

Through a Telescope Darkly: Marx and Slavery

Terrell Carver

Considering “Karl Marx in his own times” could be a simple textual and contextual study. As explained below, we have a mountain of materials on both scores to utilize. One could simply pick a topic of current interest—say, slavery—and see what Marx had to say about it, if indeed much of anything. We could then add in the well-known contextual background and historical milieu that accompanies both Marx and slavery, and then, via careful analysis, draw some conclusions.

However, this article argues that conventional text-and-context approaches are singularly failing to take Marx in his own times with sufficient seriousness and nuance. This happens because current, indeed long-standing scholarly approaches do not come to grips with the everydayness of *being* Marx in his own times. Hence this article opens with a review of reception-pathway-dependency with respect to Marx. That is, I outline the extent to which scholarly and popular discussions about him to date have portrayed him as he *became* in his posthumous reception,¹ rather than as he was when he was actually living his everyday life. Note that his “life” in this context is easily conflated to the *Life* that a biographer writes, and over the 100 years since the first one was published—Franz Mehring’s *Karl Marx: Geschichte seines Lebens*—we have accumulated a great many on our shelves.

The biographical and bibliographical narrative that we have about Marx is thus very different from the formerly living person, doing what he did, and writing what he wrote, in the “everyday” in his own times. This is not just because of a necessary selectivity in choosing among the

materials that have survived, nor is it just because not everything that was going on in the everyday was written down. Rather it is because what was immediately important to Marx within his everyday comradely circles has faded from view.² And moreover the “great man” effect of his reception has pushed his colleagues, interlocutors, and opponents into the background and reduced their significance. From our perspective Marx now towers over them and dominates the narratives that biographers construct.³ Hence, that is the Marx we know and recognize, and another everyday Marx in his own times simply would not be him.

The now overly familiar biographical narrative cannot have been in Marx’s head in his own time, nor can it have been in anyone else’s as they interacted with him. However, just as Johnson had his Boswell, so Marx had his Engels. Today’s narrative about Marx derives very largely from Engels’ aspirational publicity, starting in August 1859,⁴ casting his friend in the “great man” mold. Having set a distinction out—between the biographical life as we have it and the everyday life as Marx lived it—I then take the everyday phenomenological turn, aiming to “get behind Marx’s eyes,”⁵ to the extent that one can, in order to revivify relevant texts and reconsider “standard” readings. With that distinctive framing, familiar texts will often say something different to us, and some unfamiliar texts will leap out and enlighten us. Even if my efforts are not convincing—and indeed the criteria of plausibility here are not clear cut—I hope that my insertion of some everyday living into a well known “life” will derail the more formulaic accounts we are all used to.

In particular, I will be investigating what are now canonical and little-disputed contextualizations telling us that Marx and his texts, that is, his thinking as he wrote them, are Eurocentric, Orientalist, and—at least at times—racist with respect to Black people, Asian people, even Russophobe. Conventionally, and with the usual regrets, those judgments are usually accompanied with the qualifier that that is how it was for Marx in his own times, or that is simply how he was in himself for whatever reason.

However, adopting my rather different view of what it was to be the everyday Marx in his own times, and choosing a text not otherwise cited

on the subject in hand—slavery—I push back quite sharply not just on those judgements, but on the mode of analysis through which they appear to make sense.

Marx's Afterlife

Marx was little read during his lifetime, but much read since his death in 1883. This eventual global reception has been highly polarized, multi-various and multi-faceted, a moving target subject to moving goalposts. It has had its ups and downs over the decades and has lately been on a roll since the financial crashes of the early twenty-first century. And we have had the twin bicentenaries of Marx himself in 2018 and of Engels in 2020, the latter still on-going owing to pandemic delays. Moreover, what we have available to read and interpret—or very recently to watch on stage or in the cinema—has grown exponentially since the early 1920s, when the *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe* project began, and as it continues to date since its re-founding in 1972.

Such scholarly efforts have also had their ups-and-downs over the decades, rather similar to Marx's. Within the nearly 140 years of reception the canonical status and value-hierarchies of Marx's ever-growing volumes of republished works of various kinds, and posthumously published manuscripts and letters, have shifted in a kaleidoscopic way. Various editorial and pedagogical strategies, academic disciplinary investments and presumed audience interests, as well as straightforward political differences and in-fighting, have shaped the Marx that we see on the shelf.

