

the politics of representation. Much of this postcolonial work is associated with arenas of literary criticism and, to a lesser extent, deconstruction theory with its emphasis on nonessentialism and the arbitrary, rather than the fixed, nature of language. Many postcolonial critics are deconstructing normalized assumptions about the nature of language and texts by critiquing the cultural imperialism that underlies this discourse as well as resisting and reappropriating imperial literature and ideological frameworks. Hence, they criticize the kinds of master narratives that characterize dominant white, Christian, Western, patriarchal, heterosexual thought and discourse (sometimes described as “the canon”) that are produced and reinforced by both the dominant and the collaborator.

Moreover, anticolonialist and postcolonial critics are especially concerned with the provocation, authentication, and celebration of the “voice” of the “Other.” Such narratives capture the multiplicities of differences and diversities of the subaltern, who have been silenced for too long under colonialist and neocolonialist constraints and practices. These discourses resituate colonized people within the location of the center, rather than the margins of the local and global world. Such postcolonial works have been especially evident within feminist domains, in particular in the criticisms and writings of women of color, who, in part, challenge the notion of the essentialization of women as a universal category. Indeed, critical feminists like Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Mohanty (1997) and bell hooks (1994) point out that the identities of marginalized women and/or othered peoples are constructed by the dominant ideology. Much of this kind of postcolonial critique has been expressed in terms of “a third space” or “borderland” epistemologies or standpoints that recognize and highlight the experiences and practices of sexism, racism, classicism, and homophobia within the context of cultural, historical, geographic, national, political, economic, and social differences at both local and global levels. Hence, the dialectics of divergent and shared experiences frames the resistant and global coalition politics of many postcolonial critics. Postcolonial research and activist work seek thus to resist and transform the legacies and realities of colonial, neocolonial, and postcolonial conditions.

— Rhonda Hammer

*See also* Cultural Marxism and British Cultural Studies; Feminism; Political Economy

## FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Alexander, M. Jacqui and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, eds. 1997. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge.
- Eagleton, Terry, Frederic Jameson, and Edward Said. 1990. *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skins, White Masks*. New York: Grove.
- Bhaba, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- hooks, bell. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Freire, Paulo. 1972. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Young, Robert J. C. 2001. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

---

## POST-MARXISM

---

If Marxism is what comes after Marx, post-Marxism is what comes after Marxism as a theory and practice in its organized and relatively disciplined form characteristic of the twentieth century. Post-Marxism can be seen as an ex post facto category referring to developments in and after Marxism with the 1980s crisis of Marxism, the collapse of Eurocommunism, and the collapse of the Soviet empire. Post-Marxism is highly varied and contradictory in nature; it corresponds with the postmodern sense that anything goes, in theory, that any theory goes with any other theory. At the same time, post-Marxism can be more Marxist than the Marxists. The idea of post-Marxism has a complicated semantic relationship with the idea of the postmodern. Just as postmodern theory can place the emphasis on either of the two terms against the other—some postmoderns have a stronger sense of being post, or after, others of remaining in reviving modernity or modernism—so with post-Marxism. Some views in this field are more vehemently post, or after Marx or Marxism; others revive Marx or Marxism as a universal theory of the modern.

The historical semantics involved are also suggestive. In the first place, the idea of post-Marx is either truistic or ironic: We are, of course, after Marx; even the Marxists are after Marx. The “post” refers to the sense that something significant has changed since Marx; yet post-Marxism also seems often to involve a Marxist orthodoxy of a kind less frequently encountered since the 1930s or 1960s. The idea of post-Marxism therefore logically follows that of the postmodern, but with these further refractions, that Marxism (or Marx’s theory) is thought to be the fundamental critique of modernity. If Marx is the great modern or modernist, and we are now after modernism, then we are also after Marx, so we must all be post-Marxist. More specifically, if, as in the Soviet experience, Marx and Marxism are identified with a particular, failed, alternative path to modernity, then for the peoples of the old Soviet empire we are definitionally post-Marxist, because postcommunist. In addition,

the idea of post-Marxism can be aligned with the earlier sociological notion of postindustrialism and the more recent category of poststructuralism, where pluralism claimed to replace the alleged monism of structure.

