capital must also be one targeted against the state and nation (community). The capitalist-nation-state is fearless because of its trinity. The denial of one ends up being reabsorbed in the ring of the trinity by the power of the other two. This is because each of them, though appearing to be illusory, is based upon different principle of exchange. It is not erased by any enlightened critique; unless it is replaced by the exchange of association, it will endure.

As I have showed, Gramsci stated that in Russia, the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous; in the West, there was a proper relation between State and civil society; thus he suggested that the war of position should replace the war of maneuver (frontal attack). Whether there was a proper relation between State and civil society, that is, whether there was a mature civil society should be restated, in our context, as whether there was a proper copulation/amalgamation between capital/nation/state.

在意大利，法西斯主義摧毀了由葛蘭西領導的，以佔領工廠為中心的列寧主義鬥爭。它的弱點源於對民族主義的依賴。與此同時，在俄羅斯，資本 / 國家 / 民族的結合沒有完成，戰爭是為了沙皇自己，而不是為了民族；因此，社會主義革命可以，或不得不訴諸民族主義。從那時起，許多社會主義革命以民族獨立運動的身份出現；在國家機器和資本與殖民主義力量合謀的地區，是社會主義者喚起和實現了民族主義。不幸的是，革命的成功卻未曾進一步教導我們，在資本 / 民族國家三位一體已經確立的地方如何鬥爭。

資產階級革命——即一個民主的民族國家的形成一直是暴力的，因為這是奪取君主專制政權的行為。這場革命仍然在世界各地尤其是發展中國家，以各種名義、通過不同的途徑發生。先進國家的人民譴責這種暴力是不公平的。然而，資產階級革命後的革命，即廢除資本主義和民族國家的革命，不能像資產階級革命那樣——奪取國家政權和改造社會。因此，我們不把NAM叫做革命，而是反抗運動。

In Italy, fascists smashed the Leninist struggle that was led by Gramsci and centered on the occupation of factories. Its weakness was due to its reliance on nationalism. Meanwhile, in Russia, where the wedding of capital/state/nation had not been completed, wars were fought on behalf of the Tsar himself and not for the nation; therefore, the socialist revolution had been able to, or had to, resort to nationalism. Since then, many socialist revolutions have borne national independence movements; in those regions where state apparatuses and capitals conspired with colonialist powers, it was the socialists who informed and realized nationalism. The success of the revolutions unfortunately does not teach us anything further concerning the struggle where the capital/nation/state trinity is well established.

Bourgeois revolution—qua the formation of a democratic nation-state—has always been violent, for this was the deed of robbing the state power of absolutist monarchy. This revolution is still going on world over, especially in developing countries, under various names and by various agents. And it is unfair for the people of advanced nations to condemn the violence. But the revolution after the bourgeois revolution, namely the revolution to abolish capitalism and nation-state, cannot be anything like the bourgeois revolution—seizing state power and transforming the society. So it is that we call NAM not a revolution, but a counter-act.

馬克思認為，社會主義革命只在最先進的國家——英國——才有可能發生，因為社會主義應該在資產階級社會完全成熟，成熟到足以分解的階段才有可能。然而，事實上這並不可能發生。在普選權得到實現，工會力量得到加強的特定情況下，革命似乎更加遙不可及。不過，真正衰退的只是從資產階級革命中發展而來的「革命」；事實是，從那時起，人們需要一種完全不同的革命類型。不該忘記，在這種情況下，馬克思開始了《資本論》的寫作任務。對資本主義的批評將不再足夠，這一認識促使他寫了這部不朽的作品。在這方面看，葛蘭西從運動戰轉變為陣地戰的立場也是意味深長的。據他的分析，這種轉變在十九世紀末已經開始。「政治鬥爭從『運動戰』，轉移到『陣地戰』的問題當然需要在這一點上加以考慮。在歐洲，該轉變過程發生在1848年之後，馬尼及其追隨者並不了解，但它被另一些人所了解：1871年之後發生了同樣的轉變，等等。」¹¹在英國，李嘉圖社會主義者的憲章運動油盡燈枯時，政治鬥爭從運動戰向陣地戰的轉變比其他任何地方都要明顯。因此，必須把《資本論》理解為提供了陣地戰的邏輯。

11 《獄中札記》，第126頁，同上。

Marx thought that the socialist revolution would be possible only in the most advanced country, England, because socialism was supposed to be possible only in the stage where bourgeois society was fully ripe, ripe enough to decompose. Nonetheless, in reality it could not have seemed less likely to him that it would occur. In the particular situation where universal suffrage was installed and labor unions strengthened, revolution seemed like it had receded even farther into the distance. What receded, however, was the revolution that was imagined from the vantage point of and as an extension of bourgeois revolution; the fact was that from that juncture on, a different kind of revolution came to be called for. One should not forget that it was under such circumstances that Marx came to grips with the task of writing *Capital*. His recognition that a criticism of capitalism would no longer suffice made him write such a monumental piece. And in this respect, too, Gramsci's shift from the war of maneuver to the war of position is suggestive. According to his analysis, the shift had already begun in the late 19th century. "The problem of the political struggle's transition from a 'war of maneuver' to a 'war of position' certainly needs to be considered at this juncture. In Europe this transition took place after 1848, and was not understood by Mazzini and his followers, as it was on the contrary by certain others: the same transition took place after 1871, etc."⁷ The political struggle's transition from a "war of maneuver" to a "war of position" was conspicuous, more than anywhere, in Britain at the point in time when the Chartist Movement by the Ricardian Socialists ran out. Thus *Capital* must be read as that which provides the logic of the war of position.

7

Gramsci, *ibid.*, p.110.

那麼，在高度發展的資產階級社會中，一場真正的社會主義革命怎麼樣才有可能發生？馬克思沒有直接回答這個問題。《資本論》中，他卻肯定已經正面回答過同樣的問題。在馬克思死後，德國社會民主黨的顯著進步鼓舞了恩格斯，他繼而認為，革命能夠通過議會主義成為可能。這是資產階級革命（暴力革命）的一種延伸或一個版本。無論依靠議會主義還是武裝部隊，使用國家政權本身就是暴力的。因為國家權力紮根於暴力的壟斷。根據馬克斯·韋伯的說法，國家便是一個人類共同體以在一個有限的區域內實施身體暴力的方式，要求一種實際壟斷。無論是以強制還是協議的方式，權力的執行是徹頭徹尾的暴力。所以，可以說，所有參與政治的人都與暴力中潛伏的惡魔力暗通款曲。按照韋伯的看法，社會民主儘管不那麼暴力，卻一點也不是非暴力的。社會民主通過訴諸議會制度中的多數票奪取國家政權，並將從資本處榨取來的財富（作為稅收）再分配給工人。如果是這樣（一如從激進自由主義者哈耶克的角度看），伯恩斯坦和列寧之間的差別不像看起來那麼大。他們都訴諸國家力量，即暴力。一個是軟性的國家主義，另一個是硬性的國家主義。在我們看來，兩人都不尋求廢除勞動力商品，即僱傭勞動。

愛德華·伯恩斯坦——恩格斯的一位門徒，完全移除了恩格斯革命熱情的殘餘。自然，列寧和羅莎·盧森堡攻擊這種傾向。他們否認社會主義革命只有在資本主義經濟得到充分發展的資產階級社會中才有可能的觀點，他們堅持，跨越一些階段不僅是可能的，也是必要的。

How, then, is a true socialist revolution possible in a highly bourgeois society? Marx did not answer this question directly. Yet it is certain that he had already confronted the same question in *Capital*. After Marx's death, the remarkable advance of the German Social Democratic Party encouraged Engels, who then came to think that a revolution was possible by parliamentarianism. This is an extension or a version of bourgeois revolution (violent revolution). Whether it is relying on parliamentarianism or armed force, the use of state power is itself violent. For the state power is grounded upon a monopolization of violence. According to Max Weber, the state is equal to a human community that demands an actual monopolization of the means of executing physical violence within a limited domain. Whether by compulsion or agreement, the execution of might is violent through and through. Therefore, all those who are involved in politics are flirting with the demonic power lurking in violence, it might be said.⁸ In this sense of Weber, social democracy is in the least non-violent, albeit less violent. Social democracy seizes state power by resorting to the majority vote in the parliamentary system, and seeks to redistribute the wealth extorted from capital (as tax) to workers. If so, (as seen from the stance of the radical libertarian Hayek), the difference between Bernstein and Lenin is not as large as it seems. Both of them resort to state power, that is, violence. One is a soft statism, while the other hard statism. From our vantage point, neither seeks the abolition of the labor-power commodity, namely, wage labor.

