CRITICAL ANALYSIS ON MARXIST ORTHODOXIES: A CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL HISTORY OF POLITICAL THEORY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

BERKAY KOÇAK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

SEPTEMBER 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist. Prof. R. Ömür Birler
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Örsan Ö. Akbulut (TODAİE)
Assist. Prof. R. Ömür Birler (METU, ADM)
Assoc. Dr. O. Galip Yalman (METU, ADM)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name :

Signature :

ABSTRACT

CRITICAL ANALYSIS ON MARXIST ORTHODOXIES: A CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL HISTORY OF POLITICAL THEORY

Koçak, Berkay
MS., Department of Political Science and Public Administration
Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Ömür Birler

September 2017, 155 pages

This thesis aims to identify the different approaches to historical materialism in a way describing the existing controversy between Political Marxism and mainstream (Orthodox) Marxism especially concentrating on their perspectives viewing the history of political thought. As the unique effort to understand the origins of political theory, the discipline namely 'the social history of political theory' -which was founded and developed by Ellen Meiksins Wood (1942-2016)- is revisited and re-evaluated in comparison with the works of mainstream Marxism in writing history of political thought. In addition, this study aims to illuminate the influence of other epistemologies on Marxist historical materialism in a way setting up the outlines of historical materialism's original position.

Keywords: Marxism, Methodology, Political Marxism, Political Thought, Historical Materialism

ÖZ

MARKSİST ORTODOKSİLERE ELEŞTİREL BİR ANALİZ: 'SİYASAL DÜŞÜNCENİN TOPLUMSAL TARİHİ' KATKISI

Koçak, Berkay
Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi : Yrd..Doç.Dr. Ömür Birler

Eylül 2017, 155 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı tarihsel maddeci yöntem üzerine farklı yaklaşımları, Siyasi Marksizm ve ana akım Ortodoks Marksizm arasında geçen siyasal düşünceler tarihi alanındaki çatışmayı ele alarak incelemektir. Siyaset kuramının kökenlerini anlamak için Ellen Meiksins Wood (1942-2016) tarafından bulunan ve geliştirilen 'siyasal düşüncenin toplumsal tarihi' yöntemi bu tezde ana akım Ortodoks Marksizm'in siyasal düşünceler tarihine dönük yaklaşımıyla karşılaştırmalı bir biçimde yeniden değerlendirilecektir. Buna ek olarak bu çalışma Marksist tarihsel maddeci yöntemi etkileyen diğer epistemolojik ve metodolojik gelenekleri araştırarak, bu anlamda tarihsel maddeciliğin kuramsallaştığı pozisyonun ana hatlarını ortaya koyacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Marksizm, Tarihsel Maddecilik, Siyasi Marksizm, Metodoloji, Siyasi Düşünce

To My Parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his deepest gratitude to his supervisor Assist. Prof. Ömür Birler for her guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research.

The author would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Örsan Akbulut and Assoc. Prof. Galip Yalman for their suggestions and comments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....iii

ABSTRACT.....iv

ÖZ.....v

DEDICATION.....vi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....viii

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. ON THE ORIGINS OF HISTORICAL MATERIALIST METHOD.....9

2.1 An Overview of Dialectical Relations.....10
2.1.1 The Double Dimension.....10
2.1.2 Determinant and Determined.....12
2.1.3 Constant Movement and Change.....14
2.1.4 Formal (Mainstream) Logic Building in Comparison.....16

2.2 Historical Materialism in Context.....19
2.2.1 Marx and Engels on Historical Materialism.....22
2.2.1.1 Demystification of Theory: Alienation, Power and Property.....23
2.2.1.2 Rethinking Political Economy: Labour, Class, Capital.....26
2.2.1.3 The Question on Historical Progress: Division of Labour.....32

III.THE FOUNDATIONS OF MARXIST ORTHODOXIES IN METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.....38
3.2 Regarding the Orthodoxy.....42
3.3 Construction of Orthodoxy in Methodological Perspective.....44
3.3.1 Rethinking Class and Method.....45
3.3.1.1 The Succession in the Orthodoxy.....46
3.3.1.2 Karl Kautsky and the Codification of German Marxist Orthodoxy..47
3.3.1.3 Lenin and the Recodification of the Marxist Orthodoxy.....52
3.3.1.4 The Legacy of Plekhanov.....53

3.3.1.5 Lenin and Materialism: The Struggle Among Polemics 59
3.3.2 Power and Revolution 63
3.3.2.1 The Intellectual Crossfire 64
3.3.2.2 Lenin and the Recodification of the Orthodoxy 71
3.3.3 The Theories on Imperialism 74
3.3.3.1 Road to Power and the Theory of Ultra-Imperialism in Methodological Perspective 74
3.3.3.2 Lenin on Imperialism 81
3.4 Marxist Orthodoxy on History of Political Thought Writing 83

IV. THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF POLITICAL THEORY 87
4.1 The British Marxist Historical Tradition 89
4.1.4 The Contribution of Robert Brenner and 'The Brenner Debate' 103
4.2 Foundations of the Method 'the Social History of Political Theory' 105
4.2.1 Rethinking the Findings of the Transition Debate 106
4.3 The Emergence of 'Social History of Political Theory' as Method 108
4.3.1 Determining Methodological Position 109
4.3.2 The Separation of the 'Economic' and the 'Political' in Capitalism 112
4.3.3 Against Mainstream and Orthodox Approaches in Political Thought ... 116
4.3.4 The Social History of Political Theory in Methodological Perspective 119
4.3.5 Locating the Beginning and the Journey of Political Thought 121
4.4 The Question of Political Marxism as a Tradition 123

V. CONCLUSIONS 128
5.1 Reconsidering the Social History of Political Theory with Historical Materialism 128

REFERENCES 134

APPENDICIES 144

A. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET 144

B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU 155

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Marxism has long been debated with its methodological approach that brought in a new way to explain the world according to the social and material conditions of production. Beyond this particular vision that it has, Marxism is both identified as a methodology and also an ideological positioning. Methodologically Marxism was constructed starting with the early studies of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, under the materialist tradition that had been encountering a wide divergence in the philosophy and emerging social sciences in the early 19th century. Although materialism was rather a tradition which had been around for a much longer time, starting from Marx and Engels, it had been reformulated in relation with the examination of social and material conditions in the period of capitalist transformation of the Europe. This reformulation had several characteristics that transformed the existing tradition to firstly an explanatory method for capitalism, secondly a vision to approach social reality from a perspective that was based on empirical observation of the context and class struggles.

The prominent methodological inquiries of historical materialism formulated by Marx and Engels, aimed to undermine the existing methodological status quo to achieve social reality from socially and materially explanatory grounds. In addition to this, the departure took place between Marx and Engels and German Philosophy was dependent on this divergence. Moreover, it was the desire to bring in a comprehensive explanation of the transforming social reality under capitalist mode of production. Capitalism starting from the period of Marx and Engels had already been diffused in Europe, however unevenly developed. It was only in the Britain that the founding fathers of the method had met a truly developed capitalist economy, in which they had chance to observe the emerging working classes, and a more sterile bourgeoisie which had systematically disconnected with the political, but transformed to a social class that was existent in the economic activities. A closer look to the context that Marx and Engels can provide a more comprehensive analysis on the first development of the method that they had reformulated.

Historical materialism from the context it firstly appeared in, was rather a methodological investigation of the capitalist mode of production that later turned to a systematic method concentrated on the context and changing social property relations which identified the class struggles. In this regard the critique of political economy of the capitalist development played a crucial role that define the most important characteristics of the historical materialist method. It was the critique of the capitalist mode of production which the founding fathers found crucially important to set up an alternative approach. The critique of classical political economy created the opportunity for Marx and Engels to open up a methodological investigation that seek for an alternative methodology. In this systematization, historical materialism was operating on a dialectical logic that provided a model of observing and identifying the grounds of social reality. The dialectical logic that Marx and Engels operated on was not complete model but rather a logic based on viewing social phenomenon multidimensionally and interrelated. Therefore, it was consistent to follow the starting point of empirical observation which problematized the examination of social and material conditions of the related phenomenon. In regard of this properties and perception, historical materialism was not welcomed by the existing epistemological and methodological traditions that were dependent on various other variables and approaches to achieve social reality. "Historical materialism as a new way to explain the world according to the material production, emerged as both a reaction "to the dominant epistemologies of nomothetic (empiric) and hermeneutic (interpretative), by claiming that the understanding of social reality cannot be 'overarching' theoretical engagement with knowledge, and the distinctions between the natural and social, objective and subjective, structural and practical, necessity and contingency, universal and particular blur the view of social reality" (Sayer, 1987: 23).

It is vital to observe the debate on Marx and Engels about the categorization of their studies according to the early and late periods, in a way seeking to show there are ruptures in the works of founding fathers. Although there are essential nuances that may trigger some understandings or interpretations that could assume that there are major other influences on Marx and Engels from classical political economy or from Hegelian legacy, it is significant to mention that their studies to a large extent carry the reservations to be considered as comprehensive, since the influences that they

face, made them more consistent to establish an alternative approach which can challenge these influences. In other words, rather than considering that there are ruptures in the production of founding fathers, it is prominent that although they had collected some influences from their contemporaries, they had successfully used them to make their methodological approach more challenging and more controversial which could barrage the external interventions and campaigns.

As the major objectives of the study, it is vital to problematize Marxist Orthodoxies critically in order to reveal firstly how they had interpreted and used the historical materialist method and how their approaches could be differentiated, and secondly to reveal why their approach and production in the field of history of political thought remained limited. In this regard, Marxist Orthodoxies will be the second topic to be critically analyzed according to their general characteristics, their interpretations and uses of method, their relationship with the original foundations of historical materialism, and their contributions to the Marxist theory especially in several themes that the developing contexts of capitalism with different formations.

It is essential in this point to briefly mention that the approach towards Marxist Orthodoxies will consider several important steps. Firstly, since there is no single body of these Marxist Orthodoxies, their plurality may refer to the different formations of capitalist development that appeared with several different historical processes. So, it is both the context that determined the level and quantity of the fragmentation of these Orthodoxies (both methodologically and ideologically), and it is secondly their interpretation that contributed to the position of historical materialist methodology. In other words, as first step their characteristics will be considered according to the context that set up the framework that their interpretation of theory differentiated from each other, and secondly their use of the method will be considered since it is essential to review how their use of the method and contributions according to that respond their contexts. As second step, it will be revealed that there exist several important reasons that made Marxist Orthodoxies to be disinterested in the field of history of political thought. In that sense, firstly their preoccupation on the themes of ‘class’, ‘power and revolution’ and ‘imperialism’ will be referred in accordance with their interpretations on their political strategies. This examination will refer to a larger reason which will indicate that Marxist

Orthodoxies were essentially confident and programmatized to take over the system by destroying capitalism globally, and in a large extent that is the main reason that they had failed to concentrate on how the capitalist system reproduced itself.

Following the early foundations of the method, it was the followers of Marxism that interpreted the method to use to explain the world. As the term orthodoxy refers to a strong principled engagement with a certain ideology or tradition, the followers of Marxism also used this reference to identify their commitment to the projection of the method. The interpretations on the method of the Marxist traditions brought in new debates on emerging phenomenon in capitalism. Class was especially reconsidered since the capitalization process of different contexts developed in various different ways that generated working classes with various different characteristics. Or it was the power relations which became a controversial challenge for the Marxists in some contexts like Russian Empire where the capitalization process prevailed under the control of a strong state mechanism. Imperialism as another phenomenon appeared in the late 19th century as a new form of capitalism. As the discussion between Marxist traditions in Germany and Russia shows, conceptualization of imperialism was even developed with strong intellectual and political controversies.

From this point one of the most influential qualities of historical materialism which is its contextualizing explanatory capacity, channeled, by Orthodox Marxism, to a general schema that the productive forces assumed to be progressive agent of the historical progress towards socialism. This channeling nevertheless, was a part of the orientation and interpretation of the method in relation with the political strategies and it contained a single path in explaining the social reality from the potential of productive forces. In relation to this nearly all the methodology of Marxism considered to be a deductive method. The reduction which took place left promising areas of research insufficiently fertile. However, as mentioned above, it was not only the disinterest of Marxist Orthodoxies which made the area fertile, rather their total concentration and recognition of how capitalism reproduce itself established the grounds.

The history of political thought as a significant field in social sciences, became one of the prominent areas this transformation to reductionism failed to produce an

alternative approach in relation to historical materialist method. Regarding the preoccupations and assumptions that made Marxist Orthodoxies away from this field, which is the field that can be considered as one of the prominent fields that brought in a story and narrative to how the social reality can be confirmed from the existing social property relations that refer the class societies. The history of political thought as field represented a narrative under the mainstream literature's hands which described there are several prominent categories such as 'justice', 'citizenship', 'the idea of Polis', 'right', 'utility' etc., which the whole of the political philosophy is composed of. These categories are presented as the natural influences and natural pathways for political thinkers as well. However, the construction of the narrative according to several principles and categories which are considered without the contexts that created them, and how the political thinkers could be considered away from their social, material and political conditions remains controversial.

It is vital to mention here that these disinterest and preoccupations did not mean that Marxism had failed to concentrate on theory. Although the prominent field of history of political thought has not been completely recognized, Marxism had always been theorized in several different periods by prominent traditions like Frankfurt School, Althusserian approaches, the Critical Theory tradition. However, in accordance with the purposes of the methodological investigation that this study carries on by problematizing the Marxist Orthodoxies, their contribution to the Marxist theory will not be reviewed in detail.

The British Marxist Historical Tradition appeared as a reaction to both the mainstream literature and also against Marxist Orthodoxies majorly in the field of history. The main objective that the tradition was to deconstruct the existing explanatory schemas on how history has been written on, and contextualize the prominent issues such as class, revolution, modes of production in accordance with a social analysis that could enlarge the explanatory capacity of Marxist methodology. Although the tradition was composed of different generations and different range of interests the prominent contribution of the tradition to Marxist methodology appeared with the reconsideration of class and history in accordance with the social property relations. As one of the major outputs of this tradition the debate on

transition from feudalism to capitalism appeared as a controversial debate that collected attention which would later evolve to open up new considerations on Marxist methodology.

Despite the disinterest of Orthodox Marxism to this field, the historical materialist method once again became controversial following the emergence of the 'Transition Debate'. The 'Transition Debate' contributed lots of other supportive areas like history of political thought, making the existing literature questioned. The findings of the 'Transition Debate' had questioned the explanatory schemas both the mainstream approaches and also the reductionist production that in a large extend Orthodox Marxist positions had formulated. Rather than concentrating on the explanations which considered different variables like 'trade', 'urbanization' or 'industrialization' to explain capitalism, the 'Transition Debate' attracted attention that these concentrations only follow methods that fail to refer to the social and material context of the related phenomenon. Robert Brenner's attempt in 'Transition Debate' to ground the transition to capitalism by concentrating on the social and property relations and the crisis of feudalism, provided a suitable path for reconsidering class struggles this time disconnected from schemas.

On the other hand, Ellen Meiksins Wood with her further contributions to methodological discussions against Post-Marxist approaches in 1980's had opened up another front that challenged the existing literature in a way critically revealing the actual concerns of these literatures to shadow the original premises of historical materialism which is primarily to become an alternative methodology. It was secondly another interest of Ellen Meiksins Wood to critically approach the field of history of political thought writing. By the introduction of this field with the help of Neal Wood, Ellen Meiksins Wood carried her methodological investigation to this field. It was this time the 'Transition Debate' had provided a suitable ground for Wood to develop an alternative and critical approach that intended to fulfill the premises of historical materialism. The questions and problematization over this field especially about the contextualization of the political thinkers and their productions, had driven Wood to use the findings of the transitions in theorizing about the context of related political figures. Brenner's and Wood's effort to emphasize the changing social and property relations which indicates the

reproduction capacities of developing capitalism, had provided a wide base to discuss with the existing literature.

-'The social history of political theory' as a method appeared with Ellen Meiksins Wood, seeking an alternative construction and rewriting of the field. "The social history of political theory' starts from the premise that the great political thinkers of the past were passionately engaged in the issues of their time and place" (Wood, 2008). As Wood defined the new method methodologically challenged the existing Orthodox Marxist and mainstream approaches in association with the findings of the 'Transition Debate'.

Regarding all of these points, this study concentrates on *'the social history of political theory'* which is an approach with a purpose of updating the historical materialist method in relation with the social and political context that the production in the history of political thought took place. The social history of political theory as an alternative method departs against the mainstream history of political thought writing in a way locating the source of the theory writing in the social and political context it took place, combining the properties of class character and the extend of autonomy of the political thinker with the production. The main purpose of this research is firstly to examine social history of political theory in relation with historical materialism, seeking their relevancy and investigating whether it is an update or a departure from the method, and secondly to analyze social history of political theory in comparison with the other methodological traditions which are claiming to follow historical materialism.

In that respect, first chapter is firstly going to focus on the basic principles of historical materialist method, defining the principles of dialectical logic and conceptualizations it contains. Secondly it is going to focus on the context that Marx and Engels developed this method against the other methodological approaches in a way discovering the foundations of properties of historical materialism which under their lead, transformed into Marxism.

The following chapter will open up a discussion in the Marxist literature on history of political thought and consider their method in comparison with the content of historical materialist method. Third chapter will examine the social history of political theory in comparison with the existing Marxist literature on the same issue,

regarding an analysis on the methodological approach of the social history of political theory. Lastly the perspectives regarding this new alternative approach will be examined including the perspective of the further generations that try to consider these contributions as a prominent tradition namely Political Marxism. Through these examinations, the relevancy and consistency of this new approach with the premises of historical materialist method, will be identified.

CHAPTER II

ON THE ORIGINS OF HISTORICAL MATERIALIST METHOD

The question of method arose, while Marx and Engels were in a way to disconnect from the Hegelian tradition and were about to establish the materialist method towards to receive social reality since their first engagement with political economy of the British thinkers. Although this question of method first appeared in the letters to Engels as "I should be very much to write two or three sheets making accessible to the common reader the rational aspect of the method which Hegel not only discovered but also mystified" (Marx, 1983:248), the real tendency of Marx had already started with his encounter with the political economy. It was cleared in the *Capital* with the well-known inform of Marx: "My dialectical method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite" (Marx, 1967: 19).

The critical approach of Marx later showed itself in his late works delightfully, as it will be discussed in this section. Although Marx and Engels's efforts formulated the early stages of the method of historical materialism, the question of method has continued to blur the Marxist tradition. The main reason behind was the lack of logic building, that established the relations between distinct phenomenon regarding the examination of social and material conditions with which lies in the core of dialectical materialism. The legacy of Marx and Engels was rather pre-accepted and imitated by the following Marxist traditions in a way against the method's assumptions.

In contemporary political philosophy, the question of method still continues to limit the potential of historical materialism, forcing it to transform to a practice which depends on law-like generalizations extinguishing the founding logic of the method, and thus undermining the departure point of the method that is the empirical observation. This limitation is also one of the departure points of this research, since this research aims to analyze the method of historical materialism, historically comparing the different approaches inside the method in relation to their use of method and their relevancy to the founding position of the method.

2.1 An Overview of Dialectical Relations

It is more proper to open up the examination on historical materialism from the internal construction of the method which essentially depends on the dialectical logic and empirical observation. Although materialism is a long-going tradition in the history of political thought, it gained a new dimension with the dialectical logic and historical interpretation of Marx and Engels. The framework of the method was formed under the critical interpretation of historicisation of the social and material conditions that Marx and Engels in a large extend conceptualized about the relations and phenomenon.

The very starting point of the method, as it occurs in Marx and Engels, is empirical observation. The empirical observation is nevertheless made through a filtering in relation to the theoretical frameworks that are already in existence but as it will be discussed in the following sections, the dialectical logic legislates, that the social phenomena are not always determined but also determinant.

The key concepts in the dialectical logic are; the *relations* are interactions among people, which may evolve in a social extent. *Processes* are transformations of people carry out in the context of these relations (Carchedi, 2011:3). Lastly *phenomena* can be referred as the 'unity in contradiction of relations and processes'. They are the basic units of social reality and also the starting points of the enquiry either social or individual. As Carchedi puts it; the main foundations of dialectical logic, the social phenomena can be associated with three principles: 'social phenomena are always both realized and potential', 'social phenomena are always both determinant and determined', and 'social phenomena are subject to constant movement and change'. It is vital to briefly evaluate on these principles in relation to the comprehensive picture of the dialectical logic building.

2.1.1 The Double Dimension

The methodological approach of dialectical logic lies behind the principles mentioned above and it is proper to start with the first principle which can briefly summarized as the social phenomenon's *multidimensional existence*, in order to construct a comprehensive outline of the methodological critic. As in the general physic principles of motion, a social phenomenon contains a potential and a real dimension. In that sense, it is what it is but also has a potential to be something else

due to the potentialities inherent in itself. Thus, the social reality has a double dimension, which is the what has become realized and might become realized in the future.

The concentration of Marx in *Capital* includes this multidimensional aspect of social phenomenon in the very early examples about the commodity. Commodity such as 'gold' or 'silver' as measure of value, being a product of labour, and being potential capital. The labourer realizes his potential due to his engagement with the economic activities, only by selling his labour. Further, examples such as the being of labourers and means of production as potential for production or commodity's potential mean to become capital could be given to this conceptualization of potential and real.

The notion of 'value' comes forward among these examples. "Upon its completion, a commodity contains value, crystallized human labour in the abstract. This is its individual value, a realized substance. But it is not the value that the commodity realizes upon its sale, its social value." (Carchedi, 2011:5). Marx also analyzed the notion of value according to the dialectic logic in a way separating it from the one in the classical political economy.

> "The real value of a commodity, however, is not its individual, but its social value; that is to say, its value is not measured by the labour-time that the article costs the producer in each individual case, but by the labour-time socially required for its production" (Marx, 1976:434).

It is possible to conclude that the individual value is also a potential social value.

The general points to follow are first, since a social phenomenon has a double dimension including its potential and real position, a phenomenon is the *'unity of identity and difference'* (Carchedi, 2011:6) (Ollman, 2003). Secondly a phenomenon also contains and also can be defined as the *unity of opposites*. It is also possible that a potential aspect of a social phenomenon can be the opposite of its realized aspect. As Lefebvre asserts 'life and death' are in unity since aging starts from the beginning of life and potentially carries the possibility of death although they are exact opposites (Lefebvre, 1982:164-172). Third, "a phenomenon is the unity of essence and appearance: its potential aspect is its own essence, that which can manifest itself in a number of different realizations, while its realized aspect is its

appearance, the form taken by one of the possibilities inherent in its potential nature" (Carchedi, 2011:6).

It is vital to mention that potentials although they might exist inside an opposite composition of a phenomenon's real aspect, never exist without the relations and processes which activating them. Therefore, they have no absolute shape or form rather they are shaped when their activation with social relations and processes start. That is why the empirical observation is crucial to identify a potential aspect of a social phenomenon. The empirical observation examines the relations and processes which establishes the ground for a phenomenon to change.

As final considerations, it is significant to state that realized phenomenon can contain the potential aspects in itself. However potential phenomenon as the formless and yet passive notions cannot include realized aspects in themselves until they become somehow activated. "Realization is thus the transformation of what is potentially present into a realized form" (Carchedi, 2011:7). Another consideration about potentials is that they can never be observed until they become realized since they are no ideal forms that can be used for definition. On the other hand, it is possible to reveal a potential within a certain sphere of reality, in another abstraction level. As in the examples in *Capital*, an individual vale of a commodity as an output of a production has different real correspondence due the set of relations it engages with. Commodity has a socially constructed labour value, a part of a capital accumulation potential, or another exchange value in money form. So, considering the different relationships a potential can be revealed unless the relationships and processes are defined.

2.1.2 Determinant and Determined

The second principle following the double dimension of the social phenomenon, is about the inter-connectivity of the social reality. According to the dialectical logic as Carchedi puts it;

> "all elements of social reality are inter-connected into a whole that this whole change continuously, that this change can be continuous or discontinuous, and the whole's inter-connected parts can be contradictory, that is the reproduction of some phenomena

> might imply the super-session of some other phenomena and vice versa"[1] (Carchedi, 2011:8).