So where does the post-Marxist move begin, theoretically? One obvious point indicating the shift beyond Marxism is in the work of Michel Foucault, or at least its reception, in the Foucault effect. One aspect of the Foucault effect is the opening up of orthodox Marxism to methodological pluralism. Even if Foucault's power ontology is ultimately misleading, Foucault practically pluralises power. Beyond the economic sphere or the point of production, there are other institutions based on different aspects of power, on the model of Bentham's Panopticon rather than the image of the factory in Marx's *Capital*. Foucault's effect for orthodox Marxists in the 1970s and after is a belated echo of the Weber effect on nascent critical theory in the 1920s, where rationalisation or bureaucratisation is a world historic problem alongside commodification, alienation, or capitalism. It is impossible, however, to imagine the Foucault effect or the extraordinary hegemony of his influence without contemplating the incredible influence of French Marxism in this period. Foucault happened, for the Anglo Left, because he followed Louis Althusser. If Foucault was German, his influence would have been negligible. While Foucault's reception in the United States was mediated differently, in terms of the history of systems of thought and especially with reference to law, discourse, and sexuality, in Great Britain and Australia, Foucault was presented as what came next for Marxists after the crisis of Marxism.

Althusser is the crucial connection here, as his Marxism managed to combine the most orthodox of Leninist and then Maoist claims with an importation of thinkers completely unholy for communism, from Freud and Lacan to Spinoza and Montesquieu. The apparently random nature of this mix, compared, say, to the more coherent integration of different themes in the work of Henri Lefebvre, itself prefigures what is now often called post-Marxism—on the one hand, a stubborn orthodoxy, on the other, a rough use of whatever theory passes by. This is the beginning of a trend that results in post-Marxism, exemplified in the work of Slavoj Žižek, where Lacan meets Hitchcock and Marx is coupled with Lenin. There was an alternative prospect in the 1970s connected with the project of Nicos Poulantzas, where the challenge in principle at least was to integrate the Weberian insights of Foucault and the realization of the centrality of democracy into a more originally orthodox Marxist framework. Instead, the work of Foucault was too often accommodated into Marxism for its occasional radical insights to prevail. Foucault met Marx and Althusser on at least one ground: the unshiftable of structure.

An alternative path of development for post-Marxism could be plotted out through the work of Jean Baudrillard. Baudrillard's (1975) first great work to become available in

the English language was *The Mirror of Production*, a kind of Marxian critique of Marx. Here the alternative French legacies of Surrealism and Situationism seemed to be far more potentially generative than the weary clichés of orthodox Marxism. Baudrillard's trajectory through anthropology into culture and culture studies signals another kind of post-Marxist route, increasingly influential with the rise of cultural studies itself. For if the world seemed to consist of surfaces and random issues, then theory, and Marxism, should also be so. Post-Marxism, in this way, has more impact on cultural studies than on sociology; alternatively, its presence can be observed in geography, where Marx has just arrived, and radical political economy, where he has been revived.

An alternative path again can be connected to the work of another lapsed Marxist, Jean-François Lyotard. Lyotard's (1984) *Postmodern Condition* claimed to criticise grand narratives in general, but in Paris there was one narrative grander than all others, Marxism itself. The argument for the plurality of voices coincided with the rise of identity politics. The alternative to the stern orthodoxy of Marxism was a playful academic politics, with as many voices as the Tower of Babel. The connection with the postmodern here was undeniable. Marxism was modernism par excellence.

The presence of post-Marxism in sociology is more limited. This reflects the mixed reception of the postmodern in sociology, as well as territory disputes with cultural studies. The work of Zygmunt Bauman is one obvious candidate for the description of postmodern and post-Marxist sociology: Postmodern, because his work takes the postmodern seriously, at least at the level of a sociological phenomenon to be explained; post-Marxist, because his intellectual formation was Marxist up until his exile from Poland in 1969, and remains so afterward, in the broad sense that Marx's questions and key concerns—capitalism, consumption, reification—remain frames for his own work. Bauman's own critical categories can be applied here, stretched from his own working distinction between a postmodern sociology and a sociology of postmodernity. The first, postmodern sociology, enters and embraces the postmodern labyrinth. The second, a sociology of postmodernity, takes on the phenomena of the postmodern from the perspective of a critical sociology. By extension, there will also be a post-Marxist sociology, a sociology where the horizons of post-Marxism frame the task of sociology, and a sociology of post-Marxism, whose project would be not only to enter but also to interpret and then exit from post-Marxism.