Occasionally Marx catches a wave, as with the manuscript editions, termed "economic and philosophical," that suited the liberatory movements of the 1960s. Even the formidable and famously unread volume 1 of his projected study *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* is having a moment now when hostility to multi-billionaires is growing and unimaginable inequalities are readily visible. While Marx did not predict climate change, his view of rip-roaring industrial capitalism included graphic accounts of material damage, not just human damage. However, quite a lot of Marx's ideas have simply sunk into unmarked—

or rather “unMarxed”—general wisdom among social historians, political commentators, sometimes even economists. Whether presenting the history of civilization as an array of everyday objects and technologies, or understanding democratization in economically egalitarian terms, or even presenting market exchanges as constitutive of class conflict, “we are all Marxists now.”⁶

To get a view of the biographized Marx—or rather we find in those works a constellation of Marxes conflated with various Marxisms—we are looking through our telescopes over a considerable distance in space-time to make Marx look bigger and to see ever greater detail. What we get by doing that is an image, but then it is up to the viewer to make judgments and draw lessons. The everyday Marx, however, was a terrestrial object, and a human one, so our judgments—if we reverse the telescope and take a distancing view—should come from an appropriately nuanced and down-to-earth register of immediate interests and empathetic identifications. Marx will become smaller and farther away, but more our own size and more realistically alive.

This reverse view will vary, not just with the proclivities and politics of the viewer, but with who—in that viewer’s gaze—Marx is supposed to have been in his own times among his associates. And from them we have very limited detail to go on because few knew him, or even of him, and little of what was written down has survived into the record, or at least in the easily accessible archives. Is it possible, then, to get any sense of the everyday Marx in his own times? Since we have little direct testimony to help us—memoir accounts almost all date from after his death, and therefore from many years after most of the incidents recounted—we are in a realm of plausible inference.

For me, this will be based on taking a look at how Marx was *doing things* with words,⁷ not just putting words on pages for an on-going timeless posterity. We can develop a picture of his projects, how he was trying, from a very early age, not just to interpret the world but to change it. And we can take note of his interlocutors and audiences—typically his choice of polemical targets and intended readers—and try to see the issues

as on-going everyday personal interventions. In his own times, the idea of doing this was itself controversial and dangerous, given the heavy censorship, authoritarian régimes and successive residences-in-exile that were in fact his everyday.

Marx Agonistes

Since the 1970s Marx has been widely understood as Eurocentric, white, male, heterosexual and hypocritically bourgeois, failing to meet current—and oftentimes rapidly developing—standards of inclusivity, equality, historicity, morality, and authenticity. It is easy to conclude that this kind of discussion tells us more about the manners and morals of today's scholars than about how Marx was in his own times. In this article, though, I am concerned to explore just one of the supposed—indeed presumed—Marxian blindspots through which the various characterizations listed above become credible. This is not simply a matter of turning up another text, which, as a single item, could not overturn the weight of judgment already accumulated about the texts already examined. Rather, the blindspot is in the way that commentators to date have conflated the biographized Marx, who is made to speak to our posterity, with the everyday Marx, who was actually speaking to his target audience.

Post-coloniality and de-colonization, chattel slavery and racial oppression, are current concerns and contestations in the global Anglosphere and in similarly important ways elsewhere. Most particularly this is the case in nation-states where struggles with an imperial past are framed by discussions of international equality and inter-generational justice. My contention is that to a significant degree, the everyday Marx has been mangled up, like Procrustes, in order to make him—as Marx/Marxism—fit the charge-sheet. My focus, though, is not so much on extricating him from the dock as explaining how the moralizing tropes of prosecution and defense put him there in the first place.

Edward Said's *Orientalism*⁸ is now just past its 50th anniversary, and Samir Amin's *Eurocentricism*⁹ is currently having a 30th anniversary, both celebrating an *aporia* that has not much changed since the 1870s. The

dilemma is as follows: on the one hand, for intellectual critique and political activism, taken together, the Marx/Marxism paradigm links economics to politics to culture as capitalist modernity. That paradigm depicts capitalism as a forceful, invasive, and pervasive historical juggernaut, set out in rhetorical flights common to both the *Communist Manifesto* and *Capital*. But, on the other hand, Marx/Marxism also configures capitalist modernity as an historical construction that could be mitigated in practice through reforms—which would understandably be regarded by some “in their own times” as revolutionary. Or indeed, capitalism in Marx’s view could even be transformed utterly through what would, by expectation, be a communist, or at least in some sense a socialist, revolution. Given that for Marx—and us—capitalism is a brute force with a life of its own, creating wonders to be enjoyed yet blighting lives and wasting resources, what could possibly be done to ameliorate the bad effects and promote the good ones, or indeed transcend it altogether?