A disciple of Engels', Eduard Bernstein, totally removed the residue of revolutionary fervor that Engels had harbored. Then, of course, Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg attacked this tendency. Denying the observation that the socialist revolution was possible only in bourgeois society where the capitalist economy was fully developed, they insisted that a jump over the stages was not only possible but also necessary.

8 Max Weber, *Politik als Beruf*, Berlin, Dunker & Humboldt, 1968, p.8. "Heute dagegen werden wir sagen müssen: Staat ist diejenige menschliche Gemeinschaft, welche innerhalb eines bsetimmten Gebietes--dies: das 'Gebiet', gehört zum Merkmal--das Monopol legitimer physischer Gewaltsamkeit für sich (mit Erfolg) beansprucht."

然而，與其說只有在先進國家革命才是可能的，不如說，在先進國家，繼承了資產階級革命形式的古典革命已經過時。所以需要一個新的理念。恩格斯等人的修訂是對這種情況的回應。在資本主義沒有完全發展起來的國家，革命傾向於遵循資產階級革命的道路。許多二十世紀的社會主義革命試圖通過民族解放或民族獨立的方式建立近代民族國家；借助這個目標，他們獲得了成功。從那時起，爭論一直在於，對階段的跨越是否有真實的可行性。

托洛茨基提出了對此的敏銳理解。俄國1905年的革命後，他認為，既然俄羅斯的資產階級文明社會發展仍很落後，而且它的主要目標是國家權力，那麼某種跨越是可能的。但他也正視了跨越的不可能。無產階級領導的政府必須進行原始積累（即搶奪農民）——也就是資本過去做過的——而做到這一點，需要一種專制獨裁的統治。他在自己的理論中確信，這個難題可以通過不斷革命解決。後來他兩方面的預言都被現實情況證實了。

先進民族國家的左派稱讚、羨慕甚至模仿不發達國家的革命典型的極端暴力，反而忽略了自身環境中固有的難題。他們珍視落後國家的革命，因為這些革命可以通過封鎖市場使先進國家的資本陷入困境。但是，封鎖只會影響社會主義民族國家的經濟，對世界資本主義的發展沒有影響。此外，在二十世紀八十年代後期，資產階級革命——這個本應該被跨越的階段——最後擊敗了社會主義封鎖。兜了一整個世紀的圈子，左派現在回到了伯恩斯坦的社會民主立場，完全喪失了廢除資本和國家的目標。很可能它會在將來重複相同的失誤，不僅不能防止帝國主義戰爭，還加入到狂熱本身。但是，正如我們現在了解到的，列寧主義不能取代它。有別的選擇嗎？我會假設《資本論》這本馬克思有意留在革命可能性正在消逝的英格蘭所寫的書——裏有。如我解釋過的，資本、民族、國家及其三位一體都植根於人類交換可以假設出的必要形式中，因此，幾乎不可能跨出這個怪圈。然而，在《資本論》中，馬克思發現了一個出口；第四種交換——聯合。

This problem should be expressed, however, less as that revolution was possible only in advanced nations than as that in the advanced nations, classical revolution—which inherited the form of bourgeois revolution—had become obsolete. Thus a new idea was required. It was that the revisions of Engels et al were the responses to this situation. In the nations where capitalism was not fully developed, revolutions tended to follow the path of bourgeois revolution. Many of the socialist revolutions of the 20th century sought to establish the modern nation-state itself by way of national liberation or independence; they succeeded because of this objective. Therefore, the problem ever since has been to discern if a jump is really possible.

It was Trotsky who pioneered a keen understanding of the problem. After the Russian Revolution of 1905, he came to think that a jump would be possible since the bourgeois civil society in Russia was only poorly developed, and the main target was the state power. Yet he also confronted the impossibility of the jump. For the government led by the proletariat class had to itself render the primitive accumulation (namely, the robbing of farmers)—that which capital had previously done—and an absolutist dictatorship was required to do this. He had a conviction in his theory that the aporia could be solved by the permanent revolution. And the real situations subsequently proved his prophecies in both aspects.

Leftists in the advanced nation-states praised, envied, and even mimicked the heroic violence typical of the revolutions in underdeveloped countries, while ignoring the aporia inherent in their own circumstances. They cherished the revolutions of backward nations from the vantage point that they could corner the capitals of advanced nations by blockading markets. In consequence, however, the blockades only cornered the economies of socialist nation-states, and had no power over the development of world capitalism. Furthermore, in the late 1980s, the bourgeois revolution—that which had supposedly been jumped over—finally hit the socialist bloc. After a detour of one full century, the leftists have now returned to the position of Bernstein, of a social democracy; and this has totally lost the objective of abolishing capital and state. Not only has it not been able to prevent the imperialist war, but it has also been involved in the frenzy itself. And it is quite possible that it will repeat the same faux pas in the future. Yet, as all of us know well by now, Leninism cannot replace it. Is there an alternative? I would posit that it is found in *Capital*, the book Marx wrote as he deliberately remained in England where the possibility of revolution was fading away. As I have explained, capital, nation, and state and their trinity are rooted in the necessary forms that human exchange could assume, and therefore, it is nearly impossible to get out of the ring. Marx in *Capital*, however, discovered an exit, the fourth type of exchange—association.

在《德意志意識形態》中，馬克思對恩格斯所寫的文字作了補充：「共產主義對我們來說不是應當確立的狀況，不是現實應當與之相適應的理想。我們所稱為共產主義的是那種消滅現存狀況的現實的運動。這個運動的條件是由現有的前提產生的。」¹²從那以後，馬克思堅持這一立場。二十年後，他發現了共產主義在幾個「廢除事物現狀的運動」中的可能性——生產者 / 消費者的合作。例如，他認為股份公司是「作為私人財產的資本在資本主義生產方式本身範圍內的揚棄」¹³，這是因為股份制公司通過分離資本和管理，取消了「資本家」這一實體。然而，這只是資本主義制度的一種被動揚棄。馬克思發現的是生產者合作社中的積極揚棄，其中股東是工人自己。在這一背景下，他談到了「個人財產」，一個與「私有財產」相對的新術語。

從資本主義生產方式產生的資本主義佔有方式，從而資本主義的私有制，是對個人的、以自己勞動為基礎的私有制的第一個否定。但資本主義生產由於自然過程的必然性，造成了對自身的否定。這是否定的否定。這種否定不是重新建立私有制，而是在資本主義時代的成就的基礎上，也就是說，在協作和對土地及靠勞動本身生產的生產資料的共同佔有的基礎上，重新建立個人所有制。¹⁴

12 見註[2]。

13 《資本論》第三卷，第 495 頁，中央編譯局譯，人民出版社 2004 年版。

14 《資本論》第一卷，第 874 頁，同上。

In *The German Ideology*, Marx made an addition to the text written by Engels: “Communism for us is not a state of affairs which is to be established, an ideal to which reality [will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the now existing premise.”⁹ Since that time, Marx persisted in this stance. In the twenty years after, he discovered the possibility of communism in several “movement[s] which abolish the present state of things”—the cooperatives of producers/consumers. He, for instance, saw stock companies as “the abolition of capital as private property within the confines of the capitalist mode of production itself.”¹⁰ This is because stock companies abolished the previous integrity of capitalists by the separation of capital and management. Yet this is only a passive abolition of the capitalist system. Marx discovered the positive abolition in the producers’ cooperative of which stockholders are workers themselves. In this context, Marx spoke of a new phase of “individual property” as opposed to “private property.”