If we view some of the fields of the post-Marxist regionally, some of its differences emerge. Eastern and Central Europe is a primary field for post-Marxist activity. Bauman's work is a central example of a project that is more closely defined as post-Marxist than postmodern, with the distinction that the emphasis in post-Marxism is on

the Marxist in the context of a broad sympathy for classical sociology, critical theory, and continental philosophy. The work of the so-called Budapest school is another central project. Agnes Heller and Ferenc Feher both responded early to the European sense of being postmodern or post-histoire. Heller's trajectory, like Bauman's in its lineage though distinct in its detail, is also best described as post-Marxist rather than postmodern. The connection with the Weberian Marxism of Lukács means that, in Heller's case, the significance of Foucault is less marked. The work of Foucault can, however, be seen to have a significant impact on Bauman's (1982) work in exile, in *Memories of Class*, as a complement to Marx's factory-based critique. In France, Lefebvre pioneered the post-Marxist road by creatively building on Marxian themes with other materials from Surrealism to Nietzsche. One of his leading books here was called *Beyond Marxism* (1970), which might also in post-Marxist spirit be rendered as "With Marx, Against Marx." The influence of Althusser was never so high in Paris as beyond, via the work of its English importers. Other thinkers living in France who pioneered post-Marxism include Cornelius Castoriadis, who long before Baudrillard took the attitude that if you could be a Marxist or a revolutionary, then the only path was the revolutionary one; in order to be a Marxist in spirit, you had to be a post-Marxist, after Marx.

In Italy, where for the ultra-Left Gramsci was part of the problem of sclerotic communism, the most prominent post-Marxist is Antonio Negri, though here the anomalous nature of the term is apparent in full light: Negri is also the most orthodox of automatic Marxists, following the tradition where it is capital and capitalism itself that is the most revolutionary force on the planet, and will revolutionize the planet. The phenomenal success of Hardt and Negri's (2000) *Empire* needs to be seen in this context. Negri's work emerges out of the context of the Italian ultra Left of the 1960s and 1970s. The key word of this movement was its claim to workers' autonomy; often known as the *autonomista*, they advocated workerism, a kind of revolutionary syndicalism after Marx. The emphasis on workers' autonomy or voluntarism went together with an automatic Marxism, where capitalism was viewed as necessarily containing and heading toward socialism. The result, in a book like *Empire*, is a kind of magical Marxism. Where others earlier viewed capitalism as doing socialism's work, globalization here is viewed as a kind of socialization from within. Capital and empire here are autopoietic machines of power. Capital ravishes the planet but prepares the way for socialism in so doing. Proletarian struggles nevertheless persist in constituting the motor of capitalist development. The primary task, however, is not getting into but getting out of modernity. Information technology, which involves immaterial labour, in this way of thinking offers potential for a kind of spontaneous and elementary communism. The

contradiction in the argument is familiar: On the one hand, capitalism revolutionizes itself; on the other, socialism is the result of the conscious action of the new workers. The post-Marxist contradiction is the old Marxian contradiction revisited. These arguments seem to appeal to the remaining American radicals who want to insist both on the necessity of socialism and the centrality of intellectual militancy.

In the United Kingdom, Gramsci has been one of the connectors to post-Marxism. The most influential text here is that by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985), *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, itself an exemplary text in the sense that it juxtaposes the orthodox wisdom of Marx's 1859 Preface with Lacan and Wittgenstein. If anything goes, why not? The conduct of social theory becomes an eclectic mix, with the distinction for post-Marxism that the mix involves this combination of Marxian axioms and cultural theses from afar. Here, in *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* at least, the emphasis is post-Marxist in equal proportions. A more synthetic approach is that taken by Stuart Hall, whose work in this sense places the emphasis on the Marxist rather than the post. Yet the very idea of "a Marxism without guarantees" places Hall firmly in the revisionist, or extensionist stream, for what was orthodox Marxism if not a theory of necessary guarantees? In the United Kingdom, one striking spinoff of post-Marxism was the adoption of the "New Times" motif by the Left magazine *Marxism Today* prior to its collapse into New Labour. Here the politics of post-Marxism took an alternative route to the new vanguard indicated earlier by bolshevism. As in the case of the modernization of the Australian Labor Party before it, Marxist intellectuals left the Communist Party and joined forces with the new revisionism of Blair. Gramsci's New Prince was no longer the Communist Party but the new Labour Party. A distinct trajectory followed Althusser out through Foucault into political theory (Barry Hindess) or via a return to the British radical thought of Cole and Laski toward the project of associative democracy (Paul Hirst).