For Marx and Engels, as the society provides unchangeable potentialities such as human beings in the sense that human beings having the capacity to create their own means of production and creating societies, the dialectical determination should be rooted socially according to the class-analysis which exposes these potentialities with relation to the social and material conditions concerning the anatomy of the conflicts about the means of production. The potentialities may change according to the modes of production as in the example, under capitalism, the potentialities lie under the *ownership-relations* that create and cause the hierarchy of social classes.

Furthermore, the ownership relations cause the design and properties of the production, which in return determines the social, economic and political forms of relationships in a society. The existence of ownership relations also can consolidate the ruling classes to be more dominating over the ruled classes. On the other hand, it may cause a resistance in long run. As the exploitation level increases, this which might cause transformation to another phase in a society where ruling classes can be overthrown or they are forced to share the power and decision-making processes by other forms of power. As the example shows, although capitalism determine the relationships and processes that reproduces its rule, the same relationships and processes might encourage contradictory social and material conditions which renders capitalism into a determinant. Again, a double-sided relationship appears in this principle as the empirical example also supports. This double-sided relationship by all means depends upon the relationships and processes that may activate the potentials inside the phenomena also characterizing them. As the double property of the phenomena create the characteristics of it, every phenomena have their own uniqueness, which makes them relatively autonomous from each other (*causa sui*).

A further investigation on the ontology of the determinant and determined characteristics of social phenomenon can illuminate the analysis. As the determined phenomena are the elements presently exist in the determinant phenomena in the characteristics of potential, the determinant phenomena are the ontological conditions of existence of the determined ones. So, the determined phenomena

[1] Ibid., pp.8.

become also the conditions of reproduction or super-session of the determinant ones. "Thus, a relation of mutual determination, or a dialectical relation, is one in which the determinant phenomenon calls in to realized existence the determinant one from within its own potentialities through its interaction with other phenomena"[2] (Carchedi, 2011:15). As a phenomenon contains and causes another phenomenon, the determined phenomenon is both a part of the determinant but also different since it is not existing in the same conditions that the determinant had started its journey. So, the determined carries the determination of the determinant phenomena in the core that makes the determined the reproductive of the determinant. However, this discontent may evolve into a contradiction which dynamizes the dialectical relationship between the determinant and the determined.

Dialectical relationships are different than mutual relations or cause-effect relationships since the relationship of determination between the determinant and the determined is a very specific form of interaction in which contradictions make the relation continue while each side transforms.

2.1.3 Constant Movement and Change

As the two principles mentioned above clarified the last principle of constant movement and change is now more open for examination. Again, starting from the empirical observation, a phenomenon in the dialectical logic undoubtedly includes a potential phenomenon which is according to the relations and processes will either reproduce or contradict the determinant in a way transforming it. Potential phenomena prevent a phenomenon to be considered as static. Moreover, the potential also creates and causes the change which in parallel, forms the limitations and the quality of the change. So, phenomena are both what they are and what they are becoming in relation with the process of the potentiality inside them. Processes are continuous in the dialectical relations. "Thus, movement, is the change undergone by phenomena from being realized to being potential and vice versa and from being determinant to being determined and vice versa"[3] (Carchedi, 2011:18).

[2] Ibid., pp.15.

[3] Ibid., pp.18.

Movement in a dialectical relation has several properties that define its characteristics. Firstly, the movement is temporal in the extent it derives from potential until it is realized. Following the realization movement goes back to the potential state preparing the ground for the next realization. Secondly, movement is contradictory according to the inner contradictions that phenomenon have in the process of realization. Next, movement is depended and limited in the borders of the specific conditions that the relationship takes place. As referred they are the 'law of movement' These specific conditions emphasized also by Marx, as 'same under all modes of production'[4] (Marx, 1967:790). As fourth the law, movement contains tendencies which are in relation with their contradictory processes and also with the laws of movement that determine the limitations and conditions of the characteristics of the process. So, a phenomenon as a determinant creates another phenomenon containing it, in process the contradiction between them grows and causes another phenomenon to evolve while the determinant is also determined. By that, the tendencies of contradiction appear which is setting the direction of the phenomena. For example, in the situation of a labour mobility towards a country, the determined phenomena of mobility may affect the conditions in that country causing an over-population. Then with the over-population unemployment increases triggering a decrease in the average wage in the economy. However, it may also trigger an application which allows different wages to same jobs according to workers identity. So, immigrants although they are doing the same work are less-paid making the locals advantageous. As seen in the example there are different tendencies which contradict each other namely the tendencies and counter-tendencies.

The principles of dialectical method allow to develop more complex relationships in which social, economic, political, natural context intervenes the relations, grounding the process of achieving social reality. As the starting point remains empirical observation it is possible in dialectical method to historicize the phenomena without ignoring or trivializing any kind of cause, effect, perception, event or influence. Nevertheless, dialectical logic needs to be considered with historical materialist method in order to identify the origins of the method.

[4] Ibid., pp.790.

2.1.4 Formal (Mainstream) Logic Building in Comparison

In order to understand the dialectical logic, it is vital to examine the mainstream traditional form logic building. The general trend in social sciences is determined by the mainstream, as Carchedi names 'the formal logic' building. The formal logic building analyzes social reality with different answers and approaches the question of method in a way this thesis will critically evaluate on (Carchedi, 2011).

Like in the dialectical logic, the traditional formal logic has also several basic laws that characterizes its approach. To begin with formal logic unlike the dialectical logic, it does not depend on multidimensionality of the social phenomena. Rather in formal logic a phenomenon is what it is and nothing more. The identity of a phenomena is its structure, appearance or other visible characteristics. The definitions on phenomenon are made through this direct observation without any possibility in relation to phenomenon's relations and processes such as in social, political, natural, economic context. In that sense, formal logic conceptualizes a phenomenon in a single dimension unlike dialectical logic which conceptualizes a phenomenon both in a realized and also with a potential dimension.

Secondly for the formal logic construction a phenomenon no contradictions exist in a category. In a single dimension, a phenomenon has only one and only form. Then from a critical perspective, phenomena turns in to an absolute or 'ideal' concept which as in the Aristotelian philosophy a matter found its form which will make it concrete[5].

Furthermore, since there are no contradictions or potentials in a phenomenon, formal logic refuses to approach the law of constant movement and change. This disregard is consistent with the formal logic, since it does not observe the surrounding social

[5]As one of the major foundations of traditional formal logic, "Aristotle's logic, especially his theory of the syllogism, has had an unparalleled influence on the history of Western thought" (Smith, 2017). The relationship between the formal logic and Aristotelian philosophy can be traced back further, since Aristotelian philosophy had its impact on the foundations of social sciences way back to middle ages. The general characteristics of Aristotelian philosophy depends on the separation of matter and its ideal form, trying to load a meaning to the existence of anything in the nature. According to this logic, a seed of a certain plant, exists with the purpose of becoming a plant. And this represents its ideal form.
In the traditionalized formal logic, the observation on a specific phenomenon are done in order to categorize the phenomena, according to its function or its general properties (like appearance). In this regard, traditional formal logic like Aristotelian logic, approaches the abstraction process with a one-dimensional perspective, without contextualizing or focusing on the relationships of the phenomenon.

and material conditions of a phenomena rather only concentrates on the realized dimension which can be misleading. On the other hand, in dialectical logic, contradictions caused by the potential dimension of a phenomena also explains and justifies the movement and constant change. Furthermore, the concepts and categories of historical materialism are totally historical, since they rapidly defined through the movement of complex social relations of production (Sayer, 1983:20). As Sayer mentions, this process of justification which does not stick upon a single categorization for the general amount of time, it deliberates the conceptualization according to the social and material conditions which are actual.

Criticisms against the laws of formal logic can be made firstly on its 'truism' which namely departs from the assumption that equalizes a phenomenon directly to itself. If a phenomenon is only what it is, then building up a logic on it, will only result with the exactly same result. It stays at the level of observation for scientific purposes. Therefore, the same criticism is valid for the content of a phenomena in which non-contradictions are assumed. If there are phenomenon without internal contradictions, their change may only depend on the external interventions, which actually forms the traditional logic's perception on relations and processes especially in the cause-effect relationships.

It is possible to expand this criticism. One the one hand traditional formal logic approaches the relations justifying them with external interventions, which concern other realized phenomenon but not the potential lying inside the taken phenomena. So, the relations do not include a determinant and determined phenomenon; meaning a phenomenon is either determinant or determined. Thus, such a relationship can be categorized as in cause-effect relationships, with the intervention of other phenomena since it can only be observed chronologically but not at the same time of realization. The explanations on this single-dimensional perspective can be made in various forms however it remains adherent and incapable of explaining the relations of each phenomenon one by one. As the variety of singularities existing in formal logic, within each having its ideal meaning and form, no justifications can be made on social content.

According to materialist approaches, the method of formal logic can be considered 'ideological' -especially for the class-content of dialectical logic- since, it attempts

to defend a static state of being, ignoring the social and material conditions, as well as the existence of classes or conflicts between them. Formal logic's inability to justify change, and contradictions does not make it confident or true, rather it makes it incapable and metaphysical. These accusations of materialist approaches towards formal logic's incapability and being metaphysical depends on the formal logic's explanations on the social reality. As well as its static perspective and ignore of the grounding explanation of social and material conditions namely the context, formal logic bases its approach on formulating knowledge by accumulating the general properties of the related variable. In other worlds, for formal logic not the context but the appearance or the function of a variable determines the explanation about it and also the relations. This approach as mentioned, certainly provides some characteristics about a variable even describing its main qualities however, for materialist approaches the knowledge about a phenomena can only be identified by looking the context and the relations of the phenomena with the context. So, the descriptions of formal logic on the knowledge of a phenomena or a variable, can only be limited. Following this property, for materialist approaches, the non-material explanation of formal logic appears as a metaphysical explanation, since the relationship between the knowledge acquired and the phenomena itself, depends not on social or material grounds but assumptions on the behavior or the appearance of a phenomena. Therefore, the non-material explanation of a phenomena is considered by materialist approaches as 'ideological' in the sense that it carries knowledge assumed from a perspective which is open for controversy. As a further example for this categorization following up this argument, the critique of Marx on Hegel's historical schema depends on this same discussion. Marx criticizes Hegel's schema of history, which is a schema composed of a dialectical logic, bounding the social formation from family to civil society and state, regarding the absolutism of the definition on historical progress and the assumptions that it carries on social property and class. The departure point of Marx depends on the examination of Hegel's categories which are defined by themselves, disconnected from each other. Moreover, the theory of Hegel's social property is not located on a logic but an assumption on the middle classes that attracted Marx's attention. Marx stated that it was not the method but the descriptions or ideals which directed Hegel to formulate such a progression theory. Hegel not established the relations in a logic, but

described the existing patterns with a suitable logic. So, it is not the social and material conditions that Hegel concentrated, rather the categories of the existing society (Marx, 1963, 2000) From the criticism of materialism, the formal logic in that sense what Engels remarked in *The Dialectics of Nature*, "metaphysical categories retain their validity for everyday use, for the small change of science" (Engels, 1987:494).

Regarding these comparative points, a further examination of the historical context of historical materialism need to be done, in order to illuminate the main research question of this study namely 'the social history of political theory' since to test its approach technically according to its claims which indicate the necessity of a materialist method in the history of political thought writing. The following section will touch upon origins and context historical materialism in relation with the production of Marx and Engels namely the founders of Marxism.

2.2 Historical Materialism in Context

Historical materialism as a new way to explain the world according to the material production, emerged as both a reaction "to the dominant epistemologies of nomothetic (empiric) and hermeneutic (interpretative), by claiming that the understanding of social reality cannot be 'overarching' theoretical engagement with knowledge, and the distinctions between the natural and social, objective and subjective, structural and practical, necessity and contingency, universal and particular blur the view of social reality" (Sayer, 1987: 23). Although its emergence does not signify rise of an alternative epistemology, from its early foundation, historical materialism is considered not as an epistemology but rather as a method which tries to correspond the established divisions between natural, political, economic, and social in the understanding of nineteenth century science.

To start with historical materialism is not a method in which there are established conceptualizations and suggestions about reaching the reality or the relations between subjects and objects of the history. Since the already existing epistemologies distinguishes among natural, social, political, and economic realms while understanding the relations between subject and object in a way separating them as the agents of reality; historical materialism argues against such 'given' distinctions between those realms, claiming that all these realms are all crucial to

establish a more comprehensive picture of the reality since they are all related with each other as well as with the material production, which for historical materialism is the major dynamic that sets out the conditions of life. Moreover, for historical materialism, social reality is 'internally' constructed[6] and related, in which the aspect exists only in the relations with the other aspects that take place in the totality (Comninel 1987: 19). Rather than the given distinctions between the object and subject in the empiric and hermeneutic epistemologies, historical materialism perceives the unity of subjects and objects in relation to the dialectic relationship that they have with each other and with the material conditions that they exist in. As it is possible to observe in the early writings of Marx and Engels[7], historical materialism does not see the social and the natural as distinct but as concurrent, *'double relationship'* in which the material is socialized and historicized, and the social is originated in the material world. In this respect, historical materialism sees social constructs not as "relations between people, and things", but as "relations between people" which make the apparent distinctness between natural and social possible in the first place.

The socialization attempt of the material production of historical materialism also enables it to understand and outline the historicity of forms of social life. Since the materialization of the social creates a historical dimension for the explanation of the existence of social, it also extends the limitations of the conceptualizations that can be used. Although production is not the only extend that the conceptualizations are created, it is the essential source. Therefore, the concepts and causal relationships for historical materialism are explanatory only in relation to their historical contexts since the concepts and causal relationships are also created in their contexts.

The concentration on production as the priority of historical materialism also drives it to originate the agents of history according to the social and material conditions.

---

[6] As the discussion on dialectical logic and empiric observation supports, historical materialism stands on a logic that grounds itself upon the phenomenon's potential and real dimensions internally contradicting and progressing towards a dynamic relationship.

[7] Marx, Karl & Engels, F. (1998). *German Ideology*. London: Penguin.

Marx, Karl & Engels, F. (2002). T*he Communist Manifesto.* London: Penguin

Marx, Karl. (1964). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: International

Productive forces as a prominent category in the studies of historical materialism, becomes one of the characteristic conceptualizations that manifest itself as the driving force in history. Although there are different approaches to the use of productive forces as a subject for historical progress (which will be mentioned and discussed in the following chapters), historical materialism's position is consistent with its method, in which productive forces are only active in relation to its relation with *'relations of production'* and its inner dialectics. So, historical materialism asserts that productive forces are constituted only through forms of social interaction in process of material production (Sayer, 1983:26).

In the light of the original premise of historical materialism, all of the conceptualizations and constructions such as 'social forms of consciousness', 'forms of state', 'division of labour' and 'people's mode of co-operation' also become productive forces, to the extent that they constitute a form of social relation of production (Sayer, 1983: 36-37). Despite the employment of categories and concepts as universal and law-like 'general categories' that could be applied to each stage of history, historical materialism pursues the historical contexts of categories and explanations. Therefore, according to historical materialism, the knowledge of a social relation of production can only be expressed through studying it empirically. Thus, for historical materialism, the relations of production give us 'the form of society' or 'mode of life' that people go through in a historical conjecture (Sayer, 1983:13,62.77).

In its own emergence, historical materialism also engages with the social and material relations which are directly related with the rise of capitalism as the new mode of production. Historical materialism empirically studies the historical trajectory and asserts that capitalism is constituted by a long protracted of class struggles, which were fought through the ideational, jurisdictional, political and social forms without treating them as distinct issues of life (Sayer, 1983: 52,56,57). As it will be discussed in the following sections, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels whom formulated the historical materialism's original position directly engaged with

the transformation of capitalism in every aspect of social life from economic to scientific[89].

As seen, the main premises of historical materialism are directly related with the social and material conditions of production, in a way refuting the other epistemologies' or methodologies' positions while explaining the social reality.

In the light of overviewing the guidelines of the theoretical position of historical materialism, it is necessary to historically overview the emergence of this method in relation to both the historical context of the setting that was constructed and also the context of the founders of the original position of this method: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Since historical materialism contains a dynamic historical background with several empirical attempts to formulate itself in relation to the conditions of nineteenth century capitalizing Europe, the development of historical materialism as a method can be read from its challenges to the transformations of capitalist mode of production.

2.2.1 Marx and Engels on Historical Materialism

While examining the method of historical materialism, the method of Karl Marx throughout his life sets out the original guidelines. As mentioned the historical context of historical materialism continues to influence Marx while his studies were formulating the milestones of the method. In order to reveal the guidelines of historical materialism in Marx's method, it is essential to concentrate on the main features of historical materialism which are based on the construction of dialectical logic and resulted with demystification and materialization of the social, political and economic relations in the society, and emphasis on their unity while reaching the social reality. These features of historical materialism are going to appear in Marx's method in relation to the arguments and setting he is engaging with in different positions.

---

[8] Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. (1967). *Capital; a Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International.

[9] Engels, Friedrich. (1966). *Dialectics of Nature*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

2.2.1.1 Demystification of Theory: Alienation, Power and Property

To a large extend, Marx's method was originated from two major criticisms; firstly, against the Hegelian dialectics, and secondly the classical materialism.

As mentioned above Marx started his activities with an engagement with the critical theory on Hegel, since he was one of the Young Hegelians, later named as *Left Hegelians,* who were in conflict with the tradition and the followers of Hegel's legacy. Hegel's idealist methodology and the conceptualizations were later used universally to explain the bourgeoisie society and its development (*Bürgerliche Gesellschaft*) contained, a sophisticated method composed of complex relationships between subject and object in relation to metaphysical content. The content of the dialectical logic of Hegel is a very broad topic which this thesis will only briefly explain.

In this method, Hegel assumed a dialectical relationship in which phenomenon encounter with their opposing phenomenon, namely anti-thesis, and transform into another phenomenon which carries both from the two phenomena. Although it transforms into a phenomenon likely to be having the properties like a result, the dialectical relationship of Hegel does not formulate an internally developing relation rather an external intervention[10]. So, for Hegel the phenomenon are static categories which do not have internal contradictions but only externally activated capacities.

[10] In this point, it is vital to examine Hegel's construction on dialectical relationships. In *Encyclopaedia Logic* Hegel defines the logic building behind dialectics in three sides or moments. First moment namely moment of understanding is the the moment of fixity. In this moment concepts or forms are in a stable form and definition. Second moment 'the dialectical' or 'negatively rational' moment is the moment of instability. In this moment, the one-dimensional characteristics in the stability moment shiftes to a confrontation with its opposite. This shift happens in sublation which means cancelling and preserving itself at the same time. "The third moment—the "*speculative*" or "*positively rational*" (EL §§79, 82) moment—grasps the unity of the opposition between the first two determinations, or is the positive result of the dissolution or transition of those determinations (EL §82 and Remark to §82)

Hegel's description on these moments construct the base for his modelling. Since the sublation shift both preserves but changes the moment or the phenomena, it is cumulatively growing and trying to end in an absolute idea. "Finally, because the dialectical process leads to increasing comprehensiveness and universality, it ultimately produces a complete series, or drives "to completion" (SL-dG 33; cf. PhG §79). Dialectics drives to the "Absolute", to use Hegel's term, which is the last, final, and completely all-encompassing or unconditioned concept or form in the relevant subject matter under discussion (logic, phenomenology, ethics/politics and so on). The "Absolute" concept or form is unconditioned because its definition or determination contains all the other concepts or forms that were developed earlier in the dialectical process for that subject matter" (Maybee, 2017).

Maybee, J. (2017). Hegel's Dialectics. Plato.stanford.edu. Retrieved 16 July 2017, from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hegel-dialectics/#HegeDescHisDialMeth

Furthermore, there is a tendency to describe a destination of the process of the dialectical relations of Hegel. According to the destination, there will be an ideal order where the synthesis in dialectical relations, will be idealized meaning they will be equalized. In its one true form, namely in the 'absolute idea', in his historical schemes considered to be the 'state' which comes from the progress starting with family, later followed by the creation of the civil society.

So, Marx in his first project of doctorate, concentrated on the history of political thought of Ancient Greece, where he compared the philosophy of Epicurus and Democritus. As Hunt mentions it was the first-time Marx engaged with a critical method against the Hegelian:

> "Marx's doctoral thesis, 'The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature', was concerned with the atomism of Epicurus and Democritus, which is considered the foundation of materialist philosophy. Marx was also familiar with Lucretius's theory of clinamen. Marx and Engels both concluded that Hegelian philosophy, at least as interpreted by their former colleagues, was too abstract and was being misapplied in attempts to explain the social injustice in recently industrializing countries such as Germany, France, and the United Kingdom, which was a growing concern in the early 1840s" (Hunt, 2009:75).

Marx started his criticism on Hegel in the critique of 'The Philosophy of Right', where "he challenged Hegel's claim that state officials provided the essential 'universal' or 'general' element that was lacking in the particularism of civil society" (Comninel, 2000: 480). Marx's argument followed a refutation of the universality of the middle classes since they have ongoing interests in the private property. Furthermore, it is possible to observe Marx's first engagement with the topic of power and state. According to Marx, Hegel's idealization of state itself represents a kind of alienation (Marx, 2000).

Mainly the first part of the question of method in Marx and Engels appeared in their critical engagement with the Hegelian method, which dissatisfied them due its teleological tendency of the historical progress and more importantly the relations between phenomenon. As the Hegelian method of dialectics were declared as 'ideological constructions of ideal categories and history narrative' in the 'German Ideology', it was from its first assumption ignored the social and material conditions

of progress. It was namely excluding a materialist notion that for Marx and Engels has more explanatory power over the great transformation in the Europe at a close period towards to mid-nineteenth century. Rather Hegelian approach was glorifying the developing capitalization process, under the rise of the new establishment of state mechanism.

Starting from his earlier works, Marx also critically engaged with the studies of Young Hegelians and his early formulations of historical materialism showed itself in his critique against Bauer and Feuerbach in the 'German Ideology', the 'Jewish Question' and most importantly but in an indirect way in the 'Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844'. Rather than the concentration on religion as the Young Hegelians pursued, for Marx, the state and the concentration of power created the real alienation. With regard to these studies, Marx opposed the perspectives of Bauer and Feuerbach in the context of history and materialism. After writing two articles for the *Deutsche-Französische Jahrbücher* in 1843 and 1844, "Marx carried forward this analysis to transcend the entire framework of the French Revolutionary politics." (Comninel, 2000:481). In his confrontation with Bruno Bauer in the 'Jewish Question', Marx, paid attention to the secularizing project of Bauer, since it only conceives political emancipation rather than human emancipation (Marx & Engels, 1987:168). In addition to his critique on Bauer, Marx again emphasized the political power and its "necessarily ensuring the separation of human social capacities from humanity as a whole. True emancipation must therefore depend on ending this separation, and so necessarily the political form of state" (Comninel, 2000:481).

This debate was mainly the debate that Marx also confronted with the classical materialist tradition, which was against Hegelian hegemony and was popularizing in Germany. The essential aspect of this debate was that Marx and later Engels in 'Anti-Dühring' found their opportunity to open up a new path in which both Hegelian dialectics and classical materialism will be refuted. Instead, they were in favor of approaching the real issues they were considering namely the alienation that was caused by the transformations in state and society were happening. This debate before the very engagement of Marx and Engels with the actual class confrontation

in France, announced a necessity of a new method which is expected to base on empirical reality. As Jakubowski states:

> "A real unity of thought and being, of subject and object, can only be reached by going beyond the formal unity of Hegel. The dialectic is the basis of Hegel's philosophy, it is his legacy; but in order to hold consistently to this dialectic, Hegelian philosophy must be surmounted. Marx and Engels, and Feuerbach before them, were acting in the spirit of Hegel when they rejected his idealist thesis. Their materialist inversion of Hegel was not an arbitrary act but a demand of the dialectic. The critique of Hegelian idealism is not a purely empirico-practical one-its roots are in Hegelian theory itself (Jakubowski, 1936)"

Marx was in favor of establishing a framework in which 'the critique of law, ethics, politics, etc., in a series of distinct, independent pamphlets, can be presented as a connected whole"[11] (Sayer, 1985:221-53). As mentioned, even from the very early years Marx tried to materialize the theorization of his generation, paying attention to the unity of political, social and economic realms. With regard to this notion, his critical approach to German philosophy was in a large extend about demystification and materialization of the social and the political. However, the approach of political economy which grounded the materialization of the social in historical materialist method and which later became the original goal of Marx's studies only appeared incompletely in his manuscripts. "The central problem addressed in the earlier works remained that of the state, consonant with the pre-capitalist political thought from Rousseau through the French Revolution and Hegel, down to Young Hegelians" (Comninel, 2000: 480).

