

Marx's Thought of Technical Governance and Its Contemporary Value

Junjia Chen^{1, a}

¹Chongqing Institute of Foreign Studies, Chongqing, China

^ajunjiac66@163.com

Abstract

The analysis of Marx's technical governance thought from the dual perspectives of technical philosophy and political philosophy can be summarized as the three dimensions of "technology as governance object" and the five dimensions of "technology as governance means". The in-depth interpretation of Marx's technical governance thought will enrich the dimension of technical governance in the philosophy of science and technology, provide theoretical reference for the modernization of governance.

Keywords

Marx, Technical Governance, Governance Modernization, Contemporary Value.

1. Introduction

In contemporary society, faced with the technical governance problems brought about by Cloud Computing, Internet of Things, Artificial Intelligence and other information and communication technologies, only by paying attention to Marx's point of view, combing and explaining Marx's technical governance thought can we draw the power of truth from it. Marx deeply analyzed and criticized the practice of technical governance in capitalist society and put forward profound and unique insights. On the one hand, based on the critique of technology, Marx revealed the alienation dilemma of technology as a productive force in the capitalist system; on the other hand, he adjusted the relationship between technology and society as a whole, and promotes the academic circles to construct the realistic way out of technology governance in the practical context from the perspective of "science and technology-society holism [1]." Therefore, from the dual perspectives of technological philosophy and political philosophy, this study explores the important value of Marx's technical governance thought in resolving the dilemma of contemporary technical governance, and provides a theoretical reference for promoting Chinese path to modernization.

2. The Theoretical Basis of Marx's Technical Governance Thought

The birth of Marx's thought of technical governance is closely related to the application of science and technology, social change and the basis of philosophical thought in his era. First of all, the rapid development of science and technology in the industrial revolution has led to fundamental changes in social concepts, productivity and production methods and organizational forms. This achievement in the field of natural science was described by Marx as "a revolutionary act that seems to repeat Luther's burning teachings[2]", which further promoted Marx's attention to practical scientific and technological issues. Secondly, the refinement of production division and labor alienation brought about by the implementation of mechanized production and factory system have strengthened the exploitation of workers by capitalists, intensified social contradictions and class conflicts, and then prompted Marx to rethink the social role and governance path of technology. Finally, at the level of philosophical thought, Marx critically inherited German classical philosophical thought, early knowledge

rational governance thought and Yule's technical philosophy thought, especially influenced by Hegel's alienation theory and Feuerbach's humanism thought. By revealing the alienation of technology in capitalist society, he explored the realistic path of technology serving labor liberation and social justice.

The formation of Marx's concept of technical governance is a diachronic process. Initially, from a humanistic perspective, it gradually evolved into the practical stance of historical materialism, ultimately leading to the proposition of communist technical governance. In the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx criticized technological alienation under capitalism from philosophical and sociological perspectives, asserting that technology had become a tool for the oppression of workers within the capitalist framework, and highlighting the potential link between technology and the liberation of labor. As his theoretical development progressed, Marx, in *The German Ideology* and *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, grounded in historical materialism, clarified that technological development is inherently tied to social transformation. He emphasized that technological governance must transcend "ideological dominance" and return to the fundamental contradiction between productive forces and production relations. Through an in-depth examination of the history of technology, Marx critically analyzed the limitations of capitalist technology governance and proposed a practical vision of a communist society, in which technology would serve the collective well-being of all.

3. The Core View of Marx's Technical Governance Thought

Marx's concept of "technical governance" originates from his theory of "governance" and expresses his conception of social management. From the perspective of words, Marx used the word "management" more in the text, and this term is similar to "governance" in connotation, both of which are related to administrative power, class attributes and political activities. In different texts, Marx mentioned "the instability of governance form" and "the requirement of returning to normal governance system", and regarded "governance" as a specific form of administrative management, which is characterized as a political power distribution or administrative order[3]. Semantically, Marx regarded governance as an expression of good order or a vision of "benefiting the people". "Since the country seems to govern well, the head of state is willing to benefit the people... The people who only want to save the country after gaining power should be greatly respected"[4]. Marx believes that "governance" is not only political management in Augustus's politics, but also has the purpose of serving the people. Although Marx did not clearly define "technical governance", his governance thought has reflected the dual connotation of technical governance.