For Said, Marx, as an occidental, is clearly producing “Western” knowledge and a colonizing mind-set, whatever the dilemmas, and thus reproducing the “Western” willful ignorance and domination through which oppression and injustice are being produced. It follows that Marxists and their methods are similarly suspect, however much they are defended and promoted as scientific and thus universal. Making that kind of claim, in Said’s view, simply restates what he has already proved: these are colonizers’ claims, however snugly they are said to fit with the presumed universalism of working-class struggles in “developed” and “under-developed” countries alike.

Amir, however, attempts a rescue and resolution. The charge of Eurocentrism, in his eponymous book, is thus intended to be a response to political developments and corresponding critiques from the 1980s onwards, with the aim of updating post-war Marxism. This supplementation is intended to integrate geographies of politics and ideology that—owing to knowledge-production based in Euro-America and the self-validating character of its imperial projects—were not mentioned or much valued or were even dismissed by Marx and Engels in their canonical works. At the

end of Amin's book—if they had been able to read it—Marx and Engels would not recognize themselves, but then Amin's argument is that they also would not recognize a world that had moved on in significant ways. Hence in a sense today's readers—or so the authorial intention seems to be—should see their own world through the canonical eyes of Marx and Engels, but trans-historically and so with suitable amendments: armed with a Marx/Marxism purged of Eurocentrism, *engagé* readers should be pursuing transformative political projects accordingly.

There are two concerns here—one reflecting activist struggles over ideas, priorities, strategies, alliances, and any number of political dilemmas, and the other reflecting a somewhat retrograde-looking interest in works by Marx and Engels, major and minor, newly published and posthumously discovered. The former concern is of course very widespread, highly varied, and—given the resonance of even just the name Marx and the term Marxism—still hyper-controversial. The object in the latter enterprise—updating canonical Marxism, as Amin and many others attempt to do—is rather to ascertain how much apologetics and correction these canonical works require in order to keep Marxism politically relevant. Amin's efforts to purge Marxism of Eurocentrism were a notable curtain-raiser to further efforts in this vein.

Chief among this burgeoning literature is Kevin B. Anderson's *Marx at the Margins*,¹⁰ which occupies an important position in the exculpatory and correctional stakes. As a large volume, unlike Amin's short essay, Anderson's book sets out to be comprehensive, rigorous, and thorough. He fearlessly searches for Eurocentric and racist views in Marx's and Engels' writings, sifting through little-read journalism and archived notebooks. His aim is not so much to exonerate the two canonical authors (Marx particularly) and thus expurgate their canonical works (Engels particularly), as it is to create a more judiciously Marxist reading of the *oeuvre*.¹¹ Anderson's book thus argues the recurring centrality of Marx and Marxism to political critiques of oppression, both in theory and in practice, over and beyond the class hierarchies and economic exploitations that the two communist theorists were able to detail. Racism, as an

expression of, or generally coincident with, Eurocentrism is particularly in Anderson's frame.¹²

Anderson's book has been widely praised for its scholarly reading of the Marx-Engels archive into book-length narrative form, and for its courage in making no excuses where Eurocentrism, nationalism, racism, and (rather less often) sexism and homophobia can be identified anywhere in the collected texts.¹³ His aim is somewhat confessional, though on behalf of Marx and Engels, such that solecisms, lapses, and transgressions can be excised from thinking that—between the two canonical authors—is otherwise more than worthwhile today.

However, the discursive mode of commentary, through which Anderson operates in his book, generates questions of some conceptual and political significance, and not just about Marx. In particular it raises questions about Marx in his own times, by showing us how easy it is to assume that this concept—"in his own times"—is at all intelligible as something apart from the biographized Marx/Marxism conflation, and how such an idea about an everyday Marx could possibly emerge.