2.2.1.2 Rethinking Political Economy: Labour, Class, Capital

Since it remained to a large extend blur, Marx's criticisms only gained a more advanced ground and developed a method to achieve and explain social reality with his shifting focus to use political economy to create analytic explanations about the materialization of the social. His engagement with political economy empowered his thought by transforming it in to a social thought. A social thought "that transcended the limits imposed by pre-capitalist society altogether recognizing in capitalism a specific source of historical dynamism with the potential to emancipate humanity

[11] Marx, Karl. (1964). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: International

from all forms of alienation and exploitation…”[12](Comninel, 2000: 482). Friedrich Engels after introducing political economy to Marx, first prefigured the key arguments that Marx and him planned out in the *Communist Manifesto*. In the *‘Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy’* Engels mentions:

> “as long as you continue to produce in the present unconscious, thoughtless manner; at the mercy of chance- for just so long trade crises will remain; and each successive crisis is bound to become more universal and therefore worse than the preceding one; is bound to impoverish a larger body of small capitalists, and to argument in increasing proportion the numbers of the class who live by labour alone, thus considerably enlarging the mass of labour to be employed (the major problem of our economists) and finally causing a social revolution such as has never been dreamt of in the philosophy of the economists” (Marx & Engels, 1987: 434).

The question on working classes was an ongoing debate in France which was updated rapidly as the class struggles resulted with strikes, and occupations. Engels pays attention to the characteristics of the revolution’s which for him will definitely be the working classes. This focus on working classes as the agents of revolutions gives a guideline to Marx’s while he was discovering the premises of political economy. Marx first uses of political economy took place only after his engagement with the political economists.

In the “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844”, Marx’s engagement with political economy brought in two major questions: “What in the evolution of mankind is the meaning of the reduction of the greater part of mankind to abstract labour?” and for the emancipation of working class “What are the mistakes committed by the piecemeal reformers, who either want to raise wages… or regard equality of wages… as the goal of social revolution?” (Marx &Engels, 1987) (Comninel, 2000: 482). In the light of these questions Marx’s engagement with political economy shows itself on the basis of social formations and class divisions in the capitalist society.

After exploring the classic political economists and their analytical studies, Marx seems to had reached some conclusions which represented the position of political

[12] Ibid., pp.482

economy for his method. Firstly, since Marx approached political economy critically, he questioned the method of classical political economists, of Adam Smith and Ricardo who contributed social theory with their political economic categorization based on the division of labour. The influence of the division of labour on Marx can be observed in his later studies as well. According to Marx the division of labour is consistent with the character of bourgeois mode of production, as it increases the level of production and surplus. However, it fails for the worker who provides the labour since it reduces the social being of them, while making them less creative and alienated. Marx also pays attention to the commodification of the work force.

> "Labour's realization is its objectification. Under these economic conditions this realization of labour appears as loss of realization for the workers; objectification as loss of object and bondage to it; appropriate as *estrangement*, as alienation… Political economy conceals the estrangement inherent in the nature of labour by not considering the direct relationship between the worker (Labour) and production" (Marx & Engels, 1956: 270, 271)

> "We have preceded from the premises of political economy. We have accepted its language and its laws… On the basis of political economy itself, in its own words, we have shown that the worker sinks to the level of a commodity and becomes the most wretched of commodities… that the necessary result of competition is the accumulation of property in a few hands… that the whole society must fall apart into the two classes- the property owners and the property less *workers*" (Marx & Engels, 1956: 266, 267, 270)

With his emphasis on the commodification of the work force, Marx develops three general points about the classical political economy. "First the institution of private property, the basis of the system is taken for granted. Second, the laws of political economy are little better than descriptive generalizations. Hence finally, apparently accidental circumstances are projected as 'necessary, inevitable, and natural developments'" (Evans: 1990, pp. 648). As seen, Marx objects the generalizations of political economists on the natural development of capitalism with the contribution of division of labour and stages in historical progress. Moreover, Marx locates the center of capitalist development as the ownership of private property which is totally dependent on alienated labour that is sustained by the system. Although it is not the first-time that Marx mentions private property, its link with alienation is carefully empowered by political economy first sighted in these manuscripts.

> "Private property is thus the product… of alienated labour… Private property… results by analysis from the concept of alienated labour" (Marx & Engels, 1956: 275-76).

Marx's effort to step in the political economy which also meant a new understanding of history, was based on a very core idea of historical materialism that differs it from any other materialist understanding. As George Comninel clearly summarizes:

> "…the very core of historical materialism, its fundamental difference from liberal materialist history: where the latter takes for granted the social relations of property which even the economists recognized as leading to great disparities in class, historical materialism instead recognizes property to be the result of specific and historical *social violence* the exploitative alienation of productive humanity" (Comninel: 1987, 130).

In the studies of *Grundrisse*, 'The Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy' and finally in the *Capital*, Marx formulates again the origins of the historical materialist method as not under the division of labour like in the 'German Ideology' but as under the historical process of production. The historical origins of production is a major cause of social and political formation of the society, in a way characterizing it. In the *Grundrisse* Marx distinguishes the division of labour from his use in the 'German Ideology', which follows the existence of natural laws that can identify the societies, by claiming:

> "as encased in eternal natural laws independent of history, at which opportunity bourgeois relations are then quietly smuggled in as the inviolable laws on which society in the abstract founded," (Marx, 1973:87).

In '*Grundrisse'* Marx rather takes the concept of exchange. However, the concept of exchange is also redrafted in 'A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy', by adding there can be a social division of labour which does not necessarily becomes the base of production (Marx, 1970: 60,208; 51, 92). In order to grasp the core of the dynamics of a society in economic, social and political dimensions, Marx states that it is a requirement to ground the analytic example on its historical context. In '*Grundrisse'* Marx attempts to categorize his first detailed sketch of types of societies, which are grounded on their relations of production. Rather than the scientific and anthropologic variability of these categorizations, Marx's use of his method appears very solidly on these separations. According to him there are three

major types of communal societies: Primitive, Ancient, Germanic. The first communal society, the primitive communal society by Marx described as:

> "the clan community, the natural community, appears not as a result of, but as a presupposition for the communal appropriation (temporary) and utilization of the land. When they finally do settle down, the extent to which this original community is modified will depend upon various external, climatic, geographic, physical etc. conditions as well as on their particular natural predisposition- their clan character. This naturally arisen clan community, or, if one will, pastoral society, is the first presupposition- the communality of blood, language, customs- for the appropriation of the objective conditions of their life, and of their life's reproducing and objectifying activity… The real appropriation through the labour process happens under these presuppositions, which are not themselves the product of labour, but appear as its natural or divine presuppositions" (Marx, 1973:472).

From this long quote, it is evident that Marx bases the primitive communal society upon their use of land, and the related physical condition of land. Moreover, the general characteristics of the participants of this society, shaped from the use of land, as their political and social formation also. Other examples of Marx's method in *'Grundrisse'* about communal societies can be given from Marx's description of an Ancient or from Germanic societies, in which the production is based on also land but the society is formed under either in city/urban settings and in the clan type communities. In these societies, the production is similar but the relations of production are characterized from several different factors such as geography, nature, settlement type etc. (Marx, 1973: 474, 476,491, 492).

In the *Capital*, Marx method became much more mature in a consistency with the historical materialist method. *Capital* contains the essential contributions of Marx to political economy since the work consists of the most original example of the historical materialist method due to its systematic use of it especially in the conceptualizations and relations between the categories. Although reviewing the whole of *Capital* requires a larger study, there are some clear conceptualizations and categorizations of Marx, as an example for historical materialist method.

To start with Marx, begins his work by concentrating on the definition of commodity. Rather than defining it, Marx traces the historical context of commodity

in capitalist society and reaches the conclusion by indicating the use value, and exchange value of the commodity. It was a necessary step for Marx to open up the discussion on phenomenon that always have a double dimensional meaning on his very starting point. The commodity in that respect has also a potential and a realized dimension which can be identified with an abstraction on its context. Commodity can be identified truly in respect to the economic and social relations that illuminate its potential and realized dimensions namely use value and exchange value. The use value while representing the realized aspect of the commodity, exchange value is the value of a commodity which appears under the economic relations. Moreover, the exchange value is a unique value especially commodities gain with capitalism in a more expanded way due to the existence of market. As seen the starting point continues with an empirical observation. Later the relationships of commodity are described according to their position in the accumulation of commodities. Money comes into the picture while defining the properties of capitalist economy, when the values are abstracted from the reality of commodities, and gain an abstract value which can be identified by money as an equalizer. Money does not mean anything without the relationships it engages with[13]. So, the commodity historically first time, is represented by another value, which is a result of the changing relations in the production.

Marx with this emphasis, indicates the 'social determination of relations of production in contrast to their supposedly 'natural' character, revealing the class exploitation disguised by this ideology"[14]. In addition to this notion, the consequence of this focus appears as the question that "what are the specific antagonistic relations which define opposing classes in fundamental exploitative production, and generate the dynamics of politico-economic development?" (Comninel, 1987: 158, 168). For this question, Marx mentions to the profit on land:

> "The specific economic form, in which unpaid surplus-labour is pumped out of direct producers, determines the relationships of rulers and ruled, as it grows directly out of production itself and, in turn, reacts upon it as a determining element. Upon this, however, is founded the entire formation of the economic

[13] Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. (1967). *Capital; a Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International.

[14] Comninel, G. (1987). *Rethinking the French Revolution: Marxism and the Revisionist Challenge.* London: Verso.

> community which grows up out of the production relations themselves, thereby simultaneously its specific political form. It is always the direct relationship of the owners of production to the direct producers- a relation always naturally corresponding to a definite stage in the development of the methods of labour and thereby its social productivity- which reveals the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure, and with it the political form of the relation of sovereignty and dependence, in short, the corresponding specific form of the state" (Marx, 1959: 791).

It is possible to argue that, historical materialist method gained its main power or capacity to bring in wider explanations by the construction upon the empirical observation which was imported from the classical political economy. By all means, the classical political economy explained value and production in relation with the commercial development[15], division of labour[16], and with the one-dimensional conceptualization on labour. However, for the historical materialist method of Marx, classical political economy with regard to these aspects was totally incapable of explaining the development of capitalism. Classical political economy was providing a ground which rationalized capitalism.

Lastly it is vital to mention the engagement of Marx and Engels with the classical political economy remarks a major feature of their methodological investigation. Since the essential feature of their approach to political economy is based on a critique that also refers to the intention of establishing an alternative methodology, it remarks one of the unique characteristics at the same time. Making the critique of the classical political economy for Marx and Engels identifies their journey towards generating a methodological investigation which seeks to theorize on an alternative pathway.

2.2.1.3 The Question on Historical Progress: Division of Labour

After crystallizing the critique of political economy regarding property relations and class divisions, Marx and Engels outlined 'The Holy Family' which was bringing in a picture that Marx and Engels were not connected to Young Hegelians and also attracted to communism, which was the source of true emancipation in material

[15] Smith, A. (1982). *The Wealth of Nations: Books I-III*. London, England: Penguin Group (USA).
[16] Ibid.

sense. In this emancipation, it would be the proletariat taking over the power through class struggles.

The German Ideology appeared as one the most extended early works of Marx and Engels, where they touched upon various issues from the critique of German philosophy again to early categorization of historical stages of the historical progress. Marx and Engels pursue an explanation about alienation which is dependent to exploitation that develops through the movement of private property. For Marx and Engels, the movement of private property needs to be historicized and demystified. This work also contains the influence of political economy on Marx, especially on his conceptualization of bourgeois society and economic base and superstructure. The most prominent conclusions are about the characteristics of capitalism and bourgeois society which are alienating and oppressing the social conditioning of labour and people.

On the other hand, this work contains remarkable inconsistencies compared to the preceding works due to their presentations about the prior principles of historical materialism. To put more clearly, the very essential idea or method of Marx and Engels about their originality is about their critical conceptualization of history and the origins of historical relationships about the true form of social reality. Furthermore, their critique "exposed the specific class character of political economic categories in capitalism, it also laid the basis for criticizing the ideological conceptions of previous class societies" (Comninel, 1987: 137).

As the first conclusion Marx arrives at is the essential alienation that bourgeois society creates. According to Marx, the capitalist mode of production, economic activities are governed by 'the laws of the market'[17]. Due to the eternal progress of development towards capitalism of the understanding in classical political economy, the conceptualization and direction is not dynamic but a 'given' phenomena. However, in historical materialism the core idea is about the original constitution of development due to the relations between production and class struggles. In the 'German Ideology', it is evident that, Marx and Engels sketched a type of explanation that historical stages are bound to follow each other towards a certain future.

[17] Marx, Karl & Engels, F. (1998). *German Ideology*. London: Penguin.

> "The relations of different nations among themselves depend upon the extent to which each has developed its productive forces, the division of labour and internal intercourse. This statement is generally recognized. But not only the relation of one nation to others, but also the whole internal structure of the nation itself depends on the stage of development reached by its production and its internal and external intercourse. How far the productive forces of a nation are developed is shown most manifestly by the degree to which the division of labour has been carried. Each new productive force, in so far as it is not merely a quantitative extension of productive forces already known… brings about a further development of division of labour" (Marx & Engels, 1963:8,9).
>
> "The various stages of development in the division of labour are just so many different forms of ownership; i.e. the existing stage in the division of labour determines also the relations of individuals to one another with reference to the material, instrument, and product of labour" (Marx & Engels, 1963:8,9).

As can be seen the division of labour for Marx and Engels rather than a unique concept resulting from capitalist mode of production, becomes an essential category that distinct every society in every stage of history. "Instead of taking exploitation as the given point of departure, Marx and Engels have followed the schema of the four stages theory, and so incorporated its mechanical and 'naturalistic' conception of development" (Comninel, 1987: 145).

The division of labour which (in the context of the 'German Ideology') was previously mentioned as the given feature to identify the societies, distinguished and replaced by Marx in *Capital*. Moreover, in *Capital* Marx emphasizes that the role of division of labour only in capitalist context, summarizes the focus of political economists. It cannot become a distinctive feature for pre-capitalist ones.

> "in spite of the numerous analogies and links connecting them, division of labour in the interior of society, and that in the interior of a workshop, differ not only in degree, but also in kind" (Marx, 1954: 334)
>
> "the social division of labour is found in all societies, 'whether such division be brought about not by exchange of commodities" (Marx, 1954: 339).

The social division of labour is a comprehensive instrument of social organization however the division of labour in the workshop is an instrument for the maximization of the surplus making. Marx mentions about this distinction by:

> "By decomposition of handicrafts, by specialization of the instruments of labour, by the formulation of detail labourers, and by grouping and combining the latter into a single mechanism, division of labour in manufacture creates a qualitative gradation, and a quantitative proportion in the social process of production; it consequently creates a definite organization of the labour of the society, and thereby develops at the same time new productive forces in the society. On its specific capitalist form… manufacture is but a particular method of begetting relative surplus value, or of augmenting at the expense of the labourer the self-expansion of the capital… It creates new conditions for the lordship of capital over labour. If, therefore, on the other hand, it presents itself historically as a progress and as a necessary phase in the economic development of society, on the other hand, it is a refined and civilized method of exploitation" (Marx, 1954: 334).

Second major inconsistency of Marx and Engels in the 'German Ideology' is about class and class struggles. The concept of class in the 'German Ideology' categorized as a part of the economic categories which is a result of division of labour. Division of labour creates variety of branches (agriculture, industry) in which individuals co-operate in definite kinds of labour. So, the approach to class is a category rather than a social concept which originates according to the social and material conditions of a society. As will be mentioned in the following part, in the *Communist Manifesto*, the term of class is used again in a totally different sense which is more consistent with historical materialist method.

So, although the 'German Ideology' in a large extend contains historical materialist method's explanation about various topics about German philosophy and political economy there some approaches of Marx and Engels which are inconsistent with their later works.

These inconsistency matter for this thesis especially for the following chapters since this thesis problematizes the mainstream Marxist literature on history of political thought, which in a large extend imported the concepts and idealized formulated in the 'German Ideology'. But as the inconsistencies may mislead on the perception of Marx and Engels' premises, it may also overload the meanings. Furthermore, the

historical materialist method especially developed in the *'Capital'* is clearly expanding the level of abstraction, showing the dialectical logic with more dimensional aspects, and sticking up with the premises of historical materialism especially observing the empirical reality.

As the most prominent and famous work of Marx and Engels, in the *Communist Manifesto*, historical materialist approach shows itself in the very clear arguments about bourgeois society and the task of proletariat in the historical progress. The *Manifesto* rather than being a scientific-analytic study, is a political text which contains the systematically formulated interests of working classes. As mentioned the most prominent category in the *Manifesto* is the class, which is definitely representing not an economic result rather a social division which is based according to the social and material conditions. More than its originating approach on class, it is the class struggle which is realistically consistent with the premises of historical materialism about the capitalist society.

The later works of Marx and Engels were shaped according to their changing setting towards England where capitalism with industrialization completely consolidated to a more advanced dimension. Marx and Engels focused on political economy, attempting to create an alternative and critical approach to this field. For the account of historical materialism, it is essential to review *'Grundrisse'* and *Capital*, since they contain the most prominent uses of historical materialist method. There are of course several works that they produced however, reviewing them is a requirement of a larger study.

By all these remarks on the writings of Marx and Engels, it is possible to outline the general characteristics of the historical materialist method once again more specifically, rooted for the original position of method[18]. The position of historical materialism for Marx and Engels, after their long engagement with German idealist tradition and also liberal materialist Young Hegelians, the long-term influence of

[18] In the study of Comninel (Comninel, G. (1987). 'Rethinking the French Revolution: Marxism and the Revisionist Challenge', London: Verso.pp.170-174) on historical materialist method summarizes one of the most comprehensive premises of the original position of Marx and Engels as in the stages of:

i. The identification of class exploitation
ii. The characterization of state
iii. Recognition of historical continuities

revolutionary movements in France, and most importantly their critique against classical political economy in their late years, is based on firstly 'the demystification of the social reality' by materializing and socializing the things according to their historical mode of production. Secondly the unity of the explanations about the social, political, natural and economic dimensions about the social reality in which the dialectical form of relationships is identified and materialized according to the mode of production. Moreover, a third aspect is that in nearly all of their studies, Marx and Engels pursued an empiric-analytical ground for their arguments. Even their method was not completely formulated in a specific writing, both Marx and Engels engaged with actual politics, the developments in natural sciences, the crises and stagnations in economy. Historical materialism especially for Marx and Engels was a definite practical method which reaches theory with all the empiric-analytical ground. As Thompson suggests:

> "We have often been told that Marx had a 'method', that this method lies somewhere in the region of dialectical reason, and the this constitutes the essence of Marxism. It is therefore strange that, despite many allusions, and several expressions of intent, Marx never wrote this essence down… If he had found the clue to the universe, he would have set a day or two aside to put it down. We may conclude from this that it was not written because it could not be written, any more than Shakespeare or Stendhal could have reduced their art to a clue. For it was not a method but a practice, and a practice learned through practicing" (Thompson, 1978: 258).

"The methodological injunction of historical materialism is to locate in actual history the dynamism of class exploitation and struggle, and to reveal the source of historical social change and human self-development in the dialectical determination of social structure by relations of class" (Comninel, 1987:175). Although more can be said about the method in the studies of Marx and Engels since their works contain a very large set of empiric-analytic examples, this thesis only focused on the historical context of Marx and Engels in relation to the premises of the method because of this thesis further attempt to reconsider the Marxist literature on history of political thought. In addition, because this thesis also attempts to cover social history of political theory in relation to historical materialism in comparison to test its relevancy and methodological approach.

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDATIONS OF MARXIST ORTHODOXIES IN METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

It is a vital question that how Marxism became both a political ideology, and a method of considering philosophy and history in relation with a class perspective. In this regard, the contribution of Marx and Engels to materialist tradition was a turning point in the history of the method since it expanded the major dimension of the tradition by transforming it to a more historical and philosophical method through the dialectical logic. Although, historical materialist method had put forward an extended perspective on explanations on the historical progress by Marx and Engels for the first time, from its first foundation it was a method used for also political purposes. The revolutionary character of historical materialist method, nevertheless assumed to be confronting every other epistemological and methodological positions which did not considered a materialist ground for their explanations. Despite its major claim of intellectually challenging the other approaches, historical materialism had been in a large extent used for justifying the inevitable journey of the productive forces, namely under capitalism, the working classes.

The question of method over historical materialism continued to be delivered by the followers of Marx and Engels in late 19th and early 20th centuries. While the idea of revolution was staying at the center of the political theory for Marxism, the practicality of revolution did not arrive until the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. So as one of the main concentrations of Marxism during this era was about politics of power, which mentioned the significance of establishing socialism with a revolution. However, it is possible to remark another point here to indicate a crisis inside the theory which is the overload of practical issues over the theory. Since the expectations in Europe about the emerging crisis of capitalism- starting from 1870- indicated a wave of change, socialists throughout Europe and Russia, deliberated on the practicality of the revolution in also their theoretical attempts. As Perry Anderson claims;

> "…the protocols for a Marxist reflection on Marxism must therefore be twofold. On the one hand, the destiny of historical materialism in a given period must first of all be situated within the intricate web of national and international class struggles which characterize it, and whose course its own instruments of thought are designed to capture. Marxist theory, bent on understanding the world, has aimed at an symptotic unity with a popular practice seeking to transform it" (Anderson, 1984:14).

Orthodoxy as a term representing a strong commitment and close following, inevitably developed naturally among the followers of historical materialist method, with strong association with the political ideology that Marxism potentially carried. Moreover, the orthodoxies in Marxism had successfully engaged with the social and political transformations across Europe, expanding its influence over large masses by movements and political parties. Due to orthodoxy for a long period, starting from Social Democratic Party experience through Bolshevik Revolution an onwards, had obtained political power which created a monopoly over the intellectual debates. In this regard, the orthodoxies in Marxism became a key topic to discover the history of the application of the method. To measure the relevancy with orthodoxy it is vital to review the use of method, and the consequences and outputs that appeared by the use.

While examining the use of method by these Marxist Orthodoxies, it is significant to underline some prominent characteristics of these Orthodoxies such as how under their political concerns, and preoccupations that depend on their claims of revolution against capitalism, they had not concentrated to one of the essential features of capitalism namely 'the reproduction'. Although reproduction of capitalism indicates a strong capacity to overrun against the crises and structural breakdowns, it was not considered as prominent by these Marxist Orthodoxies. The ignorance or disinterest on how capitalism reproduce itself even though it is having severe breakdowns caused an unconscious absence of production in several fields such as the history of political thought writing.

As the major reason that caused Marxist Orthodoxies to hesitate on approaching or even leaving the field of history of political thought writing, these deconcentrating on the reproduction of capitalism, also shows itself in the field of history of political

thought, where the mainstream literature has produced and maintains a dominant narrative dependent upon several themes.

It is possible to name the tradition of most of the historical materialist history of political thought writing attempts according to their common features. Most of them locatedthemselves under the shelter of Marxism, and claimed that their methodological approach is to continue Marx's and Engels' studies. From these aspects, this chapter will identify the origins of the Orthodox Marxist method, which is also called as 'mainstream' Marxism, seeking explanations on the characteristics of this method in relation to it's relevancy with historical materialism on a comparative basis. Moreover, this chapter focuses on the Orthodox Marxism in order to show its differences and similarities from the formal traditional methodologies.

It is observable in relation with this studies' purposes there are several intellectual traditions that much contributed to the current shape of Marxism, regarding their commitment to the orthodoxies. These traditions to a large extent left a methodological and intellectual legacy that firstly influenced current Marxist theory, secondly the Marxist movements and parties, and thirdly the understanding of Marxism as a method in political theory. Due to these strong influences, it is vital to examine these traditions in relation to their relevancy with the historical materialist method discussed in the first chapter.