First of all, Marx put forward the "third kind of people" in *Das Kapital*, that is, people engaged in technical activities who serve capitalists and workers, "receive money from them as compensation", or do not serve them," and become the co-owners of surplus value in the form of rent, interest and so on"[5]. As a result, technical governance is regarded as a governance tool that relies on the participation of technology and management personnel. Secondly, Marx also emphasized another dimension, that is, the governance of technology itself. He borrowed from Aristotle's discussion in *The Politics* that "a technology, as long as its purpose is not to act as a means, but as the ultimate goal, its requirements are unlimited" pointing out the disorder of technology application in capitalist society and redefining the technology [6]. Therefore, Marx's thought of technical governance has two meanings: one is to use technology as a means of governance, and the other is to govern technology itself and make it good.

3.1. The technical governance thought that regards the technology as the governance object

From the perspective of technology philosophy, Marx thinks systematically about the nature of technology, technological alienation and technological innovation based on the relationship framework of "man-nature and society".

First of all, Marx reflected on the nature of technology in the framework of man, nature and society through the questioning and reflection of human nature. In Marx's view, the essence of technology has three meanings: first, technology is the labor practice of "Realistic Man" and the externalization of human nature. Marx linked people's self-confirmation with life activities themselves, pointing out that people transform their life activities into the object of their own consciousness and show their conscious life behavior. In his opinion, there is a certain connection between the human nature and social relations confirmed by labor practice, and this connection is related to the object of labor production, "relative to labor", so that "this reality of labor is manifested as the unreality of workers...possession is manifested as alienation and externalization[7]." Second, technology is the productive forces and the revolutionary force in the highest sense. Marx compared the machine to the "cow dragging a plow", arguing that it was not an "economic category", but a "productivity"[8]. Marx was aware that in the development of human society and history, technology had played a powerful lever of history. Third, the interaction between technology and society is an indicator of social form. In Marx's view, the level of technology and the mode of production directly determine the economic structure and social structure of a society. On the one hand, technology plays a decisive role in social development. Marx defined his study of technology and social relations as "our theory that the means of production determine the organization of Labour"[9]. On the other hand, social development is equally important to technological development. "These conditions, in agriculture, have the natural nature of production, in manufacturing and the vast majority of the mining industry, change with the social development of the production process itself[10]." Therefore, Marx divided the technological change: one is the material change that be specified with the precision of natural science, and the other is "Ideology".

Secondly, after Marx's deep discussion of the nature of technology, he turned to the analysis of the problem of technology alienation. Under the capitalist system, technology has evolved into an intermediary tool to promote labor alienation, production alienation and social alienation. Marx proposed the four forms of labor alienation, believed that industrial technology made people lose the practicality and sociality. Thus, Marx replied,"the being of the alienation to which labor and the product of labor belong... can only be man himself"[11]. Then, Marx realized that technology became an endless tool of capitalists to plunder nature, resulting in the alienation of production into a power to plunder nature. Marx believed that this plunder of nature not only led to environmental damage, but also was a manifestation of production alienation. Furthermore, technology leads to social alienation and becomes an accomplice to maintaining the capitalist rule. Marx believed that the alienation of this technology "turned the objective conditions of labor into the antagonistic opposites of living labor", while the past labor, which included social forces, natural forces and scientific forces, was transformed into an instrumental weapon, "in part is the absolute monarchy and military discipline used to subject workers to the carefully established capital set up in the factory"[12]. Part of technology becomes a weapon for capitalists to deprive workers of their posts and expertise, while the other part becomes rational tool for capitalists to exploit workers and control society.