Colonialism, Eurocentrism, Anachronism, Moralism

In most of Marx's lifetime there was nothing like a nation-state in the German-speaking patchwork of régimes east of France and west of Russia (or even obvious prospects for this), as there had been for some centuries in the much more unified kingdoms of Spain, France, and Great Britain. It is therefore not surprising that those empires, with their institutions and practices of colonization, were not high on Marx's list of concerns until his move to London in late 1849. Nor were they really on the horizon at all in his earlier writings, as they are preserved, other than in passing references. Or in other words, for Marx or anyone else, a focused project on anything produces apparent lacunae on other subjects and interests. And even so, the liberal/socialist/reformist movements in Great Britain and France, with which Marx aligned himself politically, were famously split on the empire question in his own times and then well into the twentieth century and post-war years of supposed de-colonization. It

follows that trying to judge Marx as Eurocentric, white-racist, or empire-complicit is fraught with anachronism, given that commentators generally work within discourses of certainty that, as with Anderson, operate with a dualizing commentator-to-author framing. That "head-down" approach elides consideration of the hermeneutic complications in being the everyday Marx in his own times that I have instanced above.

The commonplace *faux*-contextualization that Marx was 'simply a man of his own times' obscures the historical fact that many men—and women, when we can find out what they thought—of those times had at least somewhat differing views on, for example, race/ethnicity/nationalism/colonization, even if not the precise critiques of today. In any case today's critiques are highly varied and minutely contested. From what we know of Marx's positioning, he was a German-speaker with a Germanic education, German-centric political interests, and an eastward-directed modernizing and democratizing mission of political transformation drawn from French and British sources in political theory, political economy, and political action. That was a viewpoint which necessarily put other concerns—now salient in Anglophone intellectual and public life—out towards the periphery of his political interests and activities. Even in what we have of his thinking about the "world market," which dates in manuscript form and published materials from the 1860s, it takes effort to find much notice of French colonies, the decaying Spanish and Portuguese empires, even the burgeoning Russian empire, much less the Ottoman and Chinese empires, other than when they surfaced in the political context of western European great-power politics. As a newspaper correspondent, Marx was often assigned to write on those subjects because they were the important ones from his editors' points of view. Hence, within the Marxian *oeuvre* we encounter those imperial/colonial topics at times such as the Opium Wars of the 1840s, the Eastern Question in the 1850s, and the Russo-Turkish War of the 1870s.

In some respects the USA was even more peripheral, not figuring very much in Marx's historical frame, nor much considered as a newly constituted rebel state against a colonizing power. As a foreign

correspondent on foreign affairs for the New York *Daily Tribune*, though, the USA was simply not “his beat.” When the American civil war was in the European and particularly British news in the 1860s, the Marxian *oeuvre* tells us what he thought about the North American economy and North Atlantic trading powers. Those texts are of course conditioned by the proclivities of editors and their presumptions about readerships, as well as various guesses about censorships and Marx’s own assumptions about what terms and tropes would be intelligible to the target audience. And, as Steven Katz usefully notes, Marx’s writings on Ireland, rather than evincing Eurocentrism because that is where Ireland is, actually explore how capitalism works “through the agency of colonialism.”¹⁴ In those works we see greater command of detail and therefore of theorization than we do in his writings on areas falling into conventional, later-twentieth-century notions of colonies and colonialism, what and where they are, and what and where they are not.

Rhetorics and Realities

A brief exploration here will touch on a number of geographical areas, political issues, and supposed theoretical claims to be found in Marx’s activities in 1846-47. Those years pre-date Marx’s exile in London where, in the imperial metropole, he supposedly turned his thoughts only then to the slave trade. Rather than aiming to synthesize Marx’s lifetime “thought” or “theory” as a whole, or even to construct a periodized or chronologizing biographer’s view of twists and turns, as Anderson does,¹⁵ my discussion here uses a re-reading encounter to probe today’s views and judgments, and to push back on exculpatory moralizing.

A good place to start on this short but indicative exposition of a different approach is with Marx’s first venture as a socialist/communist on the wider European stage, namely his critique—written and published in French, the pan-European language of politics and culture—of the famous socialist writer and political figure Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-65). Marx’s *The Poverty of Philosophy*¹⁶ was a satirical reworking of Proudhon’s latest book and was published in 1847 in Paris and Brussels.

That was a big step-up for the young Rhinelander, already exiled from Prussia as a dangerous socialist/communist radical in each of the two foreign countries successively. Proudhon's recently published and widely reviewed title, *The Philosophy of Poverty*, had appeared in 1846, and for Marx the political project was simple: he aimed to "big himself up" in relation to a putative German-speaking audience back home (and from his political perspective, still in the backwoods) by taking on a famous French socialist. In his book Proudhon had dared—and here was Marx's special *entrée*—to appropriate the great German philosopher G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) as an authority on, and guide to, historical change and political possibilities.