Two major intellectual traditions will be discussed in this chapter. Firstly, the tradition of German Marxism, which grounded itself in the context of developing capitalism in Germany in parallel with large social, political and intellectual transformations that the country was witnessing in late 19th century. As the Social Democratic Party (SPD) was established and the party elite under Kautsky had reformulated the party programme with adopting Marxist principles with the contribution of Engels, it is significant to review how did the SDP identify itself and how German Marxism systematized historical materialist method just after Marx and Engels. It is also essential to review prominent attempts to use the method by Kautsky, Bernstein, Luxemburg, and other challenges to the orthodoxy established.

Secondly the journey of Marxism in Russia, which is composed of various interpretations under different movements is important to reconsider since, with

Russian context, Marxist orthodoxy re-codified in a more theoretical dimension with a focus to the very essential concepts and definitions of the method. The journey of Marxism in Russian context, nevertheless contains lots of debates on materialism, idealism, class, power, state, revolution. Inside the debates around these prominent concepts, the orthodoxy had been shaped firstly by Plekhanov and later succeeded and completely transformed by Lenin. Furthermore, after Lenin's major interpretations and uses of the method for the consolidation of party and the communist movement, the use of method became a very controversial issue regarding its engagement with the political ideology.

The intellectual traditions which in a large extent gave Marxist Orthodoxies its shape by their use of method, introduced some new themes to the Marxist theory, which were not prominently existed in the time of Marx and Engels. It was firstly the debates on revolution, which appeared also in the political life more concretely. Although the theme of revolution was present in Marx and Engels in a certain context, it was in the construction of the Marxist Orthodoxy, it became the most controversial theme. Secondly, it was the debate on the role of working classes in relation with the revolution that the Marxist Orthodoxies produced new ways to explain the requirements of working classes in their political agenda. Thirdly, in relation with the conjecture, it was imperialism which became a new theme inside the Marxist theory. Imperialism appeared as one of the latest phenomenon of capitalism which triggered very controversial debates between different Marxist traditions. The debates on imperialism became a prominent theme which Marxist Orthodoxy used to develop a systematic explanatory scheme. In that sense, this chapter will be focusing on categorizing the contributions of Marxist Orthodoxies to the theory and method according to these new introductions.

The concentration of this chapter will be about the Marxist method after Marx and Engels about the question of method. With regard to the question of method, Marxist traditions and the debates between them will be examined andtheir attempts on writing history of political thought will be methodologically investigated in accordance with their consistency with historical materialism. To put it more briefly, the prominent purposes of this chapter are firstly to identify the roots of Marxist methodology and specifically to illuminate the question: "How did Marxists

approach to the question of method, after Marx and Engels?", "To what extent their approaches are in consistency with the method regarding the clarifications in the first chapter?", “How were the orthodoxies in Marxism founded?”, “What are the new themes and contributions of orthodoxy in Marxism brought in to Marxist theory?” and finally "To what extent their methodological approaches fulfill the main assumptions of historical materialism over the field in history of political thought?".

This chapter of the study also concentrates on one of the major topics that the previously mentioned question of method can be located. History of political thought was always a sterile field which the mainstream literature dominated, and in which the historical materialist production remained ineffective. The reasons behind this ineffectiveness will be discussed in this chapter, in a way comparing the attempts of writing history of political thought in relation with the historical materialist method. Naturally, the attempts have their own historical means, however the selected studies, will be concerned according to their methodological relevancy with the historical materialist method, described and examined in the Chapter I.

3.2 Regarding the Orthodoxy

Constructing an explanation over the concept ‘orthodoxy’ requires an extended outlook towards the ideological positioning and the historical use of the method since the term can address certain characteristics of the theory. It is important to locate the term orthodoxy before mentioning about the related traditions that this research examines.

From it is very first meaning orthodoxy means a close engagement or positioning to a principle or a tradition, in a way prioritizing the problematics of it, and defending the related principles from other approaches. As its principled stance emphasizes, it is possible to identify orthodoxy as a defensive positioning against other approaches. Moreover, it can also represent a purified positioning, in a way sterilely approaching the social reality from its own perspective. Nevertheless, orthodoxy seeks for consistency for its existence, parallel with the positioning of itself. Consistency of ideas and principles, establishes one of the major grounds for orthodoxy to be defined. In addition to these general points about defining the orthodoxy, it is

essential to discuss the structure of the orthodoxy regarding the variables of this research.

As this study investigates, the traditions in Marxist method carry these general characteristics of being an 'orthodox', regarding their self-association with the tradition of Marx and Engels. However, from the perspective of the use of method, there is no unity between these orthodoxies. There are several reasons why the same conceptualizations result with different stances and different uses of method.

Firstly, the traditions that followed Marx and Engels' method were not in unity even in the period Marx and Engels' were active in social movements. As the Marxist method had formulated in stages, even periodically produced in various European countries, the socialist movements followed the path and method that Marx and Engels' formulated by prioritizing different goals. As the priorities in practical struggles, characterized the traditions that associated with themselves with socialist struggle, their interpretations of Marxist method had also considered various emphasis of Marx and Engels.

Second reason that the orthodoxies established after Marx and Engels had different codifications, is about their access to the method produced. Since the theoretical production of Marx and Engels continued to be discussed around limited circles inside the communist parties, or socialist movements, not all of the followers had accessed the production took place. The German Social Democratic Party even considered this problem and found vital to republish the old studies of Marx and Engels' periodically through early 20th century, in order to put an impact that can homogenize the knowledge of method around European socialist movements. Moreover, the limited access to the original sources had resulted with various different interpretations over the method. Although the traditions, associated themselves with Marx and Engels with an 'orthodox' bound, the knowledge of them about the method actually produced by Marx and Engels was composed of only the published sources and experiences circulated around party programmes.

Thirdly, it is vital to observe that orthodox traditions had their own context, in which new phases in the transformations of capitalism took place. It was crucial to locate the interpretations of method according to the political strategies of the traditions under a movement or a party according to the necessities to conceptualize new

phenomenon produced by capitalism. As this research also put reservations in the following sections, imperialism as a new phase in capitalist mode of production, had required explanations by Marxist traditions which the differences between orthodoxies caused different positioning against a more general and a scientific analysis. Like imperialism, the conceptualizations of class or revolution had been considered differently according to the context that these traditions were established and diffused in. As this research also enlarges the debate over class and revolution, the advanced capitalist relations between state and class and society characterizes the general positioning of the orthodoxy.

In that sense, orthodoxies in Marxism can more or less overlaps with the relationship that the agent constructs with the tradition and the method that it uses to ground social reality. In this process, it is essential to observe that according to the context, the access to the original production and the ideological positioning against the other approaches had characterized the properties of the orthodoxies, causing them to exist in different forms.

As this study puts the traditions of orthodoxies as a major variable, in comparison with the other traditions and significantly with Political Marxism[19] according to the use of Marxist method, it is a necessity to examine the characteristics of the orthodoxies which are currently associated with the foundations of the orthodox traditions in Marxism. As mentioned in this stage it is vital to examine the context, the contributions of the founding traditions in orthodox Marxism, and their use of method. Regarding this purpose the traditions which associated themselves with the Marxist method and mainly represented orthodox Marxism in history will be examined, under the fields they had problematized in relation with the new phases of capitalist transformations.

3.3 Construction of Orthodoxy in Methodological Perspective

In order to identify the structures that Marxist Orthodoxy had been formed into, it is vital to analyze the material that it produced to use of historical materialist method. In regard of these content; which are in a large extent composed of theorizations attempts of role of the working classes, the agenda of revolution, and the concept of

[19] Political Marxism will be also discussed in relation with the claims of it being a tradition in the last chapter regarding the different positions that assume how can it be defined as a tradition.

imperialism, it is further possible to consider the formations and codifications of Marxist Orthodoxy and its approach to the field of history of political thought. Following sections regarding these themes, will try to analyze the major intellectual traditions in Marxist orthodoxy that gave the most characteristic contributions.

3.3.1 Rethinking Class and Method

The conceptualizations on class and class conflict are not definitely new attempts in the Marxist theory since Marx and Engels used the examination of social and material conditions and social property relations to identify class throughout history. However, notion of class became a larger debate between the followers of Marxism since developing capitalism had put out various different levels of development of working classes across Europe. In relation with the uneven development of capitalism, the social and political context that working classes existed were fragmented and the context these classes were considered also differed.

The notion of working classes and their potential role in the historical progress was an issue that came from Marx and Engels' legacy. However how these working classes became the significant actor of social change and historical progress can be associated with the contribution of Marxist Orthodoxies to the issue since Marxist traditions following Marx and Engels had put a lot of effort to politicize and socialize from working classes, emphasizing their promising role in their journey to the socialism. From Marx and Engels' considerations on their political writings concerning the communist movements around Europe, it was widely accepted that their belief towards working classes is correlated with their considerations on the role of productive forces and their relationship with the relations of production. This association is nevertheless, caused by the transition period where the first generation of Marxists appeared in Germany and in England at the last quarter of the 19th century. In order to relate the traditions of Marxism with their reformulation of the working classes and their use of method, it is necessary to briefly review how the succession in the orthodoxy took place. Followingly it is vital to overview the different contexts that reformulation of working classes fused with the theory of state and power.

3.3.1.1 The Succession in the Orthodoxy

The succession of historical materialist method from Marx and Engels to their followers took place in phases in which Engels played an important role in. Due to the context in which the engagement of intellectuals to the communist movements was an inevitable event since the popularity of Marxism had been increasing rapidly, interpretations on Marxist method started to be popping out by several different circles around Europe especially with the late works of Marx. However, the early interpretations of Marxism were not completely welcomed by first Marx and Engels, later Engels alone. Even before Marx's death, Marx and Engels had always remained critical towards the engagement of existing intellectuals to the communist movements across Europe which had been operating in different forms and different parties, although the core of the production was carried by them. The main problems for Marx and Engels were the conceptualizations and the revolutionary properties of the interpretations.

The founding fathers had always intervened and criticized the programmatization of communist parties' political agendas since the communists across Europe were considered by Marx and Engels, as either revisionists or non-revolutionaries. Moreover, they had remarked that a strong party programme should be consisting of well-systematized revolutionary plan[20] (Marx and Engels, 1970). It was in the Gotha-Erfurt Unification Programme that Marx and Engels had put on reservations about the content that the followers of communist movements were carrying.

> *"Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes*. If, therefore, it was not possible – and the conditions of the item did not permit it – to go *beyond* the Eisenach programme, one should simply have concluded an agreement for action against the common enemy. But by drawing up a programme of principles (instead of postponing this until it has been prepared for by a considerable period of common activity) one sets up before the whole world landmarks by which it measures the level of the Party movement" (Marx and Engels, 1970).

The attitude shown in the Gotha Erfurt Programme, continued in the later works of Marx and Engels and shaped the content they had been approving for the communist

[20] Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). *Marx/Engels Selected Works, Volume Three* (1st ed., pp. 11-12). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

movements. After Marx's death in 1883, Engels remained as the only leading authority in the tradition of Marxism although there were followers of Marxism across all the Europe especially in Germany. The criticism of the intellectuals who had been acquiring interests on Marxist movement and materialist conception of methodology, was also carried out by Engels, in his clarification of the principles once again in his confrontation with Eugen Dühring (Engels, 1978). "In his Anti-Dühring he extended the dialectical process which, according to Marx, characterized social development to the realm of nature. Both the social and the physical realms were, in Engels' restatement of Marxism, governed by objective, rigorously causal laws" (Pierson, 1993). The formulation of Engels' dialectical processes against Dühring had gained immediate popularity and got adopted by European socialist movements encouraging them to open up more polemics and confident attacks against intellectuals on their contrary poles.

As mentioned Germany, due to its context which was in a large extend consist of the consequences depending upon emergence of capitalism with the late and rapid industrialization, the immediate intensification of the working classes involved to the exploitation, transforming political formation through a nation state, and the intellectual crisis between the seekers of theorization of social reality, was the original setting of these debates during 1880's and 1890's. It was nevertheless the stronghold of the orthodox followers of Marx and Engels between the intellectuals. After the Erfurt conference in 1891, the Social Democratic Party had adopted a programme which was consist of Marxist principles, with involvement of Engels. Very soon the party transformed in an organization that directly represented the Marxist orthodoxy across the Europe. In this transformation, the major roles were played by firstly Karl Kautsky who later became the most popular figure and authority in the Marxist orthodoxy, secondly Eduard Bernstein who had consolidated a revisionism wave both inside and outside the party against Kautsky and lastly Rosa Luxemburg who had later represented a radical departure from the authority of the party due to her practical revolutionary concerns.

3.3.1.2 Karl Kautsky and the Codification of German Marxist Orthodoxy

After the Erfurt conference in 1891, Karl Kautsky became the popular figure and the leading theoretician in the party, codifying Marxist principles in the party

programme with a strong support by Engels. Kautsky defined his next challenge to enlarge the circle which was determining the theory production inside the party. It was his main purpose to deepen the influence of Marxism between Social Democrats. However, Kautsky's reserve in this attempt was depending upon his earlier studies in which he had developed an understanding of Marxism. Nevertheless, Kautsky had engaged several polemics both inside and outside his party which contributed his attempt to interpret Marxism, with which he concentrated on the methodological ways Marx and Engels systematized.

The early engagement of Karl Kautsky on Marxism started when he had read and influenced from *Anti-Dühring* in 1879 enabling him to understand *Capital* completely[21] (Pierson, 1993). Although Kautsky pre-Marxist framework was consisting of "Darwinian biology, the mechanistic materialism of Ernst Haeckel, and Thomas Buckle's positivistic philosophy of history"[22], reading *Anti-Dühring* activated his deeper interests. During 1880's Kautsky production had begun with his engagement with firstly the Socialist Party in Vienna and later Social Democratic Party in Germany. It was Eduard Bernstein who had welcomed Kautsky into the party in 1881 and contributed to his studies, allowing Kautsky to become the editor of *Sozialdemokrat* the monthly journal of the party. The same year Kautsky had met with Engels in London, when he had been praised by Engels that he and Bernstein was the only two Social Democrats who fully grasped Marxist theory[23] (Pierson, 1993). After this motivating visit, in the following years Kautsky founded the monthly magazine *Neue Zeit* in 1883, which opened large doors to debates concerning Marxist theory, also by consolidating a large number of followers and contributors between Marxist circles. There Kautsky and many other Marxists entered in long debates about the theory and practice in Marxism.

Kautsky main purpose of founding this magazine was about his project in mind from his earlier times. According to Kautsky Marxist method needs to be corresponding to its context in which working classes are victims of alienation in the capitalist system that prevents them to be conscious about their struggle. It is the duty of Marxist intellectuals to spread this theoretical framework to them by popularizing

[21] Ibid., pp.60.
[22] Ibid., pp.60.
[23] Ibid., pp.61.

the theory itself. The magazine would be acting as a paper which would carry out the debates on theory and practice in Marxism. Although Kautsky's concerns were more oriented on the working classes, it was later seen by him that the 'intellectual violence' was necessary for also the party members. Kautsky in order to introduce the original studies of Marx and Engels to these particular groups, chose to formulate an easier outlook on the theories. His simplification attempt in 1887, came out as *The Economic Teachings of Karl Marx,* which successfully made Kautsky as the leading theoretician in the party (Kautsky, 1979).

Kautsky in his attempt to summon the original spirit of Marxist theory in a simplified formation, showed his distinct attitude towards the previous understandings of theorizing which considered theory to be produced for practical concerns. According to Kautsky, the two sides of revolutionary struggle which are practical activity and thinking, that Marx attempted to integrate in dialectics, could not be taken consideration in a single dimension. It was necessary for Kautsky to clarify the theory without touching upon the political strategies of the revolutionary subjects. Kautsky's approach was formulated in his early dialogue with August Bebel in 1885 where he claimed to work together with Bebel to consolidate a purified theoretical position, ignoring the 'small battles' (Pierson, 1993).

The real formulation of his attempt started with Kautsky's intervention on the *Neue Zeit* with publishing the criticism of Marx to the Gotha-Erfurt Unification Programme in 1891, aimed to be reminding the Marxist principles from the primary source just before the Erfurt Conference. In the conference Kautsky took the major presentation on the programme and systematically formulated his perspective on the Marxist method. "There he recapitulated the primary Marxist doctrines presented in the *Communist Manifesto* and *Capital*, the materialistic conception of history, the irreversible contradictions of capitalism leading to its collapse, the growing polarization of classes, and the emergence of the proletariat as the force which would bring a new socialist order"[24] (Pierson, 1993). In this speech Kautsky concentrated and emphasized the irresistible economic forces as the agents of historical progress, indicating his theoretical adoption of the role of the productive forces in the historical progress. However, "Kautsky reaffirmed the crucial role of

[24] Ibid., pp.64.

intellectuals in the movement. They were charged with the task of providing the workers with a "clear conception of their historical function"[25] (Pierson, 1993). According to Kautsky the historical progress towards revolution must be departing from the shoulders of working classes but with the definite contribution of intellectuals who provide them the revolutionary programme and Marxist theory. It was in this conference officially announced by Kautsky and considered to be historically accurate formulation of one of the significant elements from the founding fathers.

Although the role of intellectuals defined by Kautsky indicating their independent position, it was not consistent with the economic based historicizing common among Marxist circles. Later criticism on Kautsky developed from this ground and ended up with a large-scale questioning of the role of *Neue Zeit* for the party goals. Since the *Neue Zeit* never achieved the expected number of followers, Kautsky's authority in this period slowly started to be challenged. However, Kautsky did not give up defending the theses of Marx and Engels about socialism, regretting the accusations that Marxism was a finished system. Kautsky due to his existing authority as theoretician in the party survived from the first wave of criticisms and went further to officially formulate the party ideology.

It is observable Karl Kautsky's initial efforts to formulate Marxism inside the Social Democratic Party but with having strong reservations about the separate role of intellectuals in the struggle, brought in a new understanding in the Marxist movement which sketched out the early orthodoxy in Marxism. Nevertheless, it is certain that Kautsky's formulations about Marxism, were done from a very close position to Marx and Engels since Kautsky had found a chance to work with Engels. Moreover, Kautsky's methodological approach which was revealed firstly in *Agrarian Question*, later in the *Road to Power*, and in his polemics, outlined the general principles of Marx and Engels very similarly to the original source. However, although the close relationship with Engels, Kautsky's formulations on Marxism, still remained as interpretations rather than the use of the method itself. The prior reason why they remained as interpretations is about Kautsky's

[25] Ibid., pp.65.

understanding of Marxist methodology on the first hand which will be in a large extend revealed in his polemics with Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin.

Kautsky insisted on socially and politically grounded evolutionary model of historical progress, in which working classes need to be provided theory with revolutionary programme in a way developing their conditions on the road to revolution. It is the social circumstances that needs to be concentrated as in the Marx and Engels, however it is also the major purpose of educating and theory providing to working classes by intellectuals. The revolutionary programme of Kautsky becomes a question for Marxist tradition due to its unsatisfactory practical concerns and over-philosophized methodological asserts, that passively narrates the agents in historical progresses.

Last but vitally significant, it was also the context that shaped Kautsky's project on Marxism in which the necessities of revolutionary struggle in the late capitalized, socially and politically re-designed Germany under capitalism. Kautsky stressed firstly the revolutionary action of 'conscious carrying' to the working classes, which in Germany rapidly increased in number. The social and political transformations which capitalism triggered by industrialization in Germany had also transformed the sociological infrastructure in Germany. Moreover, the conditions of working classes in historical perspective were positively continuing in the basis of wage, social rights, and human rights. Kautsky closely concentrated on this historical progress and theorized around the on-going and positively developing continuities unlike the other revolutionaries who thought these developments were consequences of capitalist development which would soon return with brutal exploitative applications. It is once again vital to examine Kautsky's further works in which he was challenged by other Marxist circles about his revolutionary position concerning his methodological formation.

The German Marxist Orthodoxy on the role of productive forces in the historical progress with the prominent attempt of codifying a historical canon, appeared as a significant process which influenced the other Marxist traditions in the Europe and Russia. The canon which mainly Kautsky represented became an example of the use of method and the official content about the role of productive forces in the history. Furthermore, this codification contained a solid tasking for the working classes

before radicalizing to establish socialism. That was the tasking also for intellectuals since their mission was coded to place the class consciousness. This external placement task also transformed to an example for Russian Marxists, who considered that the consciousness could only be placed externally but also through political mobilization. In this regard, it is vital to turn back to Russian Marxism which contained a crucial content on the notion of productive forces. However, it is firstly necessary to cover the construction of methodology and use of dialectics in building the logic which attempted to consider working classes as a productive force.

In relation with the German Marxist Orthodoxy which was established according to the revolutionary programme that Marx and Engels had legated to the German Social Democratic Party, the role of working classes in the historical progress had been widely debated since the orthodoxy had both protected the revolutionary notion but also introduced new arguments like placing consciousness to the working classes from the hands of party intellectuals. As this reformulation on the strategy of politicizing working classes, historical materialism had been in circulation in Russia. In Russia, starting from Plekhanov historical materialist method once again debated among materialist and the approach on working classes had been reformulated in relation to the context of Russia, which had been under much different social and political conditions. In order to clarify what kind of a contribution and reformulation did the Russian Marxism to the notion of working classes and the assumptions of their role in the historical progress, it is necessary to cover the detailed analysis of Russian Marxism methodologically. Starting from their impressions, the following parts will focus on how the origins of Marxism had been reconsidered.

3.3.1.3 Lenin and the Recodification of the Marxist Orthodoxy

The main motto on the interest on Lenin particularly reasoned because of his great interest on philosophical questions and because of his attempts to undermine several interpretations of materialism in his setting of Russia. His attempts naturally created an academic space to cover his methodology on mainly two of his works: *'Materialism and Empirio-criticism Critical Comments on a Reactionary Philosophy' (1899)* and *'Philosophical Notebooks' (1895-1916)*. Another major reason why Lenin's philosophical studies are attracting attention is because they

were also a work of a political activist who played the key role in the revolution in Russia. Moreover, the influence of philosophy over his revolutionary practice remains to be a notable question.

Kevin Anderson's study *'Lenin, Hegel and Western Marxism: A Critical Study' (1995)* focuses on this relation, linking Lenin's development of ideas about materialism which according to Anderson quite mechanic in *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, with his later work Philosophical Notebooks[26]. In this conversion according to Anderson, when "Lenin observed the failure of Social Democrats throughout Europe to oppose the war and consequent collapse of the Second International, he turned to the writings of Hegel in order to revive the revolutionary spirit of Marxism" (White, 2015). Therefore, Lenin reread Hegel and this attempt enabled him to rediscover the dialectical essence of historical materialist method which was for Lenin misinterpreted by the theoreticians of Second International (Bugden, 2007).

However, these attempts only scoped Lenin's theoretical journey with very limited sources which are also evaluated without a comprehensive analysis of the context that Lenin had. Lenin against the narrative of Anderson, concentrated completely on the intellectual context of Russia in which, according to him, various interpretations of materialism circling around, trying to mix materialist and idealist perceptions in the one hand. "It also takes Lenin's philosophizing out of the wider context of the campaign by Lenin and Plekhanov against the ideas of Alexander Bogdanov" (White, 2015). In this section, the studies of Lenin on materialism and the debates that he encountered with Russian Marxists will be examined in regard to the influence of Plekhanov who is considered to be the mentor and the founding father of Russian Marxism. By this examination the orthodoxy of Lenin will be evaluated concentrating on his method.

3.3.1.4 The Legacy of Plekhanov

The contribution of G. V. Plekhanov to Lenin's appearance in the intellectual arena is essential since his attempts to discover the philosophical dimension of Marxism regarding the dialectical method, established an outline for not only Lenin but in a

[26] Anderson, K. (1995). *Lenin, Hegel, and Western Marxism* (1st ed.). Urbana [u.a.]: Univ. of Illinois Press.

large extend the general trend in the evolution of Russian Marxism. Plekhanov started to cover the study of Marx in 1880's when there was a very little material about the philosophical studies of Marx and Engels. "In fact, at that time it was widely believed that Marx's economic scheme had no underlying philosophy. Marxism was commonly referred as 'economic materialism', and it was considered that the doctrine needed to supplemented with the philosophical underpinnings it lacked[27]"[28](White, 2015).