The capitalist mode of appropriation, which springs from the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labor of its proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a natural process, its own negation. This is the negation of negation. It does not re-establish private property, but it does indeed establish individual property on the basis of the achievements of the capitalist era: namely, co-operation and the possession in common of the land and the means of production produced by labor itself.¹¹

9 Marx and Engels, “*The German Ideology*,” included in *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 49.

10 *Capital*, Vol. 3, p. 567.

11 *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 929.

「私有財產（私有制）」和「個人財產（個人所有制）」之間的區別意味著什麼？由於現代私人所有權是作為稅收的交換由專制主義國家授予的，私有所有權等於國家所有權，所以，通過國家所有權廢除私人財產完全是一個錯誤。廢除私人財產必須廢除國家本身。對馬克思來說，共產主義意味著建立一種新型的個人財產，這是因為他認為共產主義等同於生產者合作社協會，其中僱傭勞動（勞動力商品）不復存在。儘管如此，生產者的合作社和 / 或消費者合作社被那些篤信共產主義等同於國有計劃經濟的馬克思主義者所忽略。聯合主義運動最初是由烏托邦社會主義者，如羅伯特·歐文概念化的。實際上它是在十九世紀五十年代開始在英國發展起來，經歷過無數的挫折。馬克思其實沒有否認合作社運動，反而在其中看到了共產主義—自由和平等的生產者協會。

在《法蘭西內戰》中——作為給國際工人協會總委員會的演講詞——馬克思寫道：「如果聯合起來的合作社諸團體（united co-operative societies）按照共同的計劃調整全國生產，從而控制住全國生產，進而終結資本主義生產下宿命般不可斷絕的無政府狀態和周期性變動，那麼請問諸位先生，這不就是共產主義，『可能的』共產主義嗎？」¹⁵在這種意義上，共產主義是一項工程，它試圖把資本主義經濟的貨幣交換中已實現的社會關係，轉變為自由和平等的生產者聯合，並由此進入一種全球性合作社聯合。

這種努力在本質上是道德的。用康德的話說，它要求「你要如此行動，即無論是你的人格中的人性，還是其他任何一個人的人格中的人性，你在任何時候都同時當作目的，絕不僅僅當作手段來使用。」¹⁶如果不是為了這項承諾，我們只會實現地方自治主義或集體主義，而不是共產主義。共產主義革命的第一步應該是由無產階級奪取權力，國家對私有財產的所有權，和國家對生產的控制權。當然，這個過程將「結束無時不在的無政府狀態和周期性的動蕩這樣一些資本主義生產難以逃脫的劫難」，但它遠遠不算是「自由和平等的生產者聯合」。

15 見註[3]。

16 《道德形而上學的奠基》，收於《康德著作全集》第四卷，第 37 頁，李秋零譯，中國人民大學出版社 2005 年版。

What does this distinction between “private property” and “individual property” mean? Precisely because modern private-ownership was that which was awarded by the absolutist state in exchange for paying taxes, private-ownership is equal to state-ownership. So it is a total fallacy to abolish private property by means of state-ownership. The abolition of private property must be an abolition of the state itself. To Marx, communism came to signify the establishment of a new kind of individual property, and this was because he considered communism as being equal to an association of producers’ cooperatives. This is where wage labor (labor-power commodity) is done away with. This notwithstanding, however, producers’ cooperative and/or consumers’ cooperatives have been belittled by those Marxists who believed in communism as being equal to the state owned planned economy. The cooperative movements were originally conceptualized by utopian socialists such as Robert Owen. They actually began to grow in Britain in the 1850s, after innumerable setbacks. Far from denying the cooperative movement, Marx in fact saw communism in it—the *association of free and equal producers*.

In *The Civil War in France*—written as an address to the general council of the international working men’s association—Marx wrote: “if united co-operative societies are to regulate national production upon a common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of Capitalist production--what else, gentlemen, would it be but Communism, ‘possible’ Communism?”¹² In this sense, communism is a project in attempt to shift the social relation that is realized by the monetary exchange in the capitalist economy into the association of free and equal producers, and furthermore, into a global association of associations.

This endeavor is moral in essence. In Kant’s terms, it demands, “So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means.”¹³ If not for this commitment, we will achieve only communalism or collectivism instead of communism. The first step of the communist revolution is supposed to be realized by the proletariat’s seizure of power, state ownership of private property, and state control of whole production. Certainly this process would “put an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of Capitalist production,” but it is far from “the association of free and equal producers.”

12 “The Civil War in France”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 335.

13 Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, translated and edited by Mary Gregor, with an introduction by Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge University Press, 1997, 4:429, p.38

然而，至關重要的不僅僅是馬克思看到了聯合主義的可能性，他同時也意識到了局限性和困難，因此立場模稜兩可。所以，馬克思主義者總的來說會警惕消費者/生產者合作社運動。合作運動的局限是總處於與資本的劇烈競爭之中。它們的選擇要麼是部分停留在資本主義模式還沒發展起來的生產領域，變成股份公司本身，要麼在競爭中被擊敗繼而被破產。馬克思認為，必須將權力從國家轉移到生產者自身。針對這個想法，巴枯寧攻擊了馬克思和拉薩爾主義者¹⁷，「這就是拉薩爾的綱領，這也是社會民主黨的方案。其實，這個綱領並不屬於拉薩爾，而是屬於馬克思的。馬克思在他和恩格斯於1848年發表的著名的《共產黨宣言》中就充分論述了這個綱領。...拉薩爾的綱領和他承認是自己導師的馬克思的綱領毫無區別，這還不明顯嗎？」¹⁸如果這不算徹頭徹尾的誹謗，也必然是一種極端的誤解。巴枯寧忽視了馬克思在十九世紀六十至七十年代的認識。

馬克思批判了讓國家保護和促進合作生產的想法（即拉薩爾主義的「哥達綱領」），他明確表示：「如果工人們力求在社會的範圍內，首先是在本民族的範圍內建立集體生產的條件，這只是表明，他們在爭取變革現在的生產條件，而這同靠國家幫助建立合作社毫無共同之處。至於現存的合作社，那末它們之所以可貴，僅僅是因為它們是工人自己獨立創設的，既不受政府的保護，也不受資產者的保護。」¹⁹換句話說，馬克思強調合作社的聯合自身必須從國家那裏接過領導權，取代國家領導的合作運動。因為資本和國家會枯萎。即使不考慮這種原則性命題，馬克思也從來沒有提出過任何關於未來前景的特定觀點。

17 斐迪南·拉薩爾，十九世紀德國工人運動領袖，全德工人聯合會的創立者。拉薩爾主義認為可以依靠國家幫助工人建立合作社並實現社會主義，而為了爭取國家，需要通過合法的普選。

18 《國家制度和無政府狀態》，第 190-191 頁，馬驥聰、任允正、韓延龍譯，商務印書館 2013 年版。

19 《哥達綱領批判》，第 21 頁，中央編譯局譯，人民出版社。

What is crucial here, however, is not merely the fact that Marx saw a possibility of associationism, but that, at the same time, he was aware of its limits and difficulties. Thus his ambiguous stance toward it. In consequence, Marxists in general came to be watchful about consumers'/ producers' cooperative movements. The limit of the cooperative movements lies in the fact that they are constantly placed in severe competition with capital. Their options would either remain partially in the area of production where the capitalist mode is hardly developed, become a stock company itself, or be defeated in the competition and go bankrupt. So it is that Marx believed that it was imperative to transfer power from the state to producers themselves. Then, concerning this idea, Bakunin attacked Marx along with Lassallians. "That was Lassalle's program, and it is also the program of the Social-Democratic Party. Strictly speaking, it belongs not to Lassalle but to Marx, who expressed it fully in the famous Manifesto of the Communist Party, which he and Engels published in 1848 . . . Is it not clear that Lassalle's program is in no way different from that of Marx, whom he acknowledged as his teacher?¹⁴" It must have been a gross misunderstanding, if not outright slander; Bakunin ignores the deployment of Marx's thought during the 60s and 70s.