Marx's political strategy was to make a splash in the European world of socialist/communist and perforce radical/revolutionary democratic intellectuals. In particular he aimed to set himself among those who were currently popular, albeit clandestinely, within both the middle class radical set and the nascent, illegal workers' movements. His comments in the book were not directed to subjects such as global colonial conquests in any very explicit way, because that was not then a way to engage his target audiences. Rather, his remarks in that direction occurred as rhetorical tropes in his quite brutal trashing of those whose ideas he considered unhelpful to the liberal/radical/socialist/communist cause as he conceived it, and *where* he conceived it. This was in the Franco-German world, east-facing, with the Channel and the Atlantic behind him.

Twilight of an Idol

Thus, throughout the satirical *Poverty of Philosophy* Marx gives Proudhon no quarter and finds numerous ways to bring out the banality of his thought. Chief among these is a burlesque version of Proudhon's *System of Economic Contradictions* (the subtitle of Proudhon's book), using *faux*-Proudhonian methodology. Proudhon had crudely borrowed his self-styled "system of contradictions" from Hegel, but his efforts were then sarcastically parodied by Marx. Marx deployed those rhetorical devices in order to gain political traction, but he grounded his killer points in examples

not chosen by Proudhon. Indeed, Marx chose particularly potent examples to gain notoriety. While mocking Proudhon in order to make political capital, he was keen to demonstrate his own superiority in re-thinking a major topic of common socialist/communist interest, or anyway a topic that he thought should be top of the list. This was global political economy, albeit as it appeared from his interlocutors' and his readers' localized perspectives, as otherwise he would fail to engage them. Marx kicks off:

For him, M. Proudhon, every economic category has two sides—one good, the other bad. He looks upon these categories as the petty bourgeois looks upon the great men of history: *Napoleon* was a great man; he did a lot of good; he also did a lot of harm.¹⁷

Moving on from a minor insult (Proudhon as merely petty bourgeois, i.e., like an uneducated and uncultivated shopkeeper or small trader) to a major one, Marx chose a much more insulting *reductio* for his next parody of Proudhon's flawed, unhelpful and potentially dangerous "contribution" to contemporary political analysis and social agitation. That choice was an economic category which Proudhon would not—presumably—have treated in his banal "dialectical" way, as he had done with more conventional categories of socio-political analysis such as value. Marx's gross-out category with which to skewer Proudhon was slavery:

Slavery is an economic category like any other [as per Proudhon's banalities]. Thus it also has its two sides. Let us leave alone the bad side and talk about the good side of slavery. Needless to say we are dealing only with direct slavery, with Negro slavery in Surinam [a Dutch colony], in Brazil [then a quasi-colony of Portugal], in the Southern States of North America [as preserved from colonial times].¹⁸

Marx then warms to his theme and writes analytically—though still in parody mode—about modern chattel, racialized Black slavery, which he terms direct, presumably as opposed to slave-like conditions in waged employment.

Direct slavery is just as much the pivot of bourgeois industry as machinery, credits, etc. Without slavery you have no cotton; without cotton you have no modern industry. It is slavery that gave the colonies their value; it is the colonies that created world trade, and it is world trade that is the precondition of large-scale industry.¹⁹

As a summary statement centering Atlantic slavery at the heart of a globalized picture of capitalism, this is hard to beat. As a theorization it is excellent by modern anti-colonialist standards, even if economic historians might (dare to) argue that it is somewhat exaggerated and therefore debatable, at least a bit. But since Marx's evident views on slavery were framed in terms of his Franco-German political project, and because the political project in his own times was framed as an *ad hominem* polemic, those passages are not much cited as a theoretical foundation stone in setting out Marx's way of thinking.