Karl Kautsky's edition of *'The Holy Family'* in the journal *Die neue Zeit* (1885) for Plekhanov was the first steps towards Marx's and Engels' philosophical framework. However due to the part chosen by Kautsky, the study published was limited to only a part entitled as 'French Materialism of the Eighteenth Century' (Marx, 1885). This part impressed Plekhanov that Marx's historical connection with French materialism was one of the main essences of Marx's and Engels' materialist theory. His direction towards French materialism in this regard expanded in the following years especially in his book in 1896 entitled as *Essays on the History of Materialism* in which Plekhanov evaluated on the theories of French materialists Holbach, Helvetius and Marx (Plekhanov, 1896). This impression was considered by James D. White to be reflected on Lenin:

"It is likely that when Lenin visited him in Switzerland in 1895 Plekhanov recommended that he study The Holy Family, because the very full notes from it constitute the first item in Lenin's 'Philosophical Notebooks'" (White, 2015). However, after the first complete release of The Holy Family in 1902 by the edition of Franz Mehring, Plekhanov changed his direction since he had seen the significance of French materialism for Marxism, which in a large extent was not central but subsidiary.

In the following years Engels' republishing the early works he and Marx had written about the philosophy, again reopened the case about the origins of Marxism and dialectical logic (Engels, 1886). These attempts again indicated that Marx's scheme had Hegelian origins giving out not a comprehensive picture of the early

[27] James D. White depends on two sources: Valentinov, N. (1968). *Encounters with Lenin* (1st ed.). London. and Struve, P. B. (1894) Kriticheskie zametki ob ekonomicheskom razvitii Rossii (St. Petersburg, Tipografiye I.N. Skorokhodova).

[28] White, J. (2015). Lenin and Philosophy: The Historical Context. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *67*(1), 123-142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09668136.2014.990707

studies. Therefore, since Engels brought in these early works once more, it gave a profound influence on how Marx was understood in the intellectual circles. This attempt made a larger influence on Plekhanov in his journey to sketch the theoretical framework of Marxism. The early interpretation of Plekhanov on the content covered up by Engels in *Ludwig Feuerbach*, came out in 1892 with the Russian translation of it. In this interpretation "Plekhanov made a concession to Kant by saying that human sensation resembled hieroglyphics, in the sense that they did not resemble the reality that they conveyed, though they did convey faithfully the vents themselves and the relations between them" (White, 2015).

The second interpretation of Plekhanov in his way towards to explore dialectical logic and theoretical framework of Marxism took place in his refutation of Lev Tikhomirov who published '*Why I Ceased to be Revolutionary' (1888)*. Against the idea that social change taking place gradually, Plekhanov argued that it took place in leaps regarding the Hegel's *Science of Logic* in which Hegel describes the relationships in change in quantity and change in quality.

Although Hegel's main arguments in *Science and Logic* (Hegel, 1833) indicates a pathway to which consciousness must take to reach absolute knowledge, showing the link between philosophical categories and opposing the idea of leaps, Plekhanov did not take this outline. Hegel's attempt in *Science and Logic* as one of the major works that establish a logical framework even influencing Marx in his works 'Critique of Political Economy' and 'Capital'. Marx was in favor of setting up an explanation of the relationships of categories which for him was all bound up together. The inconsistency of Plekhanov on Hegel and also on Marx appeared in this debate, disregarding the main principles of dialectical logic.

The main debut of Plekhanov in the international intellectual scale took place in his reflection in his article he prepared for 'For the Sixtieth Anniversary of Hegel's Death' in *Die neue Zeit* in 1891. "The article concentrated mainly on Hegel's Philosophy of History in which Plekhanov could see a parallel with Marx's historical scheme. But it also significant for introducing the term 'dialectical materialism', a term that Marx and Engels never used" (White, 2015). By this attempts Plekhanov in Russia considered as the founding father of Russian Marxism until he was challenged by the younger generation of Marxists in Russia namely

Bogdanov and Lunacharskii. In order to move further on the tracks of historical materialism in Russia through Lenin, it is essential to outline the theoretical framework of Plekhanov in more detail.

It is vital to mention the revisions that Plekhanov made in the dialectical logic since they were accepted as official interpretations by Russian Marxists and also influenced Lenin on his understanding of historical materialism. Although there are several different interpretations on the related literature about Plekhanov, it is a common consideration that Plekhanov made a revision on the dialectical principles of Marx and Engels, since his understanding of philosophy was developed in a different context where practical struggle of the political movements dominated the setting and where he was engaged several different debates with other Marxists traditions. Moreover, his exploration of Marxist works especially philosophical works had their natural limits due to the very little source he could obtain in the intellectual circles. Regarding his insufficient access to the early philosophical works of Marx and Engels, Plekhanov could only trace the ideas of Marx first in the French materialism then the Hegel's studies. However, this insufficient access misleads his perception on dialectics and made his interpretations of Marx and Engels with a different reformulation.

Z.A. Jordan's study *The Dialectical Materialism of Lenin (1966)* successfully illuminates the interpretation of Plekhanov on the dialectical method used by Marx and Engels. Materialism from the perception of Jordan has different senses[29] as 'genetic' and 'absolute' materialisms. From this separation Jordan indicates that the absolute namely the understanding that only accepts matter exists, is transformed in Plekhanov completely to "genetic materialism which emphasizes the priority of matter over spirit, derives mind from matter, and explains the development of mind by natural causes"[30]. Even though Engels used genetic materialism, it was Plekhanov for the name of dialectics completely adopted this understanding. "Plekhanov can justly be described as a revisionist of Engels' dialectical materialism, because he introduced specific philosophical changes into the original doctrine. He eliminated Engels' absolute materialism, that is the proposition "only

[29] Jordan, Z. (1966). The Dialectical Materialism of Lenin. *Slavic Review*, *25*(02), 259-286. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2492779
[30] Ibid., pp. 259.

matter exists," and made genetic materialism the cornerstone of the whole structure"[31]. According to Jordan, Plekhanov made great revisions that reduced the general method them, regarding the dialectical principles. (Jordan, 1966). According to Jordan the following interpretations of Plekhanov transformed dialectical method into a new format, in which the emphasis and practicality of the method stepped forward:

> "Furthermore, Plekhanov recognized that Engels' third law of dialectics, the negation of the negation, was superfluous, because it was already contained in the law of the interpenetration of opposites. Finally, he changed Engels' order of the remaining two laws of dialectics by placing the law of interpenetration of opposites before the law of the transition of quantity into quality… It intensified the conflict between dialectics and formal logic, laid stress upon the fact that the universe brims over the strife, conflict and contradiction, and thus offered obvious advantages to social and political movement based on the doctrine of class antagonism and class struggle"[32](Jordan, 1966).

As mentioned Plekhanov interpretation of dialectics had gained popularity especially among Russian Marxists, and made a great influence on the younger generations. However, Plekhanov was also challenged by this younger generation in relation to the other influences imported from the new developments that reopened the debates on materialism.

Alexander Bogdanov and his close associate Anatolii Lunacharsky as the representatives of the younger generation of Russian Marxists, challenged Plekhanov starting from the early 1900's. Although Bogdanov's philosophical criticism was already outlined in his published work *Short Course in Political Economy (1897)* (Bogdanov, 1979), in which Bogdanov follows the sociological development of society regarding the fragmentation of society by division of labour, his main attempt shaped with the upcoming literature on natural sciences. Bogdanov's main purpose in his earlier works, until his challenge with Plekhanov, was to find continuities between the natural, the social, and human mind. Consistent with this purpose his following works concentrated on nature and mind: *Basic Elements of a Historical View of Nature (1899)* and *Cognition from a Historical Point of View (1901)* (Zen′kovskij, 2003).

[31] Ibid., pp. 259.
[32] Ibid., pp. 259.

Bogdanov's engagement with the debates on materialism and epistemology of empiriocritics Mach and Avenarius dragged his attention to develop a criticism concerning these topics. "Although Bogdanov agreed with the empiriocritics, on the relativity of knowledge, he thought that they had still not overcome the dualism of the 'dependent' and 'independent' series, that is the events that took place in the mind and those that took place in the external world" (White, 2015). This criticism made his way to his departure from the empiriocritics, forcing him to build up his own theory, the system of 'Empiriomonism' (1904-1906) in which he criticized the centralization of perception of social reality on the basis of isolated individual rather than society (Boll, 1981).

Naturally Bogdanov's orientation of empiriomonism was not sympathized by Plekhanov since he thought the framework of Bogdanov was representing the denial of materialism. Although their meeting in Geneva in May 1904 and their debate, the conflict between them rapidly grew. In "November 1904 under the watch and motivation of Plekhanov, Lyubov Aksel'rod published an article in *Iskra* under the pseudonym of 'Ortodoks', attacking Bogdanov's ideas" (White, 2015). In this article Bogdanov's attempt of Empiriomonism was attacked and emphasized that it contradicted the materialist view of Marx and Engels. This article naturally enlarged the debate between Plekhanov and Bogdanov although the attack of Plekhanov's tradition did not bring in a reasonable explanation that why Bogdanov's ideas were a departure from the materialist theory.

Bogdanov's counter argument against this attack, took place in 1906 his finding that Plekhanov in his defense of Conrad Schmidt in *Die neue Zeit*, had defined matter in the understanding of Kant, meaning defining the matter as "is nothing but the totality of things-in-themselves, in so far as the latter are the sources of our sensations" (Plekhanov, 1980). Moreover, Bogdanov also attracted attention upon Plekhanov's pieces on French Materialism and Hegelian sympathizing in his earlier works[33], undermining his considered authority in dialectical materialism and in Marxists tradition. "Bogdanov made with this connection was that, in translating the second of Marx's theses on Feuerbach, Plekhanov had changed the meaning

[33] White, J. (2015). Lenin and Philosophy: The Historical Context. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *67*(1), 123-142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09668136.2014.990707

entirely, so that it appeared to give support to the concept of Kant's things-in-themselves" (White, 2015).

Bogdanov's challenge to Plekhanov is essential for the history of historical materialist method since it was a climax in the Russian Marxist tradition which later dominated the orthodoxy in Marxism. Moreover, this debate between Plekhanov and his followers with Bogdanov, illuminated the misinterpretations in historical materialist method due to the translations, interventions by ideological concerns, and the inconsistencies of theoreticians. Bogdanov's challenge also followed by others which carried the new literature on materialism from continental Europe. It is possible to trace these literature imports from the collection of Bogdanov entitled as *Studies in the Philosophy of Marxism (1908)* in which significant authors namely Bazarov, Lunacharsky, A. Berman, Yuskevich contributed and supported the reaction to Plekhanov (Lenin, 2002).

As for the future of historical materialist method, the legacy of Russian Marxism especially Plekhanov made a significant contribution to the ideas of Lenin who engaged materialism in much more political dimension, reformulating the orthodoxy and bringing in a new framework which is based on power, party and revolution. Lenin started his production in the middle of these debates on materialism and Marxism, replying them, and creating alternative and much more political explanations.

3.3.1.5 Lenin and Materialism: The Struggle Among Polemics

In the middle of these debates about materialism, Russian Marxism was in crisis and shaped and regulated under various different interpretations. Plekhanov who was considered as the founding father of Russian Marxism had theoretically undermined by the younger generation in which Bogdanov and Lunacharsky were the leading figures. Lenin as the close follower of Plekhanov had been following of these debates very closely carefully, regarding the undermination of Plekhanov from his inconsistent approach to matter. However, although Lenin did not agree Bogdanov's criticism and considered his approach was not consistent with materialism, his attitude towards Bogdanov did not appear due to their alliance against Mensheviks. During this ceasefire, Bogdanov's ideas had made a large impact on the party members and diffused to their approach (White, 2015).

Despite the first challenge of Lenin to Bogdanov appeared in series of questions that Lenin had sent to Bogdanov in relation with his series of lectures in Geneva, the major confrontation and debate on materialism appeared in Lenin's philosophical work *Materialism and Empiriocriticism (1908)* (Lenin, 1977). In this philosophical study Lenin engages with a wide range of names who had contributed to Russian intellectual debates on materialism. However, it is significant that Lenin had stayed silent towards the undermination of Plekhanov about his approach on matter which considers the matter in Kantian notices: the things-in-themselves. For the Kantian representation of matter, Lenin had encounter a large criticism also containing Bogdanov, Bazarov, Valentinov, Chernov, Berman and Yushkevich categorizing their approach under the name of empiriocritics and Machists[34] (Lenin, 1977). The accuse of being a Machist symbolically and theoretically considered by Lenin as a departure from materialist theory since, Mach's approach to physics defined itself as distant from both materialist and also idealist approaches (Frank, 1961). However, for Lenin being neutral or theoretically silent, refers to being idealist since his understanding, it will be explained in the following parts, composed of prioritizing materialism on the basis of matter.

This very first attempt of Lenin towards Machists was containing different theoretical strategies to undermine their influence that they had gained from their domination over Plekhanov. Firstly, Lenin accused Machists especially Bogdanov and Bazarov as emphasizing their real intention was to refute Engels but they could not do it due Engels' authority and prestige over Marxism. By outlining this accusation, Lenin aimed to show Machists ideological actions and their departure from the materialist theory. Lenin refers this accusation by:

> "the Machists would be Marxists have diplomatically set Engels aside, have completely ignored Feuerbach and are circling exclusively around Plekhanov. It is indeed circling around one spot, tedious and petty pecking and caviling at a disciple of Engels, while a frank examination of the views of the teacher himself is cravenly avoided. And since the purpose of the present cursory comments is to disclose the reactionary character of Machism and the correctness of the materialism of Marx and Engels…" (Lenin, 1977).

[34] Ibid., pp. 10.

Lenin's second strategy was to justify Plekhanov's attempt to define matter in Kantian terms. Lenin had observed and explained on the approaches on Kant, categorizing the approaches of Machists and Marxists differently. James D. White's interpretation of Lenin on Kant and the approaches on Kant illuminates the second strategy of Lenin against Machists clearly, regarding his careful distinctions. According to White:

> "According to Lenin, the principal feature of Kant's philosophy was the reconciliation of materialism with idealism, a compromise between the two opposing currents. Thus, when Kant assumed that something outside us, a thing-in-itself, corresponded to our ideas, he was a materialist when he declared this thing-in-itself to be unknowable, he was an idealist. It was Lenin's contention that 'Machists' criticized Kant for being too much of a materialist, while Marxists like Plekhanov criticized him for not being a materialist enough" (White, 2015).

So, Lenin implied that there are two distinct approaches to Kant since Kantian theory defines its epistemology according to relations of matter. By this way Plekhanov's interpretation is not directly accepted (and Lenin stayed silent) but the explanation on his attempt is dragged to an understandable context. The criticism on Mach following these polemics, sets an outline to understand Lenin's main logic building.

By these strategies Lenin, firstly discredits the criticism on Plekhanov and opens his path to clarify the very essence of the historical materialist method. After his clarification on the accusations on Plekhanov, Lenin emphasizes and categorizes the understanding on matter's priority over the social reality. This part of his theory making is constructed on again a criticism on the idealists and Mach himself. Regarding their approach on matter, which originates itself for Lenin on the philosophical framework of Berkeley and Hegel, Mach and idealists are ignoring the fact that the existence and priority of matter is the essential cause of sensation, knowing and understanding the social reality (Lenin, 1977). For Lenin Mach's assertion on materialism, in which Mach considers that materialism is an outdated foundation of modern scientific knowledge is unacceptable. Moreover, Mach's

attempt to deny and discredit 'matter'[35][36], is inconsistent for Lenin since, Mach's accepting that there are neutral things that can be experienced and knowable by scientific and empirical methods is conflicting with suggesting that there are no such things as matters (Mach and McCormack, 1960)(Mach and Williams, 1959).

Lenin puts out his own definitions on matter and its relations with the others, again rejecting the understanding that had been put forward by Mach and Avenarius. First clarification of Lenin appears *in Materialism and Empiriocriticism*:

> "…for idealism, there is no object without a subject, while for materialism the object exists independently of the subject and is reflected more or less adequately in the subject's mind" (Lenin, 2010).

Following this emphasis on the priority and objectivity of matter, Lenin defines matter's relationship with sensations and its influence on it. The definitions on matter and sensations in this regard illuminates the context based approach of Lenin in which he tries to emphasize on the knowability of the previously considered metaphysical categories such as sensations, in relation to the social and material conditions the matter prioritizes.

> "Matter is a philosophical category designating the objective reality which is given to man by his sensation, and which is copied, photographed, and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them"[37] (Lenin, 2010).
>
> "Matter is that which, acting upon our sense organs, produces sensations"[38] (Lenin, 2010).
>
> "The concept of matter expresses nothing more than the objective reality which is given us in sensation"[39] (Lenin, 2010).

These definitions on the relationship between matter and sensations clarify Lenin's approach on basing his theory on the social and material conditions that matter grounds and also distinguishes his theory from the Mach's and Avenarius' methods. Moreover, the way that Lenin prevails in his philosophical study Materialism and Empiriocriticism can be considered as an aggressive counter attack on the Russian

---

[35] Mach, E., & Williams, C. (1959). *The Analysis of sensations and the relation of the physical to the psychical* (1st ed., p. 332). New York, N.Y.: Dover.
[36] Mach, E., & McCormack, T. (1960). *The Science of Mechanics* (1st ed., pp. 579, 611). La Salle: Ill.
[37] Ibid., pp. 130.
[38] Ibid., pp. 146.
[39] Ibid., pp. 267.

Marxism which for Lenin was under the heavy manipulation of non-materialist and idealist attempts.

What grounds Lenin's attempt to be considered as serious challenges inside the historical materialist method, lies behind his understanding of materialism very close to Marx and Engels' on their confrontation with German philosophy. It is observable that Lenin was keen on grounding social reality in relation with social and material conditions even in the very first categories of Marxism. Rather than Plekhanov who tried to interpret Marxist dialectics, reformulating the principles, Lenin believed the principles and the whole approach can be used to re-shape the political economy that is the actual field of history, natural science, philosophy and the strategy of the working classes. In this regard Lenin's effort to use the method for to ground empirical knowledge, reminds Engels' attempts to bring in historical materialist explanations and theories other fields of sciences that may support the claims of communism in various dimensions[40]. Despite this similarity Lenin especially in his later works, both changed the interests of the method under more political associations and uses of it and popularized the method by linking it with the political philosophy of in the eve of revolution.

Russian Marxism had made a significant contribution to the Marxist Orthodoxy which definitely changed the approach of Marxism towards power relations as well. In this regard, it is possible to claim, with its revolutionary and aggressive recodification Russian Marxism brought in a complete new framework that reconsidered class and method. Furthermore, it is vital to mention this recodification was also challenged by other traditions especially after the second half of the 20th century. In order to touch upon another major contribution on the consideration of class and method, it is vital to review British Marxist Historical Tradition regarding their foundations of the Marxist theory and their conceptualizations on class.

3.3.2 Power and Revolution

From this point this research had overviewed the foundations of the methods of different Orthodox traditions regarding their perception on class which was also one

[40] Engels, F. (1972). *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* (1st ed.). Intl Pub; 1st edition.
Engels, F. (1971). *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1st ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
Engels, F. (2012). *Dialectics of Nature* (1st ed.). London: Wellred.

of the essential themes that Marx and Engels considered. Although it had been mentioned that their conceptualizations on class differed in accordance with the traditions contexts, it is one of the common features of these traditions to contain political purposes. These purposes nevertheless, regarded in a large extent constructing political strategies. However, the actual contribution on political strategies took place in the discussions of another theme namely the theme on power and revolution.

Despite the fact that the founding fathers were always considered power relations in order to grasp the future of their struggle, their theorization on power, power relations and revolution existed in their context which was after 1848 Revolutions continued with the domination of bourgeoisie around Europe rather than continuous revolutions. From their context, it was never the priority to theorize on revolution with a detailed method. From this point, it was the Orthodox traditions after Marx and Engels considered power relations and revolution with a wider and detailed perspective, even bringing in new theoretical framework on state, power and how to organize a revolution.

Following the same steps as in the first analysis on class and method, it is a requirement to overview the theoretical contribution that orthodox traditions formulated. In that sense following parts will focus on the actual discussions in the revolutionary strategies of German Social Democratic Party and Lenin and Bolshevik Party.

3.3.2.1 The Intellectual Crossfire

At the end of 1890's Kautsky's formulations on the Marxist orthodoxy remarking the role of intellectuals on the conscious raising of working classes, started to be challenged from several different angles. Although the first wave of criticisms on Kautsky was based on the inclusion of the role of intellectuals on the Marxist theory, they were appeared as not systematic attempts to encounter with Kautsky. Rather the first wave was a reactionary wave that was composed of compilation of reactions inside the party. However, the second wave emerged from different angles circling Kautsky under an intellectual crossfire.

The revisionist controversy which was mentioned above, emerged inside the party in the late 1890's, and was identified with Eduard Bernstein. Bernstein as the person

who introduced Kautsky with Engels and the party, was unpleasant due to the perspective of *Neue Zeit* and he had already abandoned Marxist doctrines when he launched his campaign. "His criticisms of the party's official ideology exposed the tension between the visionary and the apologetic elements within the Marxist synthesis. And Bernstein gave a fresh stimulus to the process of socialist self-criticism which had been unfolding among the younger intellectuals"[41] (Pierson, 1993). Although Bernstein was identified with the revisionist wave as a prominent name, it is significant to mention that firstly the protest wave was a coalition and had several wings with several different approaches to the criticisms of the ideology of the party. Secondly these different approaches were also in conflict with each other. It was in a large extend between the revisionist who had concentrated on the political strategies of the party namely Schippel, Calwer and Heine; the Bernstein group (Bernstein, Kampffmeyer, Schmidt) who had developed a gradual socialist growth model more long paced and politically designed; the Neo-Kantians who attempted to reconstruct Marxism on the philosophical basis. And lastly Lily Braun and Rosa Luxemburg who represented a more radical departure from the official ideology[42].

To start with, Bernstein's challenge on Kautsky was based on the theory of historical progress, in which Kautsky argued and defended as inevitable and the major dynamic of the Marxist theory. Bernstein with the influence of the context where he had engaged with the British Fabian Societies, had developed a larger and relaxed outlook on the historical progress when he launched his critical attempt. According to him, "Social Democrats were avoiding "theoretical difficulties" and counting on a "sudden leap from capitalism to socialist society" (Tudor and Tudor, 1988). For Bernstein, the over-trust on proletariat was not a scientific, even a mystical confidence. The criticism of Bernstein was going on in a large extent from the role of proletariat in the historical progress towards socialism, regarding the lack of sufficient conditions for socialist revolution and nevertheless on the role of intellectuals as the agents of developing consciousness. Bernstein's methodological criticism on the orthodoxy assumed a different approach on these issues. "Bernstein rejected the belief that socialism entailed a radically new mentality. On the contrary,

[41] Ibid., pp.122.
[42] Ibid., pp.121.

the vitality of the movement presupposed the persistence of older values and moral feelings. To seek to transform the mentality of the workers in fundamental way was no more realistic than the desire for an imminent and catastrophic collapse of capitalism" (Pierson, 1993). Kautsky had taken Bernstein's attempt seriously, welcoming his debates on Marxist theory, without enlarging the discussion between them directly to the party. However, their discussions end up being separated and becoming two wings in the party.

Kampffmeyer and Schmidt's further criticisms also followed Bernstein, but this time concerning directly towards the condition of working classes. For Kampffmeyer, the position of Social Democrats towards proletariat, shaped by their orthodox Marxist programme, was insufficient and inconsistent for their purposes due the alienation and exhaustion of working classes inside the capitalist system. Kampffmeyer's attempt was to reawaken the moral and physical conditions of the working classes, by starting a lively discussion of the fundamental issues of the Marxist theory (Kampffmeyer, 1898). He was following Georges Sorel, a French socialist, who argued that materialistic conception of history had failed to grasp the essential roots of the working-class individuals which are based on religious and moral aspects of human experience. Kampffmeyer in time, developed his criticism becoming to represent another wing in the party.

Meanwhile Schmidt had taken a similar position with Kampffmeyer at start, questioning the orthodoxy of the party by concentrating on the 'theoretical deductions' of Marxism. According to Schmidt it was necessary for Social Democrats to destroy the memorization habit and imperatives of Marxism in order to extent their political goals. Schmidt empowered his argument with his reaction to the 'sudden leap' dedication of the party towards socialism. In this regard Schmidt joined Bernstein, and later followed Kampffmeyer about his criticisms on orthodox Marxism (Tudor and Tudor, 1988).