Marx was critical of the idea (i.e., of Lassallian Gotha Programme) to have the state protect and foster cooperative production. Marx was clear: "That the workers desire to establish the conditions for co-operative production on a social scale, and first of all on a national scale, in their own country, only means that they are working to transform the present conditions of production, and it has nothing in common with the foundation of co-operative societies with state aid. But as far as the present co-operative societies are concerned, they are of value only insofar as they are the independent creations of the workers and not protégés either of the government or of the bourgeois."¹⁵" In other words, Marx is stressing that the association of cooperatives itself must take over the leadership from the state, in the place of state-led-cooperative movements. Whereby capital and state would wither away. And this kind of proposition of principle aside, Marx never said anything in particular about future prospects.

14 Micheal Bakunin, *Statism and Anarchy*, translated and edited by Marshall S. Shatz, Cambridge University Press, 1990, P. 176.

15 "Critique of the Gotha Programme," included in *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 93-94.

具有爭議的思想家卡爾·施密特對於消費者／生產者合作社狀態下國家的滅亡的看法很有見地。他強調國家和政治的自主維度，以及他的觀點：民族聯盟永遠不能分解國家；只會導致一個強大的國家的霸權，或者一群國家的強權。「如果一個“世界國家”能夠把全世界和全人類都包括在內，那麼它將不會是一個政治統一體，它只能在十分寬松的意義上被稱為國家。如果全人類和全世界真的變成了一個完全以經濟和技術控制的流通為基礎的統一體……如果這個利益團體想變得更加文明，更加理想化，或者更具進取心，卻仍然保持嚴格的非政治化，那麼它就會成為一個徘徊於倫理和經濟兩極之間的由中立的顧客或生產者組成的合作社。它既不知道國家、王國或帝國，也不知道共和國或君主國，既不知道貴族制，也不知道民主制，既不知道庇護，也不知道臣服，它將徹底喪失其政治性。」²⁰換句話說，施米特也暗示如果廢除國家（政治）是可能的，那只有通過消費者／生產者合作社才可能。這種情況下，雖然國家仍然存在，卻將不再是一個政治家。此外，我們可以說，雖然市場經濟仍然存在，但它不再是我們所了解的資本主義市場經濟。廢除資本主義市場經濟等於廢除市場經濟或一般貨幣，這種普遍的看法是不對的。因為全球消費者／生產者合作社網絡不是回歸到一個封閉的共同體，而是回到開放市場經濟。

四、NAM的組織和運動本身體現了它想要實現的目標。通過把抽籤引入選舉過程的方式，它防止了官僚作風，同時保證了參與式民主。

20 《政治的概念》，第 68-69 頁，劉宗坤譯，上海人民出版社。

The controversial thinker Carl Schmitt made an insightful comment on the death of the state vis-à-vis consumers'/producers' cooperative. He stressed the autonomous dimension of state and politics, and his idea that the League of Nations idea could never decompose states; it would only result in hegemony of a strong state or a group of states. "Were a world state to embrace the entire globe and humanity, then it would be no political entity and could only be loosely called a state. If in fact, all humanity and the entire world were to become a unified entity based exclusively on economics and on technically regulating traffic . . . [s]hould that interest group also want to become cultural, ideological, or otherwise more ambitious, and yet remain strictly nonpolitical, then it would be a neutral consumer or producer cooperative moving between the poles of ethics and economics. It would know neither state nor kingdom nor empire, neither republic nor monarchy, neither aristocracy nor democracy, neither protection nor obedience, and would lose its political character.¹⁶" In other words, Schmitt also implies that if it were possible to abolish state (politics), it would only be possible with consumers'/producers' cooperatives. In this situation, though the state remains, it will no longer be a political one. In addition, we might say, though the market economy remains, it will no longer be that which we know as a capitalist market economy. It is not that, as is commonly thought, the abolition of the capitalist market economy is equal to the abolition of the market economy or money in general. For the global network of consumers'/producers' cooperatives is not a return to an enclosed community, but an open market economy.

(4) NAM's organization and movement themselves embody what it intends to realize. Namely, by way of introducing the lottery into the election process, a bureaucratic fixation is prevented while a participatory democracy is guaranteed.

16 Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*, translated by George Schwab, The University of Chicago Press, 1996, p. 57.

對於「無產階級專政」這一概念，今天的馬克思主義者十分沉默，似乎不太確定。十九世紀末，德國社會民主黨（SPD）在議會掌權，恩格斯放棄了實現「無產階級專政」的想法；後來列寧把它恢復為戰略目標，他的共產主義導致了一黨和官僚制度的獨裁。結果，議會制似乎又提供了希望。對此，我們必須考慮再三。原則上說，「無產階級專政」是「資產階級獨裁」的反觀念。後者意味著一種代議制（議會）民主在歷史上，通過推翻專制主義君主制建立起來的民主議會，等同於資產階級獨裁。那麼，馬克思意義作的無產階級專政將不能退化到資產階級獨裁之前，封建制度或專制主義統治。

馬克思在巴黎公社中看到了無產階級獨裁的具體形象，巴黎公社是無政府主義者（蒲魯東主義者）的努力，而不是馬克思主義者的努力。但馬克思對它的讚賞有堅實的基礎——作為他早期國家理論的推論（詳見《黑格爾哲學批判》）。他認為至關重要的是，在現代國家中，文明社會與政府國家有區別，私人個體和公共人之間也存在區分。也就是說，個人與公共人一樣平等，而私人個體屬於資本主義生產關係的階級制度。還有，個人作為公共人可以擁有的權利只是一種立法權力，也就是投票權；他們沒有任何行政權力。人民主權的實質是他們只能投票。如果我們好好考慮這個問題，就會令人驚訝地發現，即使在民主國家，在類似公司和政府部門的工作環境中也沒有民主。形成鮮明對比的，巴黎公社既是立法機關，也是行政機關。它有一個不僅選舉、而且罷免司法官員以及行政官僚的系統。在這層意義上，它是現代民族國家的背景下，對文明社會和政府國家的雙重揚棄。

Concerning the concept of 'dictatorship of the proletariat', today's Marxists seem to be uncertain, being silent as they are. In the late 19th century when the German Social Democratic party (SPD) gained power in Parliament, Engels gave up on the idea of the realization of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Later Lenin revived it as a strategic goal, and his communism resulted in the dictatorship of a party, the dictatorship of a bureaucratic system. As a result, parliamentarianism again seems to offer hope. We have to reconsider this back and forth. In principle, the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' is a counter concept to 'dictatorship of the bourgeoisie'. The latter signifies a representative (parliamentary) democracy: the democratic parliament that was historically constituted by overthrowing the absolutist monarchy, was equal to a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. If so, the dictatorship of the proletariat in Marx's sense cannot be any retrogression to before the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, such as the feudal system or an absolutist domination.