However, the passages cited above present a very cogent, and as of 1846 quite unusual line of thought—as is also the case now—in asserting a causal relationship between slavery, large-scale industry, and world trade. But then Marx's detailed engagement with the contemporary science of political economy, which was at that point only just getting underway, was also quite unusual in socialist/communist circles. Marx made an engagement with political economy his intellectual and political signature and calling card. In commercial circles, in contrast to socialist/communist circles, political economy was closely studied and under intense development. But in those latter circles, slavery was not a popular or even polite category in anyone's analytical scheme. If acknowledged at all, it was taken to be a moral blot on the otherwise benign—or at least improvable—landscape of modern trading and state-based economies, within which global markets were to be 'free'—i.e., free from aristocratic-authoritarian restrictions and pre-industrial anti-trade meddling—worldwide.²⁰

Next, Marx really gets into the swing of his rhetorical demolition of Proudhon's open invitation to absurdity:

Without slavery North America, the most progressive of countries, would be transformed into a patriarchal country. Wipe North America off the map of the world, and you will have anarchy—the complete decay of modern commerce and civilisation. Cause slavery to disappear and you will have wiped America off the map of nations.²¹

Making direct slavery central to modern commercial and globalizing economies was no mere rhetorical gesture, evidently, but rather a serious analytical connection.

Rounding off this disquisition, Marx draws his rhetorically and empirically potent anti-colonial global politics together with the critical socialism/communism of his European audience:²² “Modern nations have been able only to disguise slavery in their own countries, but they have imposed it without disguise upon the New World.”²³ While that analogy hardly counts as a major discussion of the Atlantic slave trade (we are left to connect the dots to Africa, sugar, and tobacco production, etc.),²⁴ the economico-political project is neatly summarized in a thoroughly contemporary way. The reader can have little doubt that Marx meant to tar Proudhon with the worst sort of moral opprobrium for obscuring an incredibly important conjunction in contemporary political economy. Political economy was the developing science of commerce and trade (i.e., capitalism), which Marx—sourcing his views already in works by Smith, Ricardo, and others—was determined to consider globally and historically. His conclusion in this discussion is that by accepting far too readily the erasures of political economy—namely an engagement with class struggle which was already energizing Marx—and adding banality to blandness, Proudhon had concocted a highly publicized and therefore quite dangerous threat to the socialist/communist movements, whether actual or potential.

Conclusions

Reading Marx as a white modernizer from “the West” necessarily inscribes him as Eurocentric and makes him an orientalist *par excellence*.

The teleology and determinism in this "standard" reading arises, not from the everyday Marx in his own times, but rather from the tradition of commentary as performed by non-Marxists and anti-Marxists alike. That framing of Marx/Marxisms explains many of the theorized contradictions and periodized shifts in "Marx's thought" through which Anderson and others conduct their readers.²⁵ Reading him piecemeal from that "head down" perspective makes the issues the commentator arrives with authoritative, and licenses the moralizing urge to pass judgement on a dead author. Whereas, as argued above, it helps us rather more to conduct a thorough exploration of the texts that we have by paying suitable attention to Marx in his own times, giving due regard to what he says he knows and to genres that he used to engage the audiences he had in mind. But most important of all is to consider—as a hermeneutic principle and re-reading strategy—what things he was trying to *do* with words when he was being the everyday Karl Marx in his own times.

University of Bristol, UK

Notes

¹ For a review and analysis see chapter 1, "Making Marx 'Marx,'" in Terrell Carver, *Marx* (Cambridge: Polity, 2018), 16-30.

² Mary Gabriel's *Love and Capital: Karl and Jenny Marx and the Birth of a Revolution* (New York: Little, Brown, 2011) works hard to revive an everyday view of Marx and his associates by presenting events and milieux from Frau Marx's perspective, using family letters very largely archived outside the Marx-Engels collections, which in general exclude items not written *by* the two, or *to* them.

³ On this theme see Terrell Carver, "'Mere Auxiliaries to the Movement': How Intellectual Biography Obscures Marx's and Engels' Gendered Political Partnerships," in *The Wives of Western Philosophy: Gender Politics in Intellectual Labour*, ed. Jenifer Forestal and Menaka Phillips (New York and Milton Park: Routledge, 2020), 167-84.

⁴ MECW 16, 469ff.

⁵ My thanks to James Ingram for this phrase, and for other helpful comments from members of the Toronto area political theory group.

⁶ A saying commonly attributed to J.K. Galbraith.

⁷ A nod to J.L. Austin's inspirational *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976).

⁸ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, new edition (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003 [1978]), 9-36.

⁹ Samir Amin, *Eurocentrism*, 2nd Edition, tr. Russell Moore and James Membrez (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2009 [1988]).

¹⁰ Kevin B. Anderson, *Marx at the Margins*, Expanded Edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016 [2010]).

¹¹ Anderson, *Margins*, xii-xvi.

¹² Anderson, *Margins*, 239-44.