Both Schmidt and Kampffmeyer had challenged the Marxist orthodoxy from a fundamental way, rejecting the belief that the Marxist conception of history provided socialists with "fixed propositions valid for time" in favor of the demand that Social Democrats constantly test their ideas in economic and social

circumstances that retained the vision of a radical transformation of life" (Pierson, 1993).

Another challenge to the orthodoxy developed from the young intellectuals Schippel, Calwer and Wolfgang Heine regarding the political strategy of the party and the use of method in this sense. It was a criticism developed under the influence of local trade union leaders and officials, and representatives of the local administrations, since their struggle was also attracting attention inside the party and offered alternative ways to revive the political dynamism concerning the political strategy. The orthodox Marxist doctrine had determined the roles of trade unions inside party's political strategy and limited the autonomy of them. Schippel, Calwer and Heine launched their campaign from this limitation, remarking it as an obstacle that party should solve. It was further necessary for them to concentrate on the legislative struggle happening with the Reichstag, since the political strategy was vital to ensure the maintenance of the party and the masses following them. "The three 'Praktiker' intellectuals had rejected the claim of the orthodox Marxists that theory provided guidance for the party's political practices in favor of a pragmatic approach to legislative issues. To adopt a more constructive role in the Reichstag debates was also to assume the existence of a wider community of interests"[43] (Pierson, 1993). Although three intellectuals were weakly associated with the Marxist theory, they had claimed that the Marxist theory party official codified was not consistent with the political struggles that need to be done in order to provide a revolutionary programme.

The revisionist wave also took a more theoretical and philosophical form under the Neo-Kantian revisionists who tried to reformulate and reconstruct Marxist theory with a new mentality for the working classes. Due to the influence of Kant in the philosophical spheres around Germany, it was nevertheless carried into the intellectual crisis by Hermann Cohen and Paul Natorp. Cohen and Natorp were in favor of formulating an ethical philosophy which would be designed for working classes and include Kant's critique of materialism. However due to its content the criticism was representing an earlier debate between idealists and materialists, and well prepared by Kautsky.

[43] Ibid., pp.131.

Following Kantian remarks there happened other similar attempts to revive Kantianism inside the party. Firstly, Karl Vorlander attempted to complete Marx's ideas by Kant and tried to launch a new theoretical movement by his work *Kant and Socialism*[44]. After him, Ludwig Woltmann appeared with his *Historical Materialism* presenting an alternative history on Marx claiming that Marx after Hegel returned to Kant in his philosophical studies (Vorländer, 1926). Unlike other Kantians Woltmann refused to adopt ethical idealism to reconstruct Marxism. Rather he preferred religion as a complimentary element that would close the gaps that Marxism could not be able to provide to the working classes.

The most serious and undermining challenge appeared with the Luxemburg and Braun since their attempt was both theoretical and also corresponding to the political strategy of the party. Their challenge was a part of already ongoing struggle between women inside the party which was identified with Clara Zetkin. Zetkin was from the tradition of Engels and Kautsky, and in a large extent had focused on to the ideas and projects on class struggle and education of the workers. Challenging Zetkin, Braun emerged as a revisionist that considered the women question in the party. It was the most significant challenge for her to raise a considerable ground for women to be recruited by the party and in the socialist movement. "Braun began to consider ways in which capitalism might be transformed within. She also attempted employing the Marxist interpretation of history, to gain a broader perspective on the plight of women under capitalism" (Pierson, 1993). It was Braun's challenge to shake Zetkin's position inside the party in order to bring in a serious revision on the orthodoxy inside the party.

On the other hand, Rosa Luxemburg had carried out a larger outlook on the Marxist theory represented by the party orthodoxy. Luxemburg centralized his emergence by her offense towards the Bernstein group who were carrying the idea that "capitalism was overcoming its contradictions and could be transformed peacefully into socialism". Against this common argument, Luxemburg emphasized that crisis was the milestone for understanding the essence of Marxist theory. Inside the capitalist system, crisis is an inevitable process that could even end up with the collapse of capitalism. The objective necessity on crisis, for Luxemburg, supported by her

[44] Vorlander, K. (1900). *Kant und der Sozialismus* (1st ed.). [S.l.]: Tübingen.

indications of the revolutionary agenda of the working classes (Luxemburg and Howard, 1971).

Luxemburg considered Marxist theory as a comprehensive theory that could not be interpreted separating its elements. Rather everything inside the theory must refer to the whole. For her, the revisionist waves were in a large extent failed because of their incomprehensiveness and the misinterpretations on the main theory. Furthermore, the revisions, which were carried in the party, by ignoring the framework had fallen to 'vulgar empiricism'.

Rosa Luxemburg's challenge later turned on questioning the party orthodoxy, regarding the new phases of social and political struggle that had been shaping the class consciousness over her setting. "She was particularly concerned with the way in which the "mental vacuum" in the proletariat was being filled with new content"[45] (Luxemburg and Howard, 1971). Her major claim about the origins of class consciousness reasoned by the social and political struggle that working classes were having. It was the context that provided dialectical way of thinking to the working classes and it also provided a "sword with which to pierce darkness of its historical future" and perceive the "inevitability of the proletarian society"[46]. Therefore Luxemburg's' consideration of theory lied behind the social and political context that her setting was providing to the working classes, in a way disregarding a special emphasis on the role of the intellectuals.

This formulation naturally challenged the main orthodoxy of the party formulated by Kautsky especially in the point the role of intellectuals was driven behind. Luxemburg considered working classes the one and only agent of historical progress, and nevertheless she considered the social and political context automatically a theory imposer. However, she had never refuted party's Marxist principles against the revisionist and put reservations on the Erfurt Programme to check and balance the party orthodoxy. Erfurt Programme was a measure for her to theoretically consolidate party once again.

> "If our programme is the formulation of the historical development of society from capitalism to socialism, obviously it

[45] Ibid., pp.54-55.
[46] Ibid., pp. 54-55.

> must formulate, in all its fundamental lines, all the transitory phases of this development, and consequently at every moment it should be able to indicate to the proletariat what ought to be its correct behavior in order to move toward socialism. It follows generally that there can be no time when the proletariat will be obliged to abandon its program or be abandoned by it"[47] (Luxemburg and Howard, 1971).

Rosa's real uprising began actually later with her reaction to the political strategy of party in the eve of World War I although her earlier challenged had settled and undermined the party orthodoxy from a more radical and Marxist line.

These various challenges towards the Social Democratic Party's orthodoxy formulated by Kautsky were also the attempts towards the first orthodoxy ever established. They were nevertheless attempts which showed the potential departures from the very central doctrine Kautsky with the help of founding father had formulated. Naturally Kautsky's Erfurt Programme was here the departing point. However not all of these attempts were shaped according to the programme rather most of them departed from the political strategy of the party was following.

It is observable that orthodoxy in Marxism, was in the German context never concentrated much on the original methodology rather to issue of class consciousness, and defining the social condition of working classes, to reconstruct a theory for Marxism. The theory construction was quite related with the party's strategical purposes but they were never completely adapted due to the challenges the questioned and wore out the party orthodoxy.

From this intellectual history of SPD, it is further necessary to turn back on Lenin in order to better observe the foundations of Marxist power and revolution theory since Lenin recodifies the orthodoxy by taking a complete different positioning, promoting a revolutionary attempt to end capitalist state and declare a socialist working-class state. This attempt can be considered as a reformulation in the characteristics of the Marxist Orthodoxy which with a close focus, constructs one of the major influences for future generations of Marxism.

[47] Ibid., pp.121.

3.3.2.2 Lenin and the Recodification of the Orthodoxy

Following his other and later works it is possible to observe that Lenin had attempted to first obtain and analyze the empirical knowledge that his context was inside. The study *The Development of Capitalism in Russia (1899)*, in which Lenin comparatively analyzes the data obtained about the capitalist enterprises and organization of Russia starting from the early 19th century, was already a part of this intention (Lenin, 1977). By this effort for the strategy of working classes in Russia to prevail, Lenin had observed the condition of proletarization process in Russia and the gained an empirical ground for to develop his political strategy.

As mentioned above, the confrontation of Lenin with the non-materialist and idealist interpretations of Marxism and social and natural sciences, is vital to track the journey of historical materialism and the orthodoxy in Marxism since Lenin's further efforts to use the method to create political theory and strategy had transformed the general understanding of the method. Following his intention to use the method in order to ground political theory in relation to social and material conditions that the historical context offers to the interest of working classes, Lenin stepped forward to apply his critical approach to reformulate the orthodoxy under the revolutionary subject namely the party. His main interest in this further attempt was already observable in his critical readings later published as *Philosophical Notebooks (1895-1916)* where Lenin brought in the question of the role of politics and power in the critical reading of his Hegel's philosophy of history (Lenin, 1972). Therefore, also in this study Lenin first time developed his tribute towards Marx and Engels who he had thought always had the common approach on dialectical materialism.

Lenin had never disregarded his own political engagement with the Russian Marxists and the Bolshevik party, while in his philosophical studies and had never tried to show himself sterile. On the contrary, he always encouraged Marxists to approach philosophy and science with their political engagements most significantly with their historical materialist method. In that sense, it is observable that Lenin's political theorizing always contains a political character which can be traced also inside his political references.

Dialectical materialism for Lenin was significant firstly to understand and reproduce the materialist philosophy and scientific knowledge and secondly important for to construct a political theory that can challenge the established bourgeoise order. In addition to the second task mentioned, Lenin centralized his approach in the favor of working classes and their historical progress towards communism. This centralization naturally concentrated his political theory on a political strategy which can contain the interest of working classes against bourgeoisie. Therefore, the aspect of Lenin's political thought to be oriented in the form of a political strategy, made him touch upon the political necessities in his time more than previous theoreticians. In this regard Lenin attempted to use dialectical materialism to illuminate the fact that, against the bourgeoise class and their instrument state, namely the main sources of sustainability, it is vital to struggle for the revolution which can enable the working classes to get rid of the system completely. The strategy for revolution for Lenin is the main task and the working classes can never protect their interests permanently with consent and with following a gradual social struggle like German Marxists had claimed (Lenin, 1935). Lenin had coded this future project as the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' as in *The Class Struggles in France (1848-1850)* (Marx, 1967). Dialectical materialism in his theory towards the target of revolution was used in order to remind a wide range of Marxists and the opposition parties, it is the only and consistent way that the social reality can be achieved. It is the one and only path that the historical progress can prevail in the favor of working classes. Towards socialism it is the most logical and permanent step towards future and the most scientific and grounding way to adopt Marxism's method dialectical and historical materialism (Lenin, 1973) (Lenin, 1999).

Lenin's polemical theory building during his debates on political strategy was in a large extend based on the attitude of German Marxists namely Karl Kautsky who was considered as the closest authority to Marx and Engels around Europe. Kautsky's theory of revolution and the method which was empowering it, as mentioned above was based on a theory of gradual evolutionary model. According to this, the revolution is only possible when the best conditions for the working classes were achieved through time and with deep strategies (Kautsky, 1996). Kautsky was supporting his argument with the emphasis of Marx and Engels on the social and material conditions that capitalist development and consciousness of the

working classes (Marx, 1974). As denier of the Bolshevik strategy Kautsky, saw historical and dialectical materialist method in much more non-political and passive sense that was more oriented on the observation and analyzing of the capitalist system. Kautsky's political engagement and authority in the Marxists in Social Democratic Party had made a large impact on the followers of Marxist tradition in Germany and his reactions towards Bolshevik's political strategy had nearly determined the general attitude of Marxists towards their struggle. Moreover, the dialectical method that Lenin was consolidating on larger political goals was criticized and considered to be ideological and hostile. In this regard Lenin had targeted German Marxist tradition namely Kautsky's political stance in order to discredit and undermine his authority in the Marxist tradition. His most important leverage was naturally the attitude of German Social Democratic Party towards the World War. Lenin by this large criticism undermined the misleading political stance of the German Social Democratic Party which was supporting the official government in Germany during the World War (Lenin, 1935). This criticism nevertheless showed the Marxist public that the close following of the founding fathers and their orthodoxy was not enough to formulate a sterile political stance in relation with the principles of communism. Furthermore, it was necessary for Lenin to consolidate a sterile political instrument that could take consistent political decisions for the goal of revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat which can provide the permanent interest of the working classes. The instrument was for Lenin the communist party that would be a party of qualified minorities who would vanguard the revolution (Lenin, 1965).

As seen Lenin's understanding of dialectical and historical materialism after his harsh debates with other Marxists was fused with the political theory he was basing on the political strategy of the communist party. It is observable that the orthodoxy on historical materialist method namely Marxism was codified in a political dimension by Lenin under the party and the political goals of revolution. It is significant to review this codification with the examination of Lenin's use of method in the political writings that he formulated and offered in the communist party. These writings nevertheless emphasize the significant role of the party to protect and provide the method of dialectical materialism for the political reproduction.

Furthermore, Lenin's production and use of the method clearly shows itself in his study *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism (1916)* (Lenin, 1968).

Lenin had prioritized empirical observation at the beginning of his studies with collecting data and analyzing the scale of capitalism in Russia (Lenin, 1977). In regard of this, Lenin had politically contributed to the economic dimension of the party programme in relation to the studies he had carried. After successfully recodifiying the Marxist orthodoxy with associating and fusing it with the political strategy of the Bolshevik Party, Lenin attempted to analyze the consequences of the World War, in order to illuminate the general tendencies of the capitalist order. The main motivation behind this attempt was again in relation with the political strategy that the party which was witnessing a quiet period for the social movements in Russia. However, the unsatisfactory political strategy of the party, and the lack of dynamism in the eve of the revolution, impressed Lenin to reconsider and overview the general analysis of the world capitalist system.

3.3.3 The Theories on Imperialism

After viewing the major influences on power and revolution it is further necessary to focus the last major conceptualization that Marxist Orthodoxy introduced and influenced the forthcoming traditions. The last conceptualization that this research concentrates is the conceptualizations on imperialism. Imperialism did not exist as a conceptualized phenomenon in the developing capitalist countries that Marx and Engels lived. Rather they had estimated that capitalist world system would be seeking new markets and systematic exploitation models that would sustain the production and domination of the capitalist system itself.

The theories of imperialism in a large extent were carried out by Marxist Orthodox traditions that conceptualized the phenomena from distinct angles. It is once again necessary to start with SPD's intervention to phenomena, and turn back on Lenin since there exists a strong debate between these two traditions on the structure of imperialism.

3.3.3.1 Road to Power and the Theory of Ultra-Imperialism in Methodological Perspective

Karl Kautsky's *Road to Power (1909)* appeared as a book on revolution that Kautsky systematically emphasized the revolutionary programme of the Social

Democratic Party once again. In this study Kautsky followed a narrative that showed his closest description towards a socialist revolution in a very revolutionary sense. *Road to Power* is also containing the methodological approach of historical materialist method in fusion with the political strategy of the party.

Kautsky as in the Marx's and Engel's departure point, starts with the empirical observation, namely the context that Germany had been inside. According to Kautsky, Germany was a highly industrialized country in its time, which caused capitalism to dominate the context, regarding the social and political transformations. Unlike the situation in Britain which had hosted to a capitalism that has agrarian roots[48], the capitalism in Germany had settled with the process of industrialization. With the rapid industrialization, the transforming sociology of Germany welcomed a large wave of proletarization which carried the potential for Social and Democratic Party.

Secondly, Kautsky very similarly to founding fathers, regards the question on the crisis referring to the capitalist system. "Kautsky formulated the significance of economic crisis in the general thesis that it was a 'ridiculous hope' to assume that the cartels and trusts could 'regulate production and thus deal with the crisis' (Salvadori, 1990). Nevertheless, it was for Kautsky, although there were different consequences of capitalism as can be seen from the historical perspective on wages, or social rights, the main target should be capitalist system as whole. "'The struggle against the crisis must therefore henceforth be waged only as a struggle against the totality of the capitalist mode of production and not simply against its parts'"[49] (Salvadori, 1990).

Further of his centralization of capitalist mode of production as a target, Kautsky underlines the revolutionary mission and character of the Social Democratic Party (SPD). This underline is supported by his conceptualization of the political and social revolutions. This separation of revolution definitions represents to stages of the socialist revolution. In the political revolution, the political power is obtained and use for to create an order in which state and society would step forward to reorganize. Therefore, in the social revolution, as a secondary stage, the

[48] Kautsky, K. (1988). *The Agrarian Question* (1st ed.). London [u.a.]: Zwan.
[49] Ibid., pp.126.

reorganization becomes completed and the society applies and lives a complete communism (Kautsky, 1902). Kautsky regarding these conceptualizations mentions the inevitability of the proletarian revolution, stating the importance of the political revolution (Kautsky, 1994).

Road to Power lastly contains the conditions Karl Kautsky formulated for the struggle of the party which also helped him to overview the social and political conditions that the context put in front of the party.

> "1.the existing regime must 'counter-pose itself to the mass of the people in a decisively hostile manner'.2. there 'must be a great party that organizes the masses and stands in irreconcilable opposition'.3. this party must represent the interests of the great majority of the nation and enjoy their confidence; 4. 'confidence in the established regime, in its strength and stability, must be shaken within its own instruments, the bureaucracy and the army'" (Kautsky, 1996).

It is observable in the other remarks of Kautsky the certain tasks refer the daily social and political conditions, regarding the democracy which was a very controversial issue in the late 19th and early 20th century Germany. Kautsky carried the debates on democracy inside his revolutionary theory, linking the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism. Moreover, Kautsky analyzed the political atmosphere from a very class based outlook. As in this brief tasks Kautsky showed that he had analyzed the class character of the bourgeoisie in which in the German context, happened with the unification of industry owners and former landlords.

> "To overcome the policy of armaments and the domination of the state by the *Krautjunker* and *Schlotunker* (big landowners and big industrialists), that is, the democratization of the country, these are the most important tasks of the German proletariat. They must be accomplished if its advance is to continue"[50] (Kautsky, 1996) .

In these regards, *Road to Power* represents a study in which Karl Kautsky becomes reengaged with the Marxist methodology step by step, regarding the prioritization of the empirical observation as a starting point, the analysis of the social and political conditions of the context, and theorizing over the context based conditions for a revolutionary strategy. It is likely to claim, Kautsky after a long time of revisionist

[50]Ibid., pp.12.

debates inside the party, had considered to reapply the original methodological formulations to review the context that the party and the working classes were considered to be trapped inside. The study also has the property to be one of the most comprehensive outlooks to the late German Empire, regarding class, dialectics, power relations. Finally, it is necessary to mention that *Road to Power* is a strong contributor to the theses of the orthodoxy of Marxism for the German Marxist movement, leaving strong footprints behind.

The outbreak of World War I, opened up new debates on imperialism which was a recently conceptualized term on the aggressive character of capitalized states. During this period Karl Kautsky inside German Marxism played a significant role on the theory of imperialism mainly managing the location of the party between two different views on imperialism. First view was that Lenin also contributed to theorize, namely the theorizing imperialism as a highest stage of capitalism, which depends on monopolization of capitalist firms with a power to control their interest by managing the state apparatus (Lenin, 1968). Second approach was conceptualized by Rosa Luxemburg indicating the excessive and limitless 'accumulation of capital', the expansionist tendencies of capitalist states, the hunger of imperialists for new markets, state becoming the indispensable apparatus of imperialists, and the lack of consumption becoming a crisis element for capitalist economy (Luxemburg, Tarbuck and Bukharin, 1973). Although these two approaches from outside and inside of the party made the topic more and more controversial, Karl Kautsky lead SPD to theorize around a different approach, namely the theory of 'Ultra-Imperialism' concerning a more historicist explanation on imperialism.

Karl Kautsky while constructing his interpretation on imperialism, started again with a historical observation on "the continuity of expansionist tendencies from the prehistoric nomads to modern aristocracy" (Kautsky, 1994). It was also a part of his debate with Schumpeter, but his main purpose was to connect this historical continuity notice with the whole idea about imperialism. Furthermore, Kautsky emphasized the colonialization processes all around the world that he linked with the expansionist tradition. It was for Kautsky, the capitalism with industry created a market which depended on free trade, wage labour and development (Kautsky, 1914). Therefore, industrial capitalism since it had acquired nearly all the

instruments of production and capital accumulation, did not necessarily need expansionist planning. Kautsky had already remarked this idea in one of his earlier works:

> "It was not the needs of industrial development that brought on the latest phase of colonial policy, but, on the one hand, the needs of classes, whose interests are opposed to the requirements of economic development and, on the other hand, the needs of states, whose interests are opposed to those of advanced civilization. In other words, the most recent phase of colonial policy is, like protectionism, a work of reaction; it is by no means necessary for economic development, often even harmful. It originates, not in England, but in France, Germany and Russia. Insofar as England is going along with it, it does so only under compulsion rather than of its own free will, defensively, rather than aggressively-speaking in general, of course" (Kautsky, 1898).

Kautsky by linking colonialism with the pre-industrial patterns, reflected his aim to disconnect the link between capitalism and imperialism that was the major claim of both Luxemburg and Lenin. "In his 1898 analysis, it was thus clearly the preindustrial forces of society that Kautsky held responsible for imperialism, that is, for the revival of colonialism in the late 19th century; the big landowners and the forces they dominated, the military, the bureaucracy, and the Church…" (Kautsky, 1994).

Kautsky's theory of imperialism by his first sketches in 1898 clearly reflected his historical concentration regarding his debate with Schumpeter. However, his search on continuities on the expansionism, was not directly linked with the social and political context that the social reality was carrying. It was rather a cultural or paternalistic linking, not a representative of the whole phenomena. Furthermore, Kautsky's appreciation of the industrial capitalist development, which created the proletariat with free trade and wage labour, disregards the exploitation over the working classes which Kautsky had previously claimed.

Kautsky's second wave of interpretations came later with his review of *Finance Capital* in 1911 where he concentrated on the future of capitalism. In this characterization Kautsky review the financialization of capital, which closely an attempt to maintain capital accumulation on the basis of capital itself.

> "Not England, but the United States is the country that shows us our social future in capitalism...It is to finance capital that the capitalist future belongs. But it is most brutal and violent form of capital, both in the international competitive struggle and in the domestic class struggle" (Kautsky, 1911).

It was an explanation and definition of financialization that broke the ties between state and capitalism since Kautsky refers to a disconnection of capital accumulation from the state based and regulated production. Therefore, the theory of imperialism was based on the direction of finance capital and centered this time on the basis of advanced form of capitalism. The advanced form of capitalism was responsible for Kautsky of the tendencies that capitalist development was running on.

> "In this form, industrial capital develops the same spirit of violence toward the exploited and competitors as has hitherto characterized all exploiting classes. To that extent, certainly, finance capital is, then, responsible for imperialism" (Kautsky, 1903).

Since the advanced form of capitalism emerged by Kautsky, the explanation on pre-industrial roots of expansionism slowly disappeared in Kautskyian theorizing. The interpretation of Kautsky on finance-capital was largely and attempt to refute the theory on imperialism which was conceptualizing around Rosa Luxemburg. Moreover, it was again an interpretation that partially regarded the social and political context that capitalism was continuing on.

The third and last wave of his interpretation on imperialism, Kautsky again locates imperialism at the center of advanced form of capitalism, however approaches as it was a policy done under capitalism. Kautsky published in *Neue Zeit*, *Der Imperialismus*, an article which concluded his remarks about imperialism prior to war. His last phase of methodological interpretation in this article showed itself under his questioning of the exchange between agriculture and industry in order to reason expansionism for capitalism. In this positioning Kautsky restated his definition of imperialism as a temporary policy.

> "Does it [imperialism] therefore constitute the ultimate possible expression of the world policy of capitalism, or is another possibility conceivable? In other worlds, does imperialism constitute the only remaining possible form of expansion f

> exchange between industry and agriculture under capitalism" (Kautsky, 1914).
>
> "Imperialism is a product of highly developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the tendency of every capitalist industrial nation to subjugate and annex an ever-larger agrarian area, without regard to the nations inhabiting this area"[51] (Kautsky, 1914).

After defining his last conclusions on the subject, Kautsky refers that imperialism is not representing an end to capitalism directly but it offers 'sharpening of class contradictions' and that of 'moral bankruptcy of capitalism'.