Marx himself saw a concrete image of a proletariat's dictatorship in the Paris Commune, which was an endeavor of anarchists (Proudhonists), and not of Marxists. But Marx appreciated it with a solid ground—as a corollary of his early theory of state (in his *A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* in particular). What he grasped as crucial therein were a distinction between civil society and the governmental state in the modern state, and a separation between private individual and public man. That is to say, individuals are equal as public men, while as private individuals they belong to the class system of the capitalist relation of production. What is more, the right that individuals can have as public men is only a kind of legislative power, namely, the right to vote; and they cannot have any administrative power. The substance of the sovereignty of people is that they only can vote. If we think about it, it is surprising that even in democratic nations, there is no democracy in working circumstances such as corporations as well as government offices. In a sharp contrast, the Paris Commune was both a legislative organ and an administrative organ. It had a system that not only elected but also removed judicial officers as well as administrative bureaucrats. In this sense, it was a double abolition of civil society and governmental state in the context of modern nation-state.

不過，真正的困難是維持這樣的制度。構想之一是通過無記名投票選舉和罷免。但官僚化最終還是不可避免的，即，完全通過這種方式鞏固代表。正如馬克斯·韋伯在《以政治為業》中所言，官僚制度在存在勞動分工的社會中是不可避免的和必要的；不能簡單地被廢棄。而根據馬克思的觀點，在共產主義社會中，勞動分工應該消失；但在它到來之前的過渡時期，官僚制度作為勞動的一種分工是必不可少的。例如，俄國革命後的蘇聯類似巴黎公社，是大型的社會實驗，它最終被一個黨派（布爾什維克）和官僚制度所統治。為什麼？僅僅指出布爾什維克領導的失敗和背叛是不夠的。巴黎公社只堅持了兩個月；它被普魯士軍隊支持的政府軍擊垮了。可是，即使持續更長時間，它的結果也會是形成一種類似蘇聯的體制。

官僚制度的邪惡在於權力集中。我認為唯一能夠避免權力集中的辦法就是在選舉制度中引入純粹的應變機制（即抽籤）。具體說，就是在最後的過程，在最關鍵和最具有決定性的階段，在已經通過正常投票選出幾名候選者之後引入抽籤。它的用意是在權力一貫集中的地方引入應變機制；聚集在行政職位的權力可以通過突發的應變機制來避免。如果採用無記名投票方式的普選即議會民主，會是資產階級的獨裁，引入抽籤或許有助於進一步導向無產階級的專政。

The real difficulty, however, was in maintaining such a system. One idea was to make both election and recall by secret ballot. But it was finally impossible to prevent bureaucratization, namely, the entrenchment of representatives, entirely by this means. As Max Weber said in his *Politik als Beruf* (1919), the bureaucratic system is inevitable and necessary in those societies where the division of labor is developed; and it cannot be discarded simply-mindedly. According to Marx, in communist society the division of labor is supposed to disappear; but in the transitional period preceding it, the bureaucratic system as a division of labor is indispensable. For instance, the Soviets in the Russian Revolution were similar to the Paris Commune, a huge social experimentation. It eventually came to be dominated by one party (the Bolsheviks) and the bureaucratic system. Why? It will not suffice to point out the failure and betrayal of the Bolshevik leaders. The Paris Commune lasted only two months; it was crushed by government troops supported by the Prussian army. But even if it had lasted longer, it would have resulted in a similar system as Soviet Russia.

The evil of the bureaucratic system lies in its centralization of power. The only way it can be avoided, I believe, is to introduce a pure contingency (i.e., a lottery) into the electoral system. In the concrete, it is to introduce a lottery at the end of the process, in its most crucial and determinant phase, after several candidates have already been chosen by normal voting. The idea is to introduce contingency into the topos where power is always concentrated; entrenchment of power in administrative positions can be avoided by a sudden attack of contingency. If universal suffrage by secret ballot, namely, parliamentary democracy, is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the introduction of a lottery might help to lead it further toward the dictatorship of the proletariat.

順便一提，人們認為現代議會是雅典民主的直接衍生物，直接民主只有在一個小共同體，比如雅典才有可能，在只有一種代表制能夠奏效的現代民族國家當然是不可能的。然而，無論直接還是間接，最終都不能以這種方式測量。希臘民主和現代代議制民主本質上是不同的。代議會一開始作為不同階層的代表集會，然後演變為有限投票，最終發展成為普選，這一過程伴隨著資產階級革命的擴張。孟德斯鳩說：「用抽籤的方式進行選舉是屬於民主政治的性質。用選擇的方式進行選舉是屬於貴族政治的性質。」²¹就是說，議會制度不是民主固有的，而是君主制和貴族制所固有的。另一方面，雅典民主的本質存在於他們用於選擇管理人員的抽籤系統中，而不是在議會制度中。在雅典大會上，秘密投票被發明出來，作為罷免有獨裁傾向的領導人的手段。即便在直接民主中，也不能完全防止獨裁者的出現，秘密投票儘管可能很罕見，實際上卻在關鍵時刻被使用。據說，現代資產階級民主的癥結在於無記名投票的代表選舉和通過這種方法改變政權統治。但是，如希臘愛好者們所言，如果資產階級獨裁的字面起源是雅典民主，我們可以讓無產階級專政的技術起源也追溯到希臘的一項政治發明——抽籤。

然而，並非一切都可以由抽籤決定，這是不言而喻的。即便在雅典，抽籤也沒有應用在任何地方（比如，軍事）。抽籤通常只用於選擇不受歡迎的職位，這在今天看來是很重要的。考慮到這些經驗，我們最好通過抽籤選擇最關鍵的職位：即，首先通過秘密投票選擇三位候選人（一次性選出三位），然後，通過抽籤選擇最終的一位。鑒於最後和最關鍵的階段由偶然性決定，那麼用派系爭端或衝突來決定繼承人是沒有意義的。結果是一個相對出色，哪怕不算最好的代表會得到這個職位。此外，被選擇的人不能炫耀他 / 她的優勢和權力，而那些沒被選擇的人也沒有理由拒絕合作。這種政治技巧是可行的，它將打破「一切權力都會墮落」的陳詞濫調。

21 《論法的精神》，第11頁，張雁深譯，商務印書館 1982 年版。

In passing, it is believed that the modern representative parliament is a derivative of Athenian direct democracy, and that a direct democracy is possible only in a small community like Athens, certainly not in contemporary nation-states where only a representative system can work. Finally, however, whether direct or indirect cannot be measured in this manner. Greek democracy and modern representative democracy are essentially different. Modern representative parliament began as an assembly of the representatives of different classes; then it was expanded with limited voting, and eventually developed into the universal suffrage, along with the expansion of the bourgeois revolution. Montesquieu said: “. . . the suffrage by lot is natural to democracy, as that by choice is to aristocracy.¹⁷” That is to say, the parliamentary system is not inherent in democracy, but in monarchies and the aristocracy. On the other hand, the essence of Athenian democracy existed in the lottery system it employed to choose administrators, and not in the parliamentary system. In the Athenian assembly, secret voting was invented as a means of removing leaders who tended to be dictators. Even in direct democracies, the appearance of dictators could not be totally prevented. The secret vote, rare as it might have been, was actually used at critical junctures. It is said that the crux of modern bourgeois democracy exists in the secret ballot in choosing representatives and the rule of changing regimes by way of this method. But if, as Grecophiles say, the technical origin of the bourgeoisie’s dictatorship is Athenian democracy, we could maintain that the technical origin of the proletariat’s dictatorship that goes beyond it is traced back also to the Greek political invention—the lottery.

Nevertheless, it goes without saying that not everything can be determined by lottery. Even in Athens, lottery was not used everywhere (i.e., in military). And it is significant that today the lottery is commonly used only in choosing unpopular posts. Considering these examples, what is preferable to us would be to choose the most crucial post by lottery: i.e., first choosing three candidates by secret vote (three in one choice) and then finally electing one by lottery. Because the last and most crucial stage is determined by contingency, factional disputes or conflicts over successors would not make sense. As a result, a relatively superior, if not the best, representative would take up the post. Furthermore, the one who is chosen could not parade his/her superiority and power, while those who are not chosen have no reason to refuse collaboration. This kind of political technique would be functional and would go beyond the cliché, “all the power will fall.”