¹³ See, for example, Amy Allen, "'Decolonization,' Normativity, and the Critique of Capitalism: Reply to Critics," in Symposium, *Political Theory*, Vol. 46 (2018), 796-97.

¹⁴ Stephen Katz, "The Problems of Europocentrism and Evolutionism in Marx's Writings on Colonialism," *Political Studies*, Vol. 38 (1990), 679-81; Barbara Arneil argues against a conflation of colonialism with imperialism in order to study "domestic colonialism," conceptual moves by Marx prefigured here, and contradicting the framing in Anderson, *Margins*; Lukas Slothuus, Review of Arneil's *Domestic Colonies: The Turn Inward to Colony*, In *Contemporary Political Theory*, published on-line 9 March 2018, 1-2.

¹⁵ Anderson, *Margins*, 253 n. 2.

¹⁶ Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy* [1847], in MECW 6 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1976), 105-212.

¹⁷ MECW 6, 167; emphasis in original.

¹⁸ MECW 6, 167.

¹⁹ MECW 6, 167.

²⁰ See J.S. Mill's *Principles of Political Economy* (1848), in which Chapter V, "Of Slavery" acknowledges its profitability in the sugar

industries of the Caribbean and suggests that "proprietors" (i.e., slave-owners) were perhaps undercompensated for their loss when British colonial slavery was abolished in 1833. Mill also describes slavery as inefficient for the community as a whole and less productive than "free" labor; in the end, he calls it a "curse," and laments post-abolition sympathies in Great Britain for the continued maintenance of slavery in that "great and powerful military commonwealth," the USA. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/mill-principles-of-political-economy-ashley-ed> The contrast with Marx's clearly impassioned view is quite telling.

²¹ MECW 6, 167.

²² Marx's Franco-German potential readership stretched eastwards to St Petersburg, even at this early date.

²³ MECW 6, 168.

²⁴ Note that Robbie Shilliam reads Marx and Engels' brief references to slavery in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (composed 1847-48) as Eurocentric errors of omission, whereas I read Marx's contemporary text of 1846-47 as evidence of global knowledge and specific concern; Shilliam, "Decolonizing the *Manifesto*: Communism and the Slave Analogy," in *The Cambridge Companion to The Communist Manifesto*, ed. Terrell Carver and James Farr (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 195-213.

²⁵ Anderson, *Margins*, 14-15, 29. See also Gilbert Achcar, *Marxism, Orientalism, Cosmopolitanism* (London: Saqi Books, 2013), 82-98.

Bibliography

- Achcar, Gilbert. *Marxism, Orientalism, Cosmopolitanism*. London: Saqi Books, 2013.
- Allen, Amy. "Decolonization", Normativity, and the Critique of Capitalism: Reply to Critics. Symposium. *Political Theory* 46 (2018), 796-97.
- Amin, Samir. *Eurocentrism*. 2nd Edition. Trans. Russell Moore and James Membrez. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010 [1988].
- Anderson, Kevin B. *Marx at the Margins*. Expanded Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016 [2010].

- Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Carver, Terrell Marx. Cambridge: Polity, 2018.
- . “‘Mere Auxiliaries to the Movement’: How Intellectual Biography Obscures Marx’s and Engels’s Gendered Political Partnerships.” In *The Wives of Western Philosophy: Gender Politics in Intellectual Labour*. Ed. Jenifer Forestal and Menaka Phillips. New York and Milton Park: Routledge, 167-84.
- Gabriel, Mary. *Love and Capital: Karl and Jenny Marx and the Birth of a Revolution*. New York: Little, Brown, 2011.
- Katz, Stephen. “The Problems of Europocentrism and Evolutionism in Marx’s Writings on Colonialism.” *Political Studies* 38 (1990), 679-81.
- Marx, Karl. *The Poverty of Philosophy*. In Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works in 50 Volumes*. Vol. 6. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1976 [1847]. 105-212.
- Mill, J.S. *Principles of Political Economy*. 1848. Published on-line <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/mill-principles-of-political-economy-ashley-ed>.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*, new edn. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003 [1978].
- Shilliam, Robbie. Decolonizing the Manifesto: Communism and the Slave Analogy. In *The Cambridge Companion to The Communist Manifesto*, ed. Terrell Carver and James Farr. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 195-213.
- Slothuus, Lukas. Review of Arneil’s *Domestic Colonies: The Turn Inward to Colony*. *Contemporary Political Theory*. Published on-line 9 March 2018.