It is vital here to remark the methodology used by Kautsky conceptualizing imperialism as a theory. Nonetheless, it is observable that Kautsky had some inconsistencies in his 'ultra-imperialism' theory. "on the one hand Kautsky described ultra-imperialism sort of international collective capitalist planning based on a general agreement to exploit 'peacefully' the backward zones furnishing raw materials and foodstuffs", but on the other hand "the triumph of ultra-imperialism presumed the defeat of the imperialist line and therefore of the bloc of national finance capital and militarism within the bourgeoisie"[52] (Salvadori, 1990). It is for Kautsky both a destruction for capitalism and an offer for working classes who were considered to be developed under imperialist tendencies.

Kautsky's and Luxemburg's strategies on imperialism exampled two different methodological approaches to a single topic, and became two main fronts inside the party debates. As "Luxemburg urged a strategy based on the action of the proletariat, whose task must be to intervene in the crisis opened by the war to promote a revolutionary and international break with capitalism", Kautsky argued "aimed at a democratic peace, seen as the precondition for a recovery of the International on the basis that had been shattered by the war"[53] (Salvadori, 1990).

In regard of the methodological attempts of Karl Kautsky in his final major studies, it is vital to mention that the Marxist orthodoxy by German Marxism, largely interpreted according to conjecture that German working classes were living in. Although Kautsky throughout a long time represented and formulated Marxist

[51] Ibid., pp. 909.
[52] Ibid., pp.193.
[53] Ibid., pp.125.

orthodoxy alone, challenges against him also collected large attention especially in the case of Rosa Luxemburg. It is possible to claim German Marxism, made a huge impact towards orthodoxy of Marxism, for a long time intellectually dominating it. However, due to the use of method, it is not possible to generalize a certain theoretical framework used as in the case of Marx and Engels, who tried to ground every possible knowledge about a certain social, political or intellectual strategy. The use of dialectical principles in German Marxist history under SPD largely flexed and after some time never even mentioned. The theory making in a large extent went in the control of SPD orthodoxy which never systematically used theory except some studies of Karl Kautsky such as *Road to Power*, or in the *Erfurt Programme*. The Marxist theory used for legitimation of the party decisions and strategies although the theory never fused with the strategy completely as in the case Lenin and Bolshevik Party. Still, the orthodoxy due to its association with party and the role of party played in German politics in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, left a legacy that the German context hardly surpassed in intellectual dimension. Furthermore, the orthodoxy in Marxism continued to be controversial in different places which were never close to the context of Germany under capitalization. In regard of this, the next section will consider the reconstruction of Marxist orthodoxy in Russia in the eve of a socialist revolution.

3.3.3.2 Lenin on Imperialism

By his study *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism (1916)* Lenin analyzed the global capitalist system and the general tendencies of capitalism to monopolize. The monopolization of the capitalist system for Lenin was processing according to the rules of capitalist development and was inevitable. Monopolization of capitalism for Lenin progressed through history in some stages opening the gates for imperialism:

> "Thus, the principal stages in the history of monopolies are the following: (1) 1860-70, the highest stage, the apex of development of free competition; monopoly is in the barely discernible, embryonic stage. (2) After the crisis of 1873, a lengthy period of development of cartels; but they are still the exception. They are not yet durable. They are still a transitory phenomenon. (3) The boom at the end of the nineteenth century and the crisis of 1900-03. Cartels become one of the foundations of the whole of

> economic life. Capitalism has been transformed into imperialism" (Lenin, 1916).

Moreover, Lenin defined the stage of 'imperialism' as the last and unique stage of capitalism which generally composed of progresses of capitalist states, under the control and mentorship of bourgeoise class, towards sharing the land, wealth and economy of the not yet capitalized territories (Lenin, 1968). By the monopolization motto behind the imperialism theory, Lenin aimed to show the identical character of politics and economy in the capitalism in a way narrating the direct association of bourgeoise class with state and economy together. Furthermore, the theory of imperialism of Lenin, used a large scale of quantitative data describing the processes of monopolization (Lenin, 1916).

It is essential to mention that Lenin defines imperialism in reference to the work of J.A. Hobson with a unique difference which is reflecting an exact political interpretation (Hobson, 2016). This political interpretation nevertheless was attempted to empower the theoretical framework of the Marxist orthodoxy that Lenin had codified under the political strategy of the communist movement and party. The study of imperialism in that sense, is a serious and polemical attempt to build up a theoretical framework of the attitude of Marxist orthodoxy towards the capitalist system globally. By his last comprehensive study on imperialism, Lenin had concentrated to more political matters, since the revolutionary stage in Russia gained pace.

For reviewing the orthodoxy of Marxism, Lenin's place is essential since his studies and polemics firstly shows his great interest on philosophical and methodological interpretations on Marxism, secondly his significant attempt to transform the orthodoxy of Marxism under a new sphere composed of the association to the revolutionary instrument: the party, the inevitable and indispensable target of revolution and the struggle of working classes towards communism. The question of method which survived and had been blur through early 20th century, by Lenin in a large extend defined and solved with codification of dialectical materialism under the political strategy and tradition of Marx and Engels. Although Lenin in a large extend systematized the content of previously existing Marxists orthodoxy, it is observable that his systematization was oriented completely according to the context and the necessities of the context that Lenin had encountered. Lenin's method in that

sense a large-scale revision of method, done in order to consolidate a single method to struggle against non-Marxist interpretations. After Lenin, his method survived and became the official doctrine of the Soviet philosophy which represented the Marxist orthodoxy until the end of 20th century although the method was rapidly revised.

As the discussions on the contributions of Marxist Orthodoxy to the political theory of the historical materialist method, it is observable that, Marxist Orthodox traditions in a large extent theorized on the phenomena of the capitalist system according to their political context in relation with their political strategies. After Marx and Engels, their contributions are formative on the method and their influence provides them an ideological positioning against the other methodological and epistemological traditions. In this regard, it is vital to mention that, Orthodoxy in Marxism was composed of further contributions of Marxists on the appearing phenomenon of the capitalist system.

3.4 Marxist Orthodoxy on History of Political Thought Writing

One of the main purposes of this research is to find out the reasons that enlighten the emergence of 'social history of political theory' as an alternative method in accordance with historical materialist method. In this regard, certainly the approach of Marxist orthodoxies to the field of history of political thought writing, provides a strong reason. There are several ways to review the approach of orthodox Marxism to the question of political thought writing.

First of all, it is hard to consider the approach of orthodoxies in Marxism towards the history of political thought writing as a singular or unitary attempt. As the foundations of the methods in orthodoxies are in a large extent different, the use of method towards a history writing differs as well. Moreover, it is possible to argue that orthodox Marxism had never consolidated a consistent method for political thought writing rather, the orthodoxies used their method fundamentally to legitimize their history understanding. Rather than analyzing the social and material conditions that provide with the class analysis, a position to approach historical phenomenon, orthodoxies concentrated the revolutionary notions, class characteristics of the political thought which was produced and nevertheless the association and necessity of the related political thought content with their political

strategy. In this regard, it is first hard to trace a consistent approach and secondly it is not possible to identify the necessity of history of political thought writing since this field in a large extent not primarily useful for political strategies.

On the other hand, as mentioned briefly above, the major reason why their approaches are not clear and comprehensive to the field of history of political thought is related with their general perception of the reproduction feature of capitalism. As a part of the productions that capitalism provides to maintain itself in the superstructure, addressing the sustainability of the system, the field of history of political thought carries an important task to create a narrative which ground capitalism as a natural stage of human development and the class divergence as a part of legitimate distinction. In other words, especially in the foundation of Marxist Orthodoxies, it is not possible to identify an interest to a field that is established to provide a narrative related with the intellectual history, since the preoccupations of Marxist Orthodoxies namely their political strategies did only consider revolutionizing the world by concentrating the power relations.

It was only after the second half of the 20th century in the period when the debates had concentrated to the superstructure and the hegemony of capitalism over the society. This shifting focus had brought in a new framework that contained vital debates on the hegemony of capitalism, and how it maintained its control over the world. Starting from the discussion by Gramsci, it followed the several traditions which theorized upon the hegemony of capitalism. In accordance with the problematization of this study it is vital to observe the change in the approaches towards the field of history of political thought appeared very lately with the influence of British Marxist Historical Tradition.

Furtherly, the few attempts which contained attempts to write history of political thought with the use of historical materialism either only focused on writing the Marxist thought or even in the cases it was not the only period, there appeared the same methodological departures that orthodoxies reproduced as in the context of British Marxist historical tradition engaged with. One of the major products of this approach appeared with the study of C. B. Macpherson's *Political Theory of*

Possessive Individualism[54], the only serious attempt until the emergence of 'social history of political theory' that considered rewriting the field of history of political thought from a historical materialist position (Macpherson, 2011). Although Macpherson's attempt considered to approach the field of history of political thought from a Marxist perception, it had failed to develop an original series of conceptualizations, or analyses on the relations between political thinker and the social context. Rather Macpherson carried already in-use conceptualizations such as 'bourgeois class', role of trade and mercantilism in the early modern age, or the perception of bourgeois on property relations, in reviewing early modern age thinkers Hobbes and Locke. However, the related carried conceptualizations did not illuminate the bond between thinkers with context, rather used to schematically categorize their class characters. Moreover, Macpherson while analyzing the context that thinkers were existing in, did not go to detail on class relations, but generalized the society as a early bourgeois society[55] (Macpherson, 2011). Macpherson's canonical thinking had failed to signify a larger use of historical materialist method on the history of political thought rather reproduced the already existing method of orthodoxies in a content which it had never intervened.

Another major reason why orthodoxies in Marxism had failed to develop an original approach towards history of political thought writing, is about the characteristics of the foundation of the method. History of political thought is considered in a large extent a field which mainstream epistemology and methods had developed regarding to legitimize the political thought of the liberal/bourgeois system in historical perspective. It is nevertheless real that, history of political thought as a branch of political philosophy has been containing a narrative with a clear class position disregarding the social context and history. However, rejecting the field itself by orthodoxies, clearly puts their effectiveness behind, opening the doors for misinterpretations and further theorizing.

In regard of mainly these reasons, Marxist orthodoxies has not developed an approach towards writing history of political thought in materialist grounds, rather preferred to be either staying away and rejecting the field or intervening the field

[54] Macpherson, C. (2011). *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* (1st ed.). Don Mills (Ont.): Oxford University Press.
[55] Ibid.

from the general claims of the established orthodoxies had intervened. Regarding the purposes of this research, which are to identify the foundations of the orthodoxies' use of method, and its approach on history of political thought, it is further necessary to introduce an attempt which has completely different claims. 'The social history of political theory' as an alternative method emerges to respond the interpretations of orthodoxies in the use of the method.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF POLITICAL THEORY

Up to this chapter, this study has focused on firstly the foundations of the method of historical materialism, with analyzing the construction of the method by Marx and Engels; and secondly the foundations of the orthodoxies established in Marxism that generated the actual traditions and approaches. In these focuses the examination of the use of method by Marx and Engels and the representatives of the orthodoxies established, revealed the anatomy and history of the use of the method. Therefore, with a comparative analysis of the use of method, it has appeared that the orthodoxies in the claim of following the original tradition that Marx and Engels established, ended up reaching various different conclusions, prioritizing different issues for the same manner. Moreover, it has been revealed that these interpretations most basically and commonly concentrated on method for grounding the related political strategy in their context.

It is one of the major goals of this study to contextualize the theory in the sense that the actual production of method assumed to be depending on the social and material conditions of the setting and the interpretation of the theoretician. In that sense, this study followed the method of contextualizing, comparatively examining, and historically linking the theory between the producers. It is observable from these examinations that, historical materialist method is considered under several canonical narratives by the influence and interpretations of majorly the orthodoxies.

It is until this chapter further discussed about the methodological claims of the interpretations of the orthodoxies on the field of history of political thought. In this field, the canonical approaches on the use of method in writing history of political thought showed themselves, in a way either not even considering this field worth rewriting or considering rewriting it with some structural narratives especially based on class, state, revolution, and historical progress. However, although the attempts of rewriting history of political thought had enjoyed some appreciations as in the case of Macpherson, the disinterest on this field ended up producing a dissatisfactory

ground that the method is disconnected with its explanatory power (Macpherson, 2011).

As the desolation in this field produced and reproduced the canonical narrative of orthodoxies on political theory, which had reduced the use of method by the large involvement of structural approaches to theorizing, the original contributions of historical materialist method to methodology, that was based on empirical observation, contextualization, conceptualization and comprehensiveness, lagged behind. It was from this infertile ground, that an alternative approached happened to emerge later gaining the name 'the social history of political theory'. As a reaction to the hegemony of the orthodoxies in Marxism and the interventions of Post-Marxist explanatory schemes, it has developed a large variety of critical, and alternative explanations and approaches on the main framework of literature. 'The social history of political theory' emerged to respond the desolation of history of political thought writing both challenging the mainstream literature under the influence of empiric, hermeneutic or positivist epistemologies, and also the canonical narrative of the Marxist orthodoxies.

In this regard, this last chapter of the research concentrates firstly on the foundations of the method by examining the British Marxist Historical Tradition as the most contributive tradition to the emergence of social history of political theory General characteristics and the departure points inside the tradition will be reviewed in addition with the perspectives and use of method. In that respect it will be furtherly examined how Ellen Meiksins Wood developed analytical tools in order to both defend and update the claim of Orthodoxy. In relation with her intention, the 'Transition Debate' which was a major content inside the British Marxist Historical Tradition and later extended with the contribution of Robert Brenner, will be briefly described since it also provides the influence and ground to Ellen Meiksins Wood while she is developing the method of social history of political theory. Furthermore, the specific approach of 'social history of political theory' on the field of history of political thought, considering its relation with historical materialism and testing its validity to be the actual orthodoxy. Lastly, the research aims to reconsider historical materialism with the influence and contributions of Political Marxism, discussing the methodological future of Marxism. Political Marxism will be reviewed as a new

project to become a tradition developed in a large extent by Benno Teschke and Samuel Knafo and the Sussex University Group.

In addition to these objectives, it is also a target for this research to open up a discussion on the formation of the method. As the historical materialist method, usually been referred as 'dialectical and historical materialism', the nuance identifies a question of distinction between dialectical and historical. However, it will be discussed in the content of this chapter, that the separation of 'dialectical' and 'historical' appears to be a discontent inside the method, regarding the original properties of the method discussed in the first chapter.

4.1 The British Marxist Historical Tradition

The two sources of the orthodoxies namely the European Marxism (Western), rooted inside the debates in continental Europe with the strong influence of the German Marxism; and Soviet Marxism, which was consolidated by the reformulation of the orthodoxy by Lenin, constructed a pre-dominance over the critical intellectual traditions among Europe especially at the beginning of the century. Although, the hegemony of the Soviet Marxism over Marxist traditions was obviously determinant since the role of the Soviet Union against Nazism and it's being a concrete power in the favor of socialism; it was never considered by European Marxists as the official path of Marx and Engels. The main reason lies behind this controversy nevertheless was their monolithic perspective on the official interpretation of Marxism. To put it more briefly, both of these orthodox traditions claim their single possession over the Marxist theory. However, both of these orthodoxies were having the same problems about bringing in a reformation in the theory that would respond to the needs of proletariat around the world which was awaiting new opportunities with the war and crisis of the capitalist system was facing. The main crisis and dispute was nevertheless again the question of method, since the approaches were considering different strategies and perspectives about the social reality.

The theoretical weight of Soviet Marxism was consolidated under Lenin at the beginning of the century and considered to be reproduced by Stalinism. However, Stalinism with the claim to reproduce Marxism-Leninism once again, had made large revisions on Marxism-Leninism, turning it to a one-dimensional historical progress analysis. "Problems began with the establishment of Stalinist orthodoxies

which elevated or reduced- the metaphor to the first principle of Marxism-Leninism, asserting the supremacy of a self-contained economic sphere other passively reflexive subordinate spheres" (Wood, 1990). In the construction of the historical materialist method, the spheres of political, economic, ideological, social were considered to be complementary parts of social reality, representing the main logic of the mode of production asserted to them; the relationship between them as mentioned with the review of dialectical logic, was internal in a reflexive sense. Despite this source of the logic building, it was under Stalinist reconstruction of the orthodoxy, that the economic sphere was identified with the technical forces of production, 'operating according to the intrinsic natural laws of technological process of technological development" (Wood, 1990). This interpretation nevertheless was highly related with the historical context in which Soviet Union had been industrially transforming the society with the motto of the vanguardism for the socialist future. Therefore, the orthodoxy that Stalinism reconstructed had put privileges to the role of historical agent in the socialist transformation of the society, asserting the understanding of historical progress common inside Marxist theory.

There was also in the European Marxism, the growing interest on the approach of 'structuralism' which was an approach of outlooking the existing Marxist terminology from the focus of the role of the system. As structuralism asserted its general explanation by a reviewed outlook on the structure that pre-dominated the economic, political, social and ideological spheres, the approach appeared to be firstly departing from the understanding of historical materialist method by the fragmentation, secondly reducing the multi-dimensional perspective of dialectical logic into a single-sided explanation. Especially on the case of defining the relationship between base and superstructure, which will be discussed in details in following parts, structuralism constructed a controversial reasoning. "Althusser and his adherents redefined the relations between base and superstructure in such a way that the vagaries of human agency could be 'rigorously' excluded from the science of society, insisting on completely 'structural' determinations, while at the same time allowing for the unpredictable specificity of historical reality" (Wood, 1990).

Under these two pre-dominant orthodoxies, which considered different approaches to the use of historical materialist method in their perspectives, British Marxist

historical tradition emerged inside the tradition of British Marxism, which had long been quiet, with a distinctive voice that challenged both of these orthodoxies and establishing a strong influence over the critical history writing in 20th century. It was naturally the crisis of Marxism, that intellectually triggered such a tradition to be formed, under the context which seeks a new perspective of theorization of historical materialism.

The central working hypothesis of British Marxist historians which composed the tradition, has been that 'The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles', an argument well known in the Communist Manifesto (Marx and Engels, 1998). Therefore, the tradition inside various products had concentrated slicing and reading the history into confrontations such as for medieval ages, the confrontation between landlords and peasants, for 17th century from the angle of bourgeois revolutions, or for Industrial Revolution from the aspect of the clash between the capital and the labour. Therefore, one of the several major purposes and contributions of British Marxist historical tradition was to 'expand the scope of struggle and vocabulary of the resistance' (Kaye, 1990). This project was adopted both to challenge with the existing empirical knowledge of the mainstream methodologies over the social sciences and also to encounter with the reduction of the orthodoxies that European Marxism and Soviet Marxism had established.

The second main theoretical purpose of British Marxist historical tradition was on outlining a narrative that could succeed in the described challenges, at the same time, illuminating the gap of history writing on social concentrated basis. In this regard, British Marxist historians "have sought to redeem, or re-appropriate, the experience and the agency of the lower orders- peasants, plebs, artisans, and workers" , closing the angle between history from below or history from bottom up with the history of common people or namely the social history. Against the Annales School which in a large extent was concentrating on social history that focusses on the life and relations of the social life in history, British Marxist historical tradition had also considered a revolutionary motto, which in theoretical dimension aimed to vanguard a new approach which both enriches the material ground and also challenges the other methodologies.

The third and final contribution of the tradition has been the recovery and assemblage of a 'radical democratic tradition' which carries and organizes a 'counter-hegemonic' position on the conceptions of liberty, equality, community. "In Gramscian – as opposed to Leninist- fashion, the historians have revealed not a history of political ideas originating inside the heads of intellectuals, but a history of a popular ideology standing in dialogical relationship to the history of politics and ideas" (Kaye, 1990). The results of a more Gramscian based approach for the method will be discussed also in this section in the following parts.

Finally, for reviewing the general standing and significance of British Marxist historical tradition it is vital to mention that the tradition can hardly be considered as a singular tradition. Although the general characteristics of the tradition consist of common purposes to challenge the narratives of right and left, or to expand the vocabulary of the analysis by class struggles or to periodize history, there are different concentrations and methods inside the tradition whose examinations can reveal the actual components of the use of method. The tradition is composed of several major approaches; firstly, the approach of E. P. Thompson who although was from Birmingham School Echole, developed a unique use of method both theoretically and empirically grounded in relation with historical materialist method; secondly the historians who concentrated on the 'transition debate' which carries significant content about the explanation that historical materialist method ever formulated on the transitions in history under Maurice Dobb, Rodney Hilton and Christopher Hill ; thirdly the historians who attempted to construct a general history writing including social, political, economic spheres prominently with the contribution of Eric J. Hobsbawn. In accordance with the purposes of this research which aim to illuminate the use of method, it is vital to examine E. P. Thompson's approach than the concentration on transition debates under Maurice Dobb in methodological perspective.

4.1.1 Departure from the Orthodoxy: E. P. Thompson and Historical Materialism

E. P. Thompson's appearance has been a significant debut in the beginning of the debates about the transformation of Marxism after the Second World War. Marxism was as mentioned under the influence of two great orthodoxies which had been considered to be stuck in their dispute over Marxism. Since British Marxist

historical tradition in the academic level firstly organized under British Communist Party in 1950's, it was also a stage for E. P. Thompson who had been seeking to develop an alternative way of use of the method to history writing. Thompson had always contained further theoretical engagements than his contemporaries in the communist party even with strong reservations of Marx. "On the one hand, there has been a diversification of debate, a refusal of centers of 'orthodoxy' and, finally a hesitant move towards a critical engagement with the limitations of Marx himself" (Gray, 1990).

To start with Thompson's prior concern was to privilege the relationship between Marxism and history, in a way alternatively repositioning of history against the 'English' empirical understanding of history writing. It was also popular around the historians in communist party to recover the revolutionary and progressive popular traditions in the English history both to empower their position in the history writing and also to cover understudied periods in the history. Moreover, it was the general motto of the communist party strategy to organize and support popular democratic fronts after the war to strengthen the alliance which was against fascism. As a part of this strategy, recovering the revolutionary or progressive periods in the history writing, appeared and popularized between historians. Nevertheless, issuing these periods and elements had always required a wider engagement with cultural products in the history such as literature. It was described by Gray as a period of dual interpretations:

"The tradition was marked by an encounter between a determinist understanding of Marxism and a pressing need to assert the moment of struggle and human agency- in political practice as well as historical interpretation… It could be read to indicate a new strategic path for socialist transformation in advanced capitalist countries; but it could also be read as a defensive response to fascism, conceived in rather narrowly 'tactical' terms' (with the implication that 'liberal-bourgeois' allies in the struggle against fascism might be dumped at some later, rather than drawn into a more permanent system of social and political alliances)" (Gray, 1990).

Especially after the war the outcoming cultural transformations in the advanced capitalist countries, had created hard to confront results for Marxist left, in the form of 'fruitful tensions could collapse into a sentimental populism, a recourse to radical

popular and class traditions as a symbol of hope'. In regard of this challenges and strategical crisis of communist movements, Thompson suggested to develop more theoretically explanatory and empirically wealthy Marxist theory that could both solve the stuck in the current capacity Marxism to convince and socialize, and also the quality of the production in accordance with the historical materialist method. It was for Thompson majorly the influence of Soviet orthodoxy especially under Stalinist writings that limited the potentials of the British Communist Party and the tradition to form an alternative and scientific method which could rewrite history.

In that sense 1956 the invasion of Hungary by Soviet Union, had made a great impact for Thompson to influence his contemporaries to distinct themselves from the party and the orthodoxy that dominated it. Moreover, it was for Thompson a complete chance to make a departure from the legacy of 1930's and 1940's left that oriented on the strategy of communist parties.

By his major product, The Making of the English Working Class (1963) Thompson found the opportunity to disassociate Stalinism with the Marxist conception on class struggle analysis (Thompson, 1991). From methodological respect, it is vital to examine how Thompson theorized over history and class once again to identify his interpretations.

4.1.2 Thompson in Methodological Perspective

To start with his major empirical work of The Making, Thompson in a large extent holds the class struggle analysis to discredit the previous explanation of the historical progress and human agency understanding of Marxism-Leninism and also the attempt of empirical tradition to misuse the concept of class in a way fragmenting the core concept for their single-sided analysis.

The theoretical positions of Thompson developed for class struggle analysis depends upon several major arguments. First of all, for Thompson against Stalinist and structural functional sociologists, the concept of class and class formation is certainly historical. In other words, class can only be identified with its context, rather than an explanatory concept which can be serving as an instrument to classify.