Finally, Marx believed that technological innovation was fundamentally different from the capitalist improvement of machines. He proposed that technological innovation with three principles is the core to avoid the path of technological alienation and govern technology. First, technological innovation is oriented by the liberation of people. Under the capitalist system, the

society is generally immersed in the blind worship of technology. Technological innovation binds workers with technological objects, which leads to the "alienation" and "de-skilled" of labor, eliminates the intrinsic value of labor, and makes people fall into the "technological fetishism". Marx believed that technological innovation should eliminate class differences and promote the demise of the old division of labor, and change to the ideal state of free division of labor described. Technological innovation should adhere to the people-oriented, give play to individual initiative and creativity, and liberate human beings. Second, the technological innovation is based on the ecological concept. Marx regarded human beings as the product of nature, that man live in nature and interact with nature. Man is connected with nature, lives on nature, is a part of nature, and is also the result of nature. Marx emphasized the harmonious relationship between man and nature, and advocated the harmonious coexistence of technological development and nature. Third, technological innovation with the goal of realizing communism. Marx regarded communism as the final stage of the development of human society, and believed that technological innovation should strive to achieve this goal. Technological progress should not only promote the fair distribution of social wealth and eliminate class differences, but also realize the all-round development of economy and society.

3.2. The technology governance thought that regards technology as governance means

From the perspective of political philosophy, Marx's technical governance system is based on human society as reality, paying attention to the social function of technology, to adjust the social operation as the goal, about the country, society and the people, to build a governance framework.

First, the governance goal of Marx's technical governance thought is the liberation of politics, economy and people. In Marx's opinion, technology should be used as a means rather than an end, in order to get rid of the endless cycle of capital movement and achieve the real goal of technology governance. He put forward that technical governance should take politics, economy and human liberation as the core, running through the concept of "community" and "Realistic Man". First of all, Marx criticized the "illusory community" of capitalist countries, and believed that the independent state of "separation from actual interests" adopted by the public interest caused by the contradiction between private interests and public interests, and defined it as a form of "illusory community". The state was seen by him as a fake collective, a pseudo-collective, "only for individuals who developed within the scope of the ruling class" [13]. Therefore, he put forward the idea of "real community", based on the collective union, "each individual" obtaining "freedom" through the union. Secondly, Marx advocated that economic liberation needed to break the shackles of capital and religion, promote the governance reform of secular society from the economic level, and transcend the shackles of civil society. Marx pointed out that "the liberation of-from business and money and thus-from actual and real Judaism would be modern self-liberation"[14]. He revealed the essence of civil society, regarded economic liberation as its governance goal, and tried to realize the governance reform of the whole secular society from the economic direction. Finally, he believed that the comprehensive and free development of human beings was the ultimate goal of political and economic liberation, and technical governance should be committed to eliminating alienation, building a "real community", and realizing individual free development and social progress.

Second, Marx stressed that the subject of governance should fully reflect the diversified distribution of public power. In Hobbes' writing, the state is described as a giant beast called "Leviathan" to emphasize the absolutism and concentration of state power[15]. This view implies the direct power relationship between governance and being governed, and between ruling and being ruled. Relatively speaking, Marx's understanding of the state and society is far beyond the individual level of slavery, rooted in the mutual relationship between individuals.

Marx's analysis of public power, deeply discussed the relationship between class attachment and rule in the period before and after capitalism, emphasized the class attribute of public power, and advocated the diversified division of public power, and tried to strive for the due rights and interests of the workers and the working class. This point of view shows Marx's extensive understanding of the governance subject, and changes the understanding of a single individual or a ruling group into social relations and interactions.

Third, Marx's technical governance objects revolve around the country and society, aiming at promoting the enhancement of national governance efficiency and stabilizing social development, so as to realize the liberation of human beings. On the one hand, in Marx's view, the state is the product of class struggle, that is, a public power institution established by the ruling class to safeguard its own interests[16]. The governance of capitalist countries mainly focuses on three aspects: first, to guarantee and maintain the mode of production of the capitalist system and the social order on which it depends; second, to protect the private property and interests of capitalists; and third, to promote capital accumulation. Therefore, Marx advocated the redefine of the state in a scientific way, emphasizing that the state should go beyond the limitations of simply maintaining a particular class and that state institutions should serve the overall well-being of society. On the other hand, Marx believed that society should be the basic form of human existence and would not die out, but its form would develop with the development of productive forces and the reform of production relations, form a consortium with the free development of each person as the condition for the free development of all people, thus effectively promoting social progress.