17

Montesquieu, *Spirit of Law*, translated by T. Nugent, New York: Hafner, 1966

我們不該假設，人類渴望權力的本性將永遠消失；個人能力的差異將永遠消失。我們寧願認為這些之所以會造成惡，僅僅由於機制本身，或是由於我們對它們缺乏理解。權力之惡可以通過在權力中心引入應變機制（通過抽籤）來避免。這不是將來要實現的；它在當前的各種機構（包括公司、政府機關）就可以全面實現。很多人被官僚壟斷和優化所困擾，其程度甚至超過工資和勞動工時問題，即使工會參與管理也沒解決這個問題。在已經實現工人自我管理的前社會主義南斯拉夫，官僚化也無法避免。同時，即使在資本主義公司，當且僅當管理是通過投票和抽籤執行時，我們可以認為，這是一種工人的完全的自我管理。不過，這是不可能的——因為股東的控制權仍然佔多數。在生產者合作社中，每個成員的決策權相對於管理權而言是平等的，不管他們持有多少股票；然而，權力的壟斷仍然是不可避免的，如果不採用抽籤系統的話。反對國家和資本主義的組織必須在其內部引入權力中心的應變方案，不然，它會成為它打算反抗的東西。但另一方面，已經開始否定中央集權的各種民事行為、市民行動仍然分散，尚未被集結到一起，形成集體的反抗和干預機制。

當且僅當採納上述介紹的政治技巧時，我們不必害怕集權。NAM不僅要實現參與式民主，而且要在它自己的組織內實現。因此，作為組織原則，NAM採用兩套制度：抽籤選舉代表，以及個人的多重財產。

五、NAM是一種消除現實矛盾的現實運動；它是在現有前提下產生的。換句話說，它是利用資本主義發展所產生的社會效力，克服這種發展（已經達到信息資本主義階段）造成的社會矛盾的運動。因此，需要審視歷史經驗，挑戰未知的一切。

We should not assume that the human nature of willing to power will ever disappear; that the difference of individual abilities will ever disappear. We rather think that these natures cause evil solely because of the institutions or the lack of our understanding in them. The evils of power could be avoided by introducing a contingency (by way of lottery) in the magnetic power center. This is not in the least what is to be realized in the future; it can be fully realized at present in various institutions (corporations and government offices). Many people are troubled by bureaucratic monopolization and fixation, even more than the issues of wage and labor time. This has not been solved even by the union's participation in management. In the former socialist Yugoslavia, where the self-management of workers was realized, bureaucratization could not be avoided. Meanwhile, even within capitalist corporations as they are, if and only if management is executed by means of suffrage and lottery, can we consider it as a full self-management of workers. This has not been possible, because of the majority domination of stockholders. In contradistinction, in producers' cooperatives, the right of decision making vis-à-vis management is equal among every member, regardless to the amount of stock they hold; and still the monopolization of power will be inevitable if not for the lottery system.

Organization for the counter-act against state and capitalism must introduce within itself the device of introducing contingency in the magnetic power center. If not, it will be like the one it intends to counter. Yet, on the other hand, various civil acts that have begun to negate power-centralist hierarchical organization remain scattered and are yet to be gathered for a collective intervention for the counter-act.

If and only if we introduce the political technique above we will not have to fear centralization. NAM not only has to aim at the realization of participatory democracy, but also has to embody it within its own organization. Therefore, as its organizational principle, NAM adapts the two systems: lottery in the election of representatives and individuals' multiple belongings.

(5) NAM is a realistic movement that abolishes real contradictions; it is born out of realistically existing premises. In other words, it is a movement to overcome the social contradictions caused by the development of capitalism (that has reached the stage of information capitalism) by way of employing the social potencies produced by the same development. Therefore, it needs to scrutinize historical experience as well as challenge the unknown.

資本主義經濟通常按歷史階段劃分：重商主義，自由主義，帝國主義，晚期資本主義。為了在具體的上下文中理解這種劃分，可以從世界商品轉移的角度看。在重商主義時代，世界商品是羊毛製品，在自由主義時代是棉製品。直到十九世紀上半葉，英國始終居於世界霸主地位，而支持它的資本主義生產正是紡織工業。後來，英國資本主義在引進重工業，與得到國家支持的德國重工業的競爭過程中衰落。（馬克思森《資本論》中認為，作為股份公司出色對手的生產合作社，其迅速衰落也是因為德國國家資本主義。）也就是說，在紡織工業佔主導地位的階段，生產者合作社在很大程度上可以與股份公司競爭。後來，恩格斯和德國社會民主黨從社會化（國有化）的角度歡迎意識向大資本演變——他們覺得那就是社會主義，因而貶低了合作社運動。

向重工業階段的過渡造成周期性的大蕭條和失業。這也促成了帝國主義出現，並在第一次世界大戰中充分壯大。第二次世界大戰是它的延伸，同時，一種新的現象介入了——無論法西斯主義還是羅斯福新政，都可以看作是對經濟過程的一種凱恩斯主義式的國家干預。世界商品向耐用品轉變（汽車、電氣品等）。從那時起，批量生產 / 大眾消費（福特主義）的時代就一直持續，二十世紀八十年代達到飽和點，之後，資本主義傾向於通過對流通過程中交流的壓縮（數字化）而不是生產過程中的發展來產生剩餘價值。因此，信息成了世界商品。數字化對生產關係和工業構成帶來根本的變革，在以間接剝削為目標的行會式商業資本（代理、批發商、分銷商）領域，過去的生產關係正在分解，代替它們的是生產者和消費直接交換。這種變化必然會導致大量失業和勞動力重組。

The capitalist economy is customarily subdivided along historical stages: mercantilism, liberalism, imperialism, and late capitalism. To understand this view in the concrete context, see it from the vantage point of the shift of world commodity. The world commodity in the age of mercantilism was woolen-products, and in the age of liberalism it was cotton products. The capitalist products that supported Great Britain, the empire that had gained supremacy over the world up until the earlier half of the 19th century, were nothing other than textile industries, which did not require mammoth capital. Later British capitalism declined in the process of introducing heavy industries, in competition with state-supported German heavy industries. (The producers' cooperatives that the Marx of Capital considered as a good rival of stock companies, quickly declined also because of the German mammoth state capitalism.) That is to say, in the stage where textile industries were dominant, producers' cooperatives could rival stock companies too a large extent. Later, Engels as well as the German Social Democratic Party rather welcomed the effect of capital becoming mammoth from the vantage point of socializing (having the state own) it—they thought that was socialism. They thus came to belittle the cooperative movement.

The transition to the stage of heavy industry caused chronic depression and unemployment. This fostered imperialism, which fully blossomed in World War One. World War Two occurred as an extension, while, at the same time, a new phenomenon intervened—it was, whether fascism or New Deal, what can be considered as a Keynesian intervention of state into the economic process. In terms of the world commodity, it was the shift to durable goods (cars, electrical products, etc). Since then, the age of mass production/mass consumption (Fordism) has continued, reaching a saturation point in the 1980s. After that, capitalism has tended to achieve surplus value by a compression (digitalization) of communication in the process of circulation, rather than the development in the production process. Thus, the world commodity has been information. The digitalization is delivering radical transformations in the relation of production and industrial composition. It is especially in the domain of guild-like merchant capitals that aims at intermediary exploitation (agencies, wholesale dealers, distributors) where the previous relations of production are being decomposed. Replacing them are the systems where producers and consumers exchange directly. This change will inevitably invite a large amount of unemployment and reorganization of labor.