In the United States, the influence of Althusser was more narrow, and that of Foucault more broad than in the United Kingdom or Australia. The broad appeal of Marxism into the 1930s shifted elsewhere, into pragmatism. Marxism showed considerable influence in the 1960s revival of critical theory via phenomenology, as in the journal *Telos*. America had its maverick Trotskyists, including the Hegelian Marxists who made up the Johnson-Forrest Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party, whose most eminent intellectual leaders were C. L. R. James and Raya Dunayevskaya. Dunayevskaya was emphatically Marxist, finding all kinds of new secrets in the less popular texts of Marx. James made a greater impact as an incipient postcolonial than as a post-Marxist, though he had also followed the earlier Marxian clue that socialism was the invading society within capitalism, the theme followed through by Hardt and Negri in *Empire*. Today, the followers

of post-Marxism are scattered around places like western Massachusetts and North Carolina. A leading journal here is *Rethinking Marx*, sometimes abbreviated as *Remarx*. A leading book is *The End of Capitalism as We Knew It* (1996) by Catherine Gibson-Graham. The most influential Marxist intellectual writing on culture today, Fredric Jameson, is equally a candidate for the prize of post-Marxism, though his trajectory is more consistently aligned to the melancholic element of critical theory than to French Marxism. Perhaps the most exemplary case of post-Marxism in the mixed sense is Žižek. Žižek's mix of bolshevism and psychoanalysis is wilfully provocative and iconoclastic. Combining a strong sense of humour, sparkling prose, and vernacular example from film and television, Žižek manages nevertheless to remain a bolshevik comic in a decisively postbolshevik world. In his essay in *Revolution at the Gates* (2002), as in Hardt and Negri's *Empire*, Lenin is reconstructed as a nice guy who stumbled into bolshevism, but whose practice remains exemplary. Žižek postmodernizes Marxism by putting Lenin into cyberspace. Where Lenin in 1917 called for socialism = electrification and Soviets, Žižek calls for socialism as free access to the Internet and Soviets.

The irony of post-Marxism abounds. As with the post-modern, Marxists cannot be after themselves. The awkwardness of the category reflects the long and ambivalent relationship between Marxism and intellectual revisionism. An ever-changing world needs a changing theory. Marxism has to be open to revision; this is what compelled Western Marxists like Lukács and Korsch to insist that Marxism was a method, not a set of axioms, and which led Gramsci not to talk about Marxism but to do it by applying it to the local, Italian situation. In terms of social theory, the controversy over post-Marxism or revision indicates the fundamental nature of the Marxist claim to universal or total knowledge. Through its twentieth-century history as a social theory, Marxists have sought out supplements to strengthen Marx's work or to make it comprehensive—or to cover its lack—Darwin, Hegel, Freud. In sociology they have added Weber, in philosophy analytic or rational choice categories; for Althusser, Freud and structuralism, for Žižek, Lacan. Viewed from a distance, this theoretical will-to-synthesise in order to strengthen Marxism looks like an attempt to save Marxist theory against the world. In the long run, post-Marxism will surely be known as Marxism. An alternative approach, more often adopted by Marxist historians like Eric Hobsbawm or Bernard Smith, is to wear Marxism as a light cloak, to seek to apply it historically and comparatively. A more generalised cultural approach would be to acknowledge that Marxism emerged from European modernity and allow it to return there, to cease to be Marxist, truly to be after Marx.

— Peter Beilharz

*See also* Marxism; Revolution; Structuralist Marxism

## FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Beilharz, P. 1994. *Postmodern Socialism*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Laclau, E. and C. Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1970. *Beyond Marx*. Paris: PUF.
- Sim, S. 2000. *Post-Marxism: An Intellectual History*. London: Routledge.
- , ed. 1998. *Post-Marxism: A Reader*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wright, S. 2002. *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*. London: Pluto.
- Žižek, S. 2002. *Revolution at the Gates*. London: Verso.

## POSTMODERNISM

The current historical moment goes by a variety of names, including postmodern, postnational, global, transnational, postindustrial, late capitalist, and the society of the spectacle. The ingredients of postmodernism and the postmodern self are given in three key cultural identities, those derived from the performances that define gender, social class, race and ethnicity. The patriarchal, and all too often racist, contemporary cultures of the world ideologically code the self and its meanings in terms of the meanings brought to these three cultural identities. The postmodern self has become a sign of itself, a double dramaturgical reflection anchored in media representations, on one side, and everyday life, on the other. All too often this self is reduced to its essential markers, which carry the traces of these three terms.

The postmodern terrain is defined almost exclusively in visual terms, including the display, the icon, the representations of the real seen through the camera's eyes, captured on videotape, and given in the moving picture. The search for the meaning of the postmodern moment is a study in looking. It can be no other way. This is a televisual, cinematic age.

Classical sociological ways of representing and writing about society require radical transformation. If sociology and the other human disciplines are to remain in touch with the worlds of lived experience in this new century, then new ways of inscribing and reading the social must be found (Lemert 1997; Lyon 1999).

## DEFINING AND WRITING THE POSTMODERN

The postmodern as postmodernism is four things at the same time. First, it describes a sequence of historical