Fourth, Marx advocated the realization of the governance mode of technological participation in social change. He stressed that the working people should master the technological tools to break the old state machine. "Breaking up" is not only to overthrow the bourgeois government and destroy its armed forces, but also to establish a new proletarian regime. Marx was in favor of the first break, with a proletarian technology to support the proletarian regime led to the change of state power. Marx explored technology management mode with production socialization. According to the actual situation of the capitalist economic development in the 19th century, he observed that the production process was increasingly centralized and scale, and believed that the socialization of production and the private ownership of the capitalist means of production contradictory, and then concluded that "the demise of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat are also inevitable"[17]. Therefore, he tried to integrate technology into the process of social production in the form of production socialization.

Fifth, the political basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat is all the prerequisites to ensure the stability of the governance activities and the governance process. This requires that technical governance must get rid of the shackles of religion to thought in concept and the shackles of capitalist production relations to productive forces in material production, so as to establish the leading regime of the proletariat. First, "critique of religion is the premise of all other criticism" and "religion is the opium of the people"[18]. In Marx's opinion, religion restricts people's thoughts to a large extent, making them unable to give full play to their creativity and innovation ability. Technical governance must give full play to people's subjective initiative, which means that we must remove the conceptual obstacles, emancipate the mind, encourage scientific and rational way of thinking, so as to promote technological progress. Secondly, Marx stressed that we must get rid of the shackles of the capitalist relations of production on the productive forces and establish the leading regime of the proletariat. When the development of the productive forces is restricted by the relations of production, the productive forces will inevitably become destructive forces, and then aggravate the antagonism between classes. he stressed that "the communist revolution was not compatible with the social institutions created by the invention of social genius, but with the productive forces"[19]. The political basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat means to break the capitalist relations of

production and establish the socialist relations of production based on public ownership, so as to release the potential of productive forces and so that technological progress can truly serve the interests of the society.

4. The Contemporary Value of Marx's Technical Governance Thought

In the evolution of science and technology, human philosophical reflection and criticism of technical governance runs throughout, which has become an important path to promote political transformation and realize the practice of technology-enabled national governance. In contemporary society, digital technology and intelligent technology go hand in hand, enabling national and social governance practices, promoting the formation of a new pattern of modern governance, and serving the Chinese path to modernization drive. Marx's understanding of the essence of technology is a guide for the correct understanding of the essence of technology in the study of contemporary philosophy of science and technology. Marx based on the logical framework of human, nature and society, systematically analyzed the law of technology development, advocated the people-oriented value of the intention, technology to participate in the practice path and the dictatorship of the proletariat action premise. On the basis of governance technology, it can be the construction of communist social vision. It provides a theoretical basis for the study of the "people-centered" thought of socialist technological governance with Chinese characteristics, and also contributes Chinese wisdom and practical possibilities to global governance.

5. Conclusion

This study sorts out the historical background and theoretical origin of the formation of Marx's technical governance thought, and focuses on the main content of the technical governance thought which takes technology as the object and means of governance. Marx's technology governance thought is increasingly new and has important value to the theoretical and practical problems of the current era. First, it can provide practical possibilities for solving the practical dilemma of technical governance; second, it can promote the development of Chinese modernization. The study of Marx's thought on technical governance is still a major event that needs long-term and active efforts. This is the overall requirement of the Chinese modernization and the historical mission entrusted to us by the practice of global governance.

References

- [1] Cheng Haidong, Chen Fan. Understanding of technical governance from the practical context China Social Science Evaluation, 2021,(3), p83-90+159.
- [2] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 20. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1971, p362-363.
- [3] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 8. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1961, p67,202.
- [4] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 1. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1956, p464.
- [5] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 24. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1972, p370.
- [6] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 23. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1972, p174.
- [7] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. 1844 [M]. Chinese People's Publishing House, 2014, p47.
- [8] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 4. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1958, p163.

- [9] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 31. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1972, p236.
- [10] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 24. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1972, p352.
- [11] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 3. Chinese People's Publishing House, 2002, p276.
- [12] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 47. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1979, p566.
- [13] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 3. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1960, p84.
- [14] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 3. Chinese People's Publishing House, 2002, p192.
- [15] Hobbes. leviathan The Commercial Press, 2009, p248-249.
- [16] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 19. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1963, p7.
- [17] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 4. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1958, p479.
- [18] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 3. Chinese People's Publishing House, 2002, p199-200.
- [19] Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol. 3. Chinese People's Publishing House, 1960, p442.