我們觀察到的這種轉變，始於1980年代，在1990年代以來日益顯著，從激烈程度和規模上說，可以與1860年代開始1870年代凸顯的轉變相提並論——後者集中體現為1873年的世界經濟危機，進而出現了慢性蕭條、資本輸出和向帝國主義的轉化。同時，現在的轉型也解構當代資本主義的形式——即前轉型時期形成的普魯士國家資本主義和社團主義。在這解構的意義上，所謂的新自由主義與英國經濟 / 軍國主義統治下的自由主義階段相對應。而與十九世紀七十年代重工業和龐大資本相對應、目前向信息資本主義的過渡，則一方面通過瓦解依賴於國家社團主義的大型企業，促進跨國資本的擴張，另一方面也帶來中小型企業（如冒險企業）的興起。NAM打算通過（非資本主義的）合作社和LETS方式介入這種重組中小型公司的明確趨勢。在這個意義上，目前的情況正變得與馬克思關注英國的生產者合作社的時代相似。

我們對世界資本主義擴張所造成的局面既不樂觀，也不悲觀。資本主義經濟的滲透同時創造了廢除它的條件。這種辯證觀點的例證是互聯網的到來。這個東西最初創造出來是作為軍事防禦系統，由資本使用，現在則是反資本主義和國家的必要手段。電子貨幣——資本的延伸——同樣是促使LETS全球化擴張的一個手段。如果沒有網絡空間，NAM無法存在。反對資本主義的對抗行為與浪漫的鄉愁無關；它存在於世界資本主義產生的世界交流之間。

The transition that we have been observing beginning in the 1990s rivals, both in its radicality and amount, the transition in the 1870s, epitomized by the chronic depression after the world crisis in 1873, the exploration of capital, the shift to imperialism. At the same time, however, the present transition is also deconstructing the contemporary forms of capitalism—i.e., the state capitalism à la Prussia and corporatism that were formed in the period of the former transition. In this deconstructive sense, the situation called neo-liberalism corresponds to the stage of liberalism under the economic-militaristic domination of Great Britain. While in the 1870s, heavy industries=mammoth capitals came into existence, the present transition to information capitalism is marked by the decomposition of large corporations (aside from transnational corporations) relying on states' corporatism, and the rise of mid-to-small corporations (of venture capital). NAM intends to intervene in this precise tendency to reorganize the mid-to-small corporations by way of (non-capitalist) cooperatives and LETS. In this sense, the present situation is becoming similar to the age when Marx paid attention to the producers' cooperative in Britain.

We are not optimistic about the situation created by the expansion of world capitalism, neither are we pessimistic about it. The osmosis of the capitalist economy is at the same time creating the conditions that abolish it. This dialectic is exemplified by the coming of the Internet. This thing, that was created as a military defense system and used by capitals, is now a necessary means for counter-movements to capitalism and state. The same is true of e-money—an arm for capital and a means to expand LETS globally. NAM could not exist if not for cyberspace. The counter-act against capitalism has nothing to do with romantic nostalgia; it exists amidst the world intercourse engendered by the world capitalism.

中文版導言

雖然互聯網上還存留著《新聯合主義運動原則》英文版，但這篇論文在日本卻是絕版已久，故而，當得知它將在中國出版時，我感到又驚又喜。尤其當聽說此次出版是在一批年輕的作家、藝術家、活動家們的推動下促成時，我甚至感到一絲羨慕，因為這樣的熱情在日本並不存在。借此機會，我想簡要說明一下新聯合主義運動（New Associationist Movement）和這篇論文的來龍去脈。

NAM¹是一項以新的社會主義為目標的運動。我開始考慮這項運動，是在二十世紀末期之時。1990年以前，我一直對那些標榜「創建理想社會」的運動持消極態度。第二次世界大戰後，在美國與蘇聯，或者說資本主義與社會主義的二項對立下，曾有人邀請我探尋一條對二者皆否定的「第三道路」。但我認為，這種「第三道路」不僅不可能提出什麼積極的理念和目標，而且帶有欺騙性。我總是引出馬克思的一段話來說明：「共產主義對我們來說不是應當確立的狀況，不是現實應當與之相適應的理想。我們所稱為共產主義的是那種揚棄（aufheben）現存狀況的現實的運動。」²換句話說，我認為，只要存在著揚棄現存諸矛盾的「現實運動」，就已經足夠。

然而到1990年左右，這個狀況發生了變化：蘇聯解體了。這意味著「第二世界」的消亡，同時也意味著「第三世界」的消亡。這個過程使得資本主義經濟的全球化進程開始疾速行進。在這個時點上，我開始從根本上懷疑自己至此為止所持立場的有效性。於是，我打算借著重新考察康德「批判」的機會，展開反思。反思的結果，便是《跨越性批判——康德與馬克思》這本書了。我在這本書的序言中寫道：

1 作者曾建議我們可以把NAM譯為「南無」，除了諧音和其中的東方精神（部分地包含了對第四交換形式的展望，詳見《世界史的構造》，中央編譯出版社），也因為作者看來，「南無」在日語裏可以曲折地與「間技」（即傻瓜的意思）相關聯。作者認為投身反抗運動需要傻瓜的精神（舉例時，他提到魯迅的《聰明人和傻子和奴才》，及松本哉與朋友們自命「東亞大笨蛋」等）。「間原意指唱歌時不著調不合拍，「間」是節拍，「技」是除去，不懂節拍即除去了「間」；沒有了「間」，即是「無間」，從而與佛教產生了關聯。「南無」正是這個意義上與「間技」產生了關聯。因為這一轉換並不直觀，也為了方便漢語讀者的理解，我們保留使用NAM這個拉丁字母縮寫指代新聯合主義運動。特此說明。

2 《德意志意識形態》，收於《馬克思恩格斯全集》第二卷，第40頁，人民出版社1960年版。作者所引文獻為日文版，字詞含義與中文版稍有不同，我們以中文版為底本，根據上下文做了調整，下同。

直至1989年，我對未來的理念一直都不屑一顧。因為我認為，對抗資本和國家的鬥爭，無需未來的理念也是可行的，這種鬥爭，只能沿著現實中產生的矛盾永無止境（目的＝沒有終結）地繼續下去。但是89年以後，我的觀點發生變化。在此之前，我對向來的馬克思主義政黨和國家都抱著批判的態度，而批判的前提，就是這些政黨和國家還頑強地存續下去。只要它們存續著，我只需對它們作出否定，就能讓自己覺得已經為之做了些什麼。然而當它們解體時，我又發覺，我自己其實是悖論般地依存於它們的，我開始感到，自己必須說一些積極的話了。我對康德的思考，其實也就是從那個時候真正開始的。

那一時期，我發現，馬克思在他的晚年曾對共產主義進行過更為積極的思考。「如果聯合起來的合作社諸團體（united co-operative societies）按照共同的計劃調整全國生產，從而控制住全國生產，進而終結資本主義生產下宿命般不可斷絕的無政府狀態和周期性變動，那麼請問諸位先生，這不就是共產主義，可能的共產主義嗎？」³此外，馬克思同樣在《資本論》中，對生產合作社的聯合（association）進行過評價，說這是對資本主義「積極的揚棄」。我所謂的「聯合」，或者說「聯合的聯合」的想法，正是從這些論述中產生出來的。

我並沒有止步於撰述論文。1999年，《跨越性批判》的雜誌連載完結後，同年末，我在大阪開始了社會運動的實踐。接著，到2000年6月，我發起了對抗資本和國家的運動團體NAM，並召開了NAM的結成總會。《新聯合主義運動原則》一文就是在那時候發表的，後來，我與其他成員共著的《NAM原理》⁴也得以出版。

NAM並不是一個中央集權的組織，它的目標是促成各式各樣的聯合，以及「聯合的聯合」。它同時也致力於構建「內在性運動」（資本主義體系內的政治運動、勞動運動、消費者運動等）與「超越性運動」（非資本主義經濟圈的創立）的聯合。具體來說，後者就是一場以創立生產消費合作社以及地區（市民）貨幣為中心任務的運動。

然而，由於種種內外原因，這場運動歷經兩年左右就結束了。不得不說，主要原因在於我還未經充分準備就發起了運動。但是我想，如果我當時為它做了準備，恐怕這場運動就不會開始了。我當時恰好住在大阪，運動也就是在那裏開始的。通常來說，像這樣的對抗運動都往往發端於首都，或者說以首都為目標。而我之所以敢在大阪開啟NAM，正是冀圖以此反抗那樣的既成觀念。然而，一當實際開始組織起來，東京就成了運動的中心，而東京與大阪的成員之間也因此產生了對立。能夠在他們之間進行調停的只有我一個人，但那時，我一年中有大半時間身在美國，加之當時互聯網在日本還不是十分普及，故而溝通聯繫也成了一件難事。

3 《法蘭西內戰》，第12頁，中央編譯局譯，人民出版社1961年版。

4 太田出版，2000年11月；書中除了收入《新聯合主義運動原則》，還有NAM結成總會上的四篇報告等。

另一個原因，是2001年，NAM運動開始具體地推進時，美國發生了由「基地」組織策劃的9·11事件。這一事件給運動的內部帶來了深刻的分裂。加入NAM的成員中，有許多人對「內在性運動」，也即政治鬥爭持消極態度，而對非政治的「超越性運動」（合作社和地區貨幣）抱有關心。而且，在此之前，他們也從未參與過任何類型的活動。因此，他們的關注點集中在了地區貨幣的創始之上。如果當時的環境處於一個平穩的狀態，這也未嘗不可。然而9-11事件以後，日本政府立即響應美國，倒向了戰爭，此時一場針對於此的反戰運動就成為了必要。NAM對此該如何應對？圍繞這個問題，NAM出現了兩個相互對立的傾向。

我在2002年末決定解散了NAM，並把之後的新形態稱之為自由連合（Free Association）。那時，我在內部的一份文書中寫道：

原本來說，我們認為，「新聯合主義運動原則」是一種將各種各樣的運動體聯合起來的原理。這個原理是指，NAM以事先存在著這樣的運動體為前提，這些運動體因為各自為政而處於孤立且低迷的狀態，為了擺脫這樣的狀態，它們最終結成了NAM。這才是NAM應有的順序。

然而，NAM卻是在尚不存在這些運動體的情況下開始的，或者毋寧說，NAM是為了生成運動而開始的。儘管如此，實質上稱得上「運動」的事情卻幾乎沒有發生過。因此，NAM組織機構的維持和運營偏離了「運動」的性質，而錯將Q⁵這樣非現實的、浮於空想的東西當成了一種「運動」。

沒能發起運動，責任並不在NAM身上，因為現在整個日本都處在這樣的狀態之中。例如，當美國即將對伊拉克動武的時候，在發達國家中，恐怕只有日本沒有出現過像樣的示威遊行。然而，未能讓這樣的政治風土發生絲毫的改變，NAM卻也是有責任的。

無論怎麼改變NAM如今的組織機構和運營方式，它也不可能發起什麼計劃或運動。因此，我們只好暫且解散NAM，讓會員成為自由的個人（free agent），從組建聯合重新開始。由此而往，當各式各樣的計劃和地區運動，通過聯合的形式成長起來之後，如果屆時還有必要，那麼就以「聯合的聯合」的方式，重新結成NAM。

像NAM這樣達到如此規模的組織被解散掉，實屬異例，想必是會有人覺得可惜的。可是，淡然而對這樣的變故，才是聯合主義者應有的面目，在這介意義上說，解散NAM，正與VARI的精神相一致。或者更應該說，解散現實的NAM組織，才會讓NAM性質的組織存續下去。

5 Q 指的是地區貨幣，它是為了區分於日本貨幣的「圓」而採用了「球」的意思。一作者註

具體而言，NAM的解散，是指從現在的NAM中，取締事務局、評議會等一切上層機構，而現在的「關心系」⁶和「地區系」⁷等諸組織，則形成各自獨立的聯合，或者自行消滅。至於入會手續、運營等事項，也由這些組織獨立運作。

其次，成立自由連合（Free Associations）作為這些組織的聯絡會議。這是一個鬆散的相互聯絡機構，而非NAM評議會、事務局那樣的機構。此外，FA也並不共有像「新聯合主義運動原則」這樣的綱領。因此，此前與NAM無關的團體也可加入其中。

FA擁有網絡主頁，但它並不是NAM網站那樣的站點。FA只不過是一個指引鏈接的公告板，鏈向參與其中的聯合各自所擁有的主頁，並服務於這些聯合的運動和相互聯絡。網頁的編輯，由參與其中的各聯合輪流承擔。

NAM與FA的不同點之一，是NAM的參加者僅為個人，而FA則僅限團體參加。

此外，如果說NAM帶有康德所謂的「統覺」（apperception），則FA就是一個並沒有統覺的自由聯想（free association）。如果FA出現了對統覺的要求，那麼屆時再重新結成NAM那樣的組織即可。然而，絕不能對這樣的結果急於求成。

我自己則打算參與市民貨幣等幾個計劃。此外，《新聯合主義運動原則》既然已經和現實的組織無緣，那麼就請把它視為我的著作，讓我自由改寫。

2002年12月11日

NAM就是這樣走向了解散。我之所以並未執著於NAM的存續，是因為我認為，這樣的NAM即便消失了，「新聯合主義運動原則」還是會存留下來的。後來，NAM成員中的許多人，也都追隨著各自的「關心」，繼續進行著聯合的活動。我自己也參與了消費合作社運動，以及反核電運動。

6 指合作社、流浪人員援助等多樣的個別計劃。一作者註

7 指地區上的聯合。一作者註

但是，如果今後再要發起NAM運動，有個問題是必須考慮清楚的，那就是國際性聯合的問題。NAM初創之時，我並沒有打算把它的運動領域限定在日本，但我也從未考慮過在國外開展運動。我漠然地覺得，當對抗資本與國家的聯合運動在各地發展起來時，它們順理成章地就應當會結成國際性的聯合，從而自然而然地形成「聯合的聯合」。這一點與流行於90年代的奈格裏與哈特⁸所謂「諸眾的全球性反抗」思潮相一致，也是對馬克思在十九世紀中葉所展望的「世界同時革命」的一種回應。而且，這看上去具備實現的可能性。

然而，這樣的展望卻被9·11事件破壞掉了。發動事件的基地組織，正是一個聯合，也是一個典型的「諸眾」。然而，這次事件不僅沒讓對抗資本與國家的各地聯合運動促成國際性的合作，反而還對其造成了致命的破壞。NAM解散之後，我開始重新思考「世界同時革命」的問題，並從康德的「永遠和平」構想中，找到了解決這個問題的線索。另外，我對《跨越性批判》中提出的，從「交換樣式」的視角來看待社會構成體的歷史的觀點，也做出了根本性修正。其結果，就是我寫成的《世界史的構造》（2010）一書。

其實，我還想過根據上述觀點的變化來重寫《新聯合主義運動原則》。但是時至今日，這個想法還未能實現。所以，對現在這篇《新聯合主義運動原則》，我是存有許多不滿的。也因之，這次的出版雖然讓我感到高興，但就我個人而言，還是希望讀者不要把它當成一個已完成的規範來解讀。我以為，讀者把它看作是開展聯合運動的一種啟示來參考，便足矣。

柄谷行人

2017年7月

黃真 譯

8 安東尼奧·奈格裏和邁克爾·哈特，分別是當代意大利和美國的政治哲學家、社會學家，兩人合著有《帝國》、《諸眾》等。

本中英對照版本由
「副本製作」、「實踐論」
與「同時」三方授權予
開放文化站出版

禁止商業衍生