“I do not see class a ‘structure’, nor even as a ‘category’, but as something which in fact happens (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships” (Thompson, 1991).

“…The notion of class entails the notion of historical relationship. Like any other relationship, it has a fluency which evades analysis if we attempt to stop it dead at any given moment and anatomize its structure” (Thompson, 1991).

Through viewing Thompson’s, The Making, it is possible to find out the notion of ‘experience’ plays a vital role to construct the social reality that almost every conceptualization engages. In his class definitions, experience appears as a constructive element. The notion of experience nevertheless strongly related with Thompson’s conception of historical progress. In addition to the use of ‘experience’, there is also ‘consciousness’ which characterizes ‘class’ as a prominent element. In his interpretation on class Thompson indicates that these notions complete each other to set a general outline of existing of a historical being:

“Class happens when some men, as a result of common experiences (inherited or shared), feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs. The class experience is largely determined by the productive relations into which men are born- or enter involuntarily. Class-consciousness is the way in which these experiences are handled in cultural terms: embodied in traditions, value systems, ideas and institutional forms. If the experience appears as determined, class consciousness does not. We can see a logic in the responses of similar occupational groups undergoing similar experiences, but we cannot predicate any law. Consciousness of class arises in the same way in different times and places, but never in just the same way” (Thompson, 1991).

From this interpretation of class, it is possible to reach several conclusions about the understanding of Thompson. Firstly, as the class is defined under economic relations which generate experiences for the class, and generations of consciousness by these experiences put forward a deterministic relation. Secondly the use of class consciousness while defining the positioning of the class, is a departing point from the method since it is considered in historical materialist method, it is the class struggles that generate the historical progress. In this conceptualization however,

experiences or consciousness refers to a vaguer consolidation. Rather than the social and political conditions that locate the position of class struggles, it is the most probably cultural harmony that generate the class being. Moreover, class is identified directly with the productive forces in this set of deterministic relations, and the historical progress is explained parallelly. In these regards, it is observable that Thompson in his class interpretation, depends upon vague relationships that create the major explanation in his theory. Therefore, in a more cultural based relationship model, he retains a kind of determinism but definitely a less mechanical more controversial sense. The mystification of experience and consciousness as constructive notions of class struggles, is another insufficient explanation in accordance with the historical materialist principles.

Furthermore, it is lastly significant to review Thompson's perception over the more general notions of Marxist theory which can address his use of method in other theoretical engagements of his against other orthodoxies. It is further necessary to briefly review Thompson perspective on the one of the major questions in Marxist theory which is the separation between 'base' and 'superstructure' that with class is the most problematic issue that grounds classical Marxist theory of state and also revolution.

The metaphor of base/superstructure has been one of the most addressed distinctions in Marxist theory although the original source of this metaphor had been mentioned only in few explanations of Marx and Engels. Moreover, there has been no serious challenging criticisms of the use of this metaphor except the objections to the uses which are associated with clear determinism. It is for the understanding and common use of this metaphor observable that, the metaphor in a way indicates spheres that have different structures and have their own being. Despite the principles of dialectical logic that every phenomena is a part of some other phenomena potentially and also their being is constructing a totality although their conflict is dynamic, the use and understanding of this metaphor by orthodoxies have always draw deterministic conclusions in which the relationship between phenomenon are directly determining each other. Therefore, the being of phenomenon are considered to be existing separately from each other. As, the spheres are considered autonomous, the relationship between them becomes a question. As mentioned until

Thompson the use of this metaphor had appeared in the 'structuralist' approach which had claims to reconstruct the understanding of Marxism on a system and institution oriented basis. Althusserian approach clearly distinguished 'mode of production' and 'social formation' from each other, establishing a deterministic relationship between them. "The base/superstructure model retained its mechanical character and its conceptualization of social structure in terms of discrete, discontinuous, externally related 'factors', 'levels' or 'instances', even if structural reflections was rendered effectively inoperative in the real world by rigid separation between structure and history and by the indefinite postponement of economic determination to an unforeseeable las instance" (Wood, 1990). In terms of considering the spheres as separate parts, and their deterministic relationship between each other, Althusserian structuralism, replaces the vocabulary of the old orthodoxy with its narrative and own logic building.

The base/superstructure metaphor although historically exampled a separate interpretation from historical materialist perception, for Thompson became an obvious topic to approach critical on. His challenge towards the Althusserian approach appeared in his second major study The Poverty of Theory (1978), where he consciously recognized the misinterpretations by two founding orthodoxies. Unlike his attempt to relocate class as a constructive element of historical progress, while his large criticism on the two orthodoxies, Thompson considers the conception of economic as not a separate sphere rather a material as opposed to 'social'. "Furthermore, the 'base'- the processes and relations of production- is not just 'economic' but also entails, and is embodied in, juridical-political and ideological forms and relations that cannot be relegated to a spatially separate superstructure" (Wood, 1990). In his reference to Kolakowski, Thompson refers his theorizing once again:

"when we speak of the capitalist mode of production for profit we are indicating at the same time a 'kernel' of characteristic human relationships- of exploitation, domination, and acquisitiveness- which are inseparable from this mode, and which find simultaneous expression in all of Mr. Williams' (Raymond Williams) 'systems'. Within the limits of the epoch there are characteristic tensions and contradictions, which cannot be transcended unless we transcend the epoch itself:

there is an economic logic and a moral logic and it is futile to argue as to which we give priority since they are different expressions of the same 'kernel of human relationships'. We may then rehabilitate the notion of capitalist of bourgeois culture…" (Thompson, 2008).

Inside this approach Thompson it is observable that his theorizing considers definitely not the relative separate being of the spheres as in the structuralist approach but from the opposite side a unity, which as mentioned in his class definition, gathered under a 'unitary' conception namely the social experience. "The 'unitary' conception of social experience courts this danger by threatening to deny any integrity and specificity to production and production relations, expanding their conceptual reach beyond all meaning" (Wood, 1990). The overconcentration on production relations, by the use of constitutive element of social experience once again, Thompson dislocates his reasoning in his explanation over the relationships in the capitalist system. Although Thompson prioritizes economic than cultural or any other sphere, he tends to blur the relationship which he emphasizes as constructive for every phenomenon inside production relations born and exists.

The rejection of base/superstructure model by Thompson indicates an attempt to depart from one of the main interpretations of orthodoxies about the use of method. In addition, Thompson's critique against the reductionist and structuralist approaches has clear grounds regarding their explanation capacity. However, Thompson's proposition to refine the metaphor, meets with his vague description of relations inside the production relations, since in Thompson's conceptualization the spheres which are in other theories can be considered as 'superstructures' such as political, ideological, jurisdictional etc. both exist inside the form infrastructures or bases. In other words, Thompson's definition addresses a superstructure although generated, tries to adapt infrastructure. Although Thompson's approach does not imply a directly deterministic relation between superstructure and base, it is still the vague conceptualization of cultural elements that constitutive experience and consciousness.

E. P. Thompson regarding his studies, has become the major influence in the British Marxist historical tradition since his positioning remained between the old orthodoxies and the post-Marxist wave. Therefore, his studies historically provided a

suitable ground for further studies due to the empirically supported data. However, since his method in a large extend constructed as more sophisticated but also ambiguous about the role of culture and class, Thompson's use of method remained controversial in accordance with historical materialist method. It is further necessary to examine the use of method in the other major approach in the British Marxist historical tradition namely the method of Dobb, Hilton, and Hill, in relation with the emergence of the 'transition debate'.

4.1.3 The Emergence of the Transition Debate

As the pre-dominance of the Marxist orthodoxies had shaken with the undermine of emerging post-Marxist positions, the fundamental understanding of historical progress transformed into a major controversial issue since it had been grounding most of the explanations of Marxism about class, stages in history, base/superstructure metaphor, and nevertheless the main project of proletariat against capitalism. In the eve of debates, the dissatisfactory models of orthodoxies on reviewing historical progress had already been challenged with the emergence of the transition debate. The transition debate was an academic debate about the transitions between the mode of productions, especially the transition between feudalism and capitalism, regarding the actual role played by classes, the question of crisis in feudalism, and the reasons why capitalist mode of production, by which contributing factors, became dominant.

The foundation of the debate started with the publication of Maurice Dobb's 'Studies in the Development of Capitalism' (1946) , which was an attempt to re-read the how the birth of capitalism happened while feudalism was having a structural crisis which dragged it to decline (Dobb, 1984). Dobb's attempt was to reveal the social and material conditions that provided consequences that capitalism as a new mode of production took over the established system. Dobb's findings nevertheless indicated that capitalism due to the changing demographic factors, the long downturn of feudalism in relation with the production, the changing wage-labour-land relations, the intra-class conflicts between landlords and their vassals, the deformation of land/labour ratio which provided stability to the production in feudalism, all together prepared the grounds that feudalism has faced a severe crisis

which very firstly appeared only in England. The reason why England had been the central location of the transition was further contributed in Brenner Debate.

It is vital to mention that Dobb while researching on the birth of capitalism, depended upon 'internal' factors in the first hand. Rather than common arguments of the orthodoxies which counted trade, industrialization, urbanization as the major contributing factors that created capitalist mode of production, Dobb emphasized that it was not the already existing trade that changed the relations of production but the decline of feudalism had played the major role (Dobb, 1984). Moreover, Dobb asserted the reasoning that, it was the need for additional revenue of the feudal, promoted and increased the pressure over the producers namely serfs. This pressure became ineffective in some point, without any further contribution to the increase of production. In the core of the crisis or the long decline of feudalism, according to Dobb lies the low productivity. Nevertheless, for Dobb there are several historical factors that triggered this low productivity. Firstly, the deformation in the land-labor ratio which is the factor that provided sustainability in the production in the long run resulted with an unbalanced situation. There are again historical factors such as the decline of political stability in Europe after the disappearance of the tribal empires/kingdoms. Secondly, as the political stability got opened for instability the relativity of the political systems, in other words the relativity of the feudal restrictions among Europe, had triggered the access of peasantry to the places with less feudal restrictions. Nevertheless, the earnings of peasantry in some places in Europe with their struggle, supported their situation with relative freedom. However, these earnings had never been considered by Dobb as major achievements rather supportive historical situations.

The feudal crisis with the disintegration it had in gradual periods but in a very long run, as mentioned triggered other transformations, with which, feudal power had tried to regain its authority. As the major dynamics of the crisis was depended upon structural factors, it would not possible for feudal landlords to restore the power, but regain it with different method with which they had given up some of their political and military powers. It was nevertheless the retreat of extra-economic coercion that provided demographic conditions to be stable with the contribution of other agents such as vassals, or knighthoods. As the extra-economic coercion retreated, the

maintenance of labour could not be provided and peasantry moved through the best places they could achieve the basic needs which were used to be provided by feudal powers. Land ownership also transformed by this labor mobility, and landlords developed another strategy to regain their authority by renting their lands to the tenants who they used in the sustain of peasantry previously. Nevertheless, basic needs with the desolation of feudal production in slow paces, became under control of the ones who hold the production. In other words, they became commodities under the imperatives of the market. So, peasantry had to consume these basic needs by working in the regard of selling their only power: labour. The major relationship between landlords, peasants and emerging tenant classes, had transformed into a contact based relationships by wage. The transformation narrative of Dobb as seen developed through very interrelated explanations, in which there has never been a pre-confirmed conceptualization. Following the feudal crisis, feudal relations crumbled and the feudal mode of production reached an advance stage of disintegration. But this didn't immediately lead to smooth capitalist relations to emergence as the dominant relations of production. There emerged a period of transition, characterized by production that was neither feudal nor yet capitalist. Independent from Feudalism, this mode of production was characterized as 'petty mode of production' (Dobb, 1984).

Dobb's method as can be seen in this example, firstly depends on the empirical observation in which the social and material grounds of the context are provided. Secondly, Dobb sees all the relations as pregnant to each other, in other words in the regard of potentialities. Thirdly, all of the relations in Dobb's method are interrelated and dynamic. It is likely to observe that Dobb, develops a consistent method in relation to the major principles of historical materialism, without disregarding any major positions.

As another prominent partner of this debate Rodney Hilton indicates the crisis of feudalism also involves the most advanced section of the 'bourgeois' development within the feudal system. It is observable for Hilton that the intra-class struggle inside feudalism had played another major role and it can be traced from the property relations.

“Rodney Hilton lends full support to the ‘property relations’ perspective of Dobb. He agrees that the growth and decay of Feudalism was the result of the factors operating within it and he considers feudal rent to be ‘prime mover’. Hilton suggests that the fundamental law of feudal society was the tendency of the exploiting class to realize the maximum rent from the labor of direct producers. This conflicted with the necessities of social growth resulted in a contradiction within the exploiting class itself. The member of this class began to compete with each other to establish their domination. This strives for power lead to increase the feudal rent to maintain their position. Thus, it was struggle for power and land-control that ignited the crisis in which feudal rent became prime mover.” (Singh, 2017).

Hilton also deliberates his theorizing from an internal point inside feudalism where he considers intra-class relations potential open endings for each other, in regard of their relations with peasantry and with the declining system. The use of method in Hilton with different concentrations, seem to be in parallel with the major contributor Dobb in this debate (Sweezy, Hilton and Hill, 2006).

Another significant foundation of the debate appeared by the attempt to rethink the historical processes in revolutions in Europe especially the Glorious Revolution (1688) in Britain and French Revolution (1789). Moreover, it was Marxists’ interests to re-read the revolution with the notions of emergence of bourgeoisie as a class, the role of trade and colonialism for the development of English and French market economy, and the emergence of urban life as a result of transition. By Christopher Hill’s major studies of The English Revolution 1640, and his contribution to the transition debate and by Eric Hobsbawn’s general history writing attempt ‘The Age of’ trilogy the analysis on the role of class conflicts and the conceptualization of revolution are grounded with social and material conditions that surrounded and reasoned them.

The transition debate just after Dobb’s debut in the history writing, collected counter-attempts that challenged the major theoretical framework, especially by Paul Sweezy and Immanuel Wallerstein. Furthermore, the major confrontation later appeared in American academia, in the form of Brenner Debate which contained larger interpretation on the use of method in history writing and explaining the historical progress from the aspect of the change in the mode of production. It is

vital to observe that the transition debate triggered a new wave of use of method in accordance with historical materialism with a notion to update the method against the established and nonfunctioning orthodoxies. Transition debate nevertheless carries a significance in the British Marxist historical tradition outlining a large pool for both an academic debate and also for the use of Marxist method against established orthodoxies.

British Marxist historical tradition has great importance in the history of historical materialist method due to its critical engagement with the orthodoxies, and its various interpretations on the use of the method. Although in the context of this research only E. P. Thompson and the contributors of the transition debate are taken into consideration, naturally the tradition needs a larger attendance.

4.1.4 The Contribution of Robert Brenner and 'The Brenner Debate'

As structural approaches on capitalism were surrounding Marxism, a vital attempt started with Robert Brenner's reopening of the first transition debate with completely new remarks, that challenged the dominance of structural explanations. The challenge started with Brenner's intervention to the approaches of the transition debate which was after Dobb countered by Wallerstein and Frank. Brenner attempted to reconsider the approaches of transition debates, in a way locating a misinterpretation while grounding the historical basis of the transition. In *'The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism' (1977)* [56] Brenner argued that the structural models of explaining capitalism were in a large extent composed of deductive analysis, in which either trade, capital accumulation, urbanization, or most importantly division of labour had set the roots of capitalism. It was Brenner's main emphasis that, the nuance of these kind of deductive analysis were similar to the tradition of political economist in Britain. In this regard, Brenner argued that, the structural approaches to the rise of capitalism, were Neo-Smithian rather than Marxist.

Apart from the critique at the starting point, Brenner aimed to develop a comprehensive historical approach, which comparatively based on 'exploiting differences within social trajectories that seemed at first similar in order to challenge

[56] Brenner, R. (1977). The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism. *New Left Review*, *104*, 25-92.

the understanding on capitalism' (Knafo & Teschke, 2017). Brenner's discussions about developing a new historically rich method appeared in later published as *'The Brenner Debate'*[57] a collection that contained further debates of the transition (Aston & Philpin, 1987). It was the attempt of historically enriching the ground of the transition debate, in a way recasting the characteristics of the distinctiveness in feudalism in different parts of Europe, majorly concentrating on England. From this historicizing, Brenner successfully triggered a larger debate on Britain (an inside the Britain, specifically England), in a way attracting attention to the unique social conditions appeared in case of agrarian capitalism. Moreover, the transition to agrarian capitalism, on the basis of English feudalism, historically connected with the improvement in productivity that also later characterized revolutions. Furthermore, this historicisation provided a suitable ground for Brenner to make his method more concrete, since the historical roots of transitions, were on the basis of social and material conditions. Apart from the external intervention theses of 'market dependency' or 'urban transformation', it was the examination of social property relations, that revealed the roots of transitions in the logic of feudalism, also measuring the reactions of the system gave out. "Brenner was specifically interested in the way social property relations had been redefined so as to make workers and producers dependent on the market. Needing means of subsistence, workers had to labor for capitalists under conditions which both limited their control over production and made them vulnerable to the demands of capitalist owners" (Knafo & Teschke, 2017).

Despite all of his historical logic building, Brenner was not welcomed by the representatives of structural approaches and met the accusation of misinterpreting the historical materialist method by disregarding the demographic, social factors and economic laws that contributed the dissolution of feudalism. This was nevertheless a face-off with structural theses once again, in the form of methodological divergence. The initial reaction towards Brenner formed itself mostly on Guy Bois commentary inside '*the Brenner Debate*' volume, with a strong emphasis on the complexity of concentrating only class struggles and social property relations (Bois, 1985). However, Guy Bois accusation on Brenner about his class struggle and social

[57] Aston, T., & Philpin, C. (1987). *The Brenner Debate* (1st ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

property based concentration, by Bois could not be replaced by an alternative approach rather than a use of method to reveal key trends on explaining capitalism in accordance with the structural schemas. Rather than developing method out of structural models, Bois reproduced the deductive analysis on the transitions, which was nothing more than following the mainstream approach on the transition debate[58] (Bois, 1985).

Through the first Brenner Debate discussions, it is observable that Brenner's unique attempt to develop a historically rich method resulted with a destabilization on the structural models' common approach to history and structure, in way forcing them to rethink the historical ground for the explanation capacity of the historical materialist method. Nevertheless, the Brenner Debate continued to be expanding until a long period of time, in a way gathering the controversial historical cases especially on 'low countries'[59] and the role of mercantilism[60], 'the Eastern European feudalism'[61] (Brenner, 2001) (Brenner, 1993) (Blaut, 1994).

4.2 Foundations of the Method 'the Social History of Political Theory'

Until here it has been formulated the intervention of Brenner to the transition debate, in a way methodologically showing his alternative approach. Nevertheless, the approach of Brenner had been followed by Wood, Mooers and Comninel as the first wave, who tried to enrich the background of the discussions on the England and France, touching upon the guidelines of the transitions to formulate an alternative outlook for the field of political history. This upcoming as an attempt of expansion, reemphasized several notions of social property relations and the significance of agency. Furthermore, the expanding intervention on political history, followingly discovered the importance of filling the vacancy on the field of political thought. In order to approach to this shifting interest more detailed, it is vital to discuss the reemphasis on social and property relations, therefore with the contributions that

[58] Bois main argument against Brenner was the insufficiency of feudal mode of production to develop such a transition. Rather than the internal conditions, Bois supported that it was external variables that contributed the transition (Bois, 1985).

[59] Brenner, R. (2001). The Low Countries in the Transition to Capitalism. In P. Hoppenbrouwers & J. van Zanden, *Peasants into Farmers? The Transformation of Rural Economy and Society in the Low Countries (Middle Ages - 19th Century) in Light of Brenner Debate* (1st ed., pp. 275-338). Turnhout: Brepols.

[60] Brenner, R. (1993). *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

[61] Blaut, J. (1994). Robert Brenner in the Tunnel of Time. *Antipode*, *26*(4), 351-374.

showed itself in political history. Nevertheless, it will be discussed that, how the historicity of the transitions reflected themselves in the construction of the method of 'social history of political theory'.

4.2.1 Rethinking the Findings of the Transition Debate

As the major findings from Brenner's intervention to the transition debate outlined the significance of taking social property relations to consider class struggles by reemphasizing the role of agency in the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production, it was the next attempt to enlarge the historicisation of the settings of where transition differed. It was primarily England, for Brenner, that the social property relations had different characteristics than the continental European feudalism. "Brenner demonstrated how institutionally entrenched property and class relations, stretching back to the resolution of the 10-11th century crisis and the Norman Conquest, led to a greater degree of intra-ruling class co-operation in England, versus greater degrees of French intra-ruling class competition among the Crown and the lords over peasant produce"[62] (Brenner, 1987) (Knafo & Teschke, 2017). His effort was mainly a comparative study that measured also the divergence of characteristics of feudalism. However, Brenner's discussions on *the Brenner Debate* were mostly focused on detailing the internal progress that the agrarian capitalism found its patterns. It was after Brenner, George Comninel's *Rethinking the French Revolution*[63] , Colin Mooers' *Making the Bourgeois Europe*[64], and in Wood's *the Pristine Culture of Capitalism*[65] followingly issued enriching various topics that the Brenner Debate had grounded.

Mooers and Comninel focused on the agency inside the controversial historical periods of England and France when, revolutions took place in a way triggering transformation of the political systems, locating the role of class struggles inside these settings. Moreover, these enrichments contributed largely to the explanation on Brenner's class based narrative, challenging the de-historicized idea of structural approaches assumption on the mechanized and economized role of inevitable

---

[62] Ibid., pp.12.
[63] Comninel, G. (1987). *Rethinking the French Revolution: Marxism and the Revisionist Challenge* (1st ed.). London: Verso.
[64] Mooers, C. (1991). *The Making of Bourgeois Europe: Absolutism, Revolution, and the Rise of Capitalism in England, France and Germany* (1st ed.). [London]: Verso.
[65] Wood, E. (1991). *The Pristine Culture of Capitalism: A Historical Essay on Old Regimes and Modern States* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

development of productive forces. Comninel's influencing study of *Rethinking French Revolution* had followed the method of first grounding the scale of historicisation on the context of French Revolution, in a way identifying the class characteristics that played roles on revolution. The scale discussion nevertheless, considered contextualization in a way claiming to distinguish itself from the orthodox explanations about the progressive character of the productive forces (Comninel, 1987). Comninel had also focused on discussing the use of method in a way referring to the attempt of Marx and Engels while formulating political economy as a critique of capitalism. In this regard, the study of Comninel both re-evaluated the assumptions on the perspective and scaling French Revolution with its agents, and also the use of method.

Colin Mooers' contribution also enlarged the perspective on bourgeois revolutions in Europe comparatively scaling the roles of ruling class struggles, characterized the formation of political structure. Therefore, with the contribution of Comninel towards scaling revolution, Mooers study further approached the conceptualization of revolution with a rich historicisation of the setting in accordance with the transformation it carried with (Mooers, 1991). Mooers and Comninel had in these regards contributed to the path that Brenner opened.

On the other hand, Wood extended the conditions of capitalist development in England by her study *the Pristine Culture of Capitalism* containing extended discussions on the emergence of modern state, the idea of sovereignty, civil society and the foundations of capitalist culture. Wood's attempt in *Pristine Culture* was to historicize the existing debates of the origins of modern state and sovereignty. In order to historicize these discussions, Wood followed the method to contextualize the setting that these concepts were considered to be taken account. In this regard, the development of capitalist mode of production which especially in mainstream Marxist literature considered to be causing the rise of the bourgeois as a class, reconsidered with the historical class analysis of the social and property relations. As a result of contextualization, Wood questioned the identification of capitalist with bourgeois, distinguishing their accounts according to the social property relations that they had carried towards the capitalization process of Britain. In that sense, their identification considered to be over-conceptualized by the mainstream literature.

Rather, for Wood bourgeoisie can only be used as identical with capitalist after a later period of capitalist development. This attempt conceptualized as *'the Bourgeois Paradigm'* a use which defines the mis-identification of bourgeoisie and capitalism of the structural approaches and mainstream literature (Wood, 1991). This remarkable divergence by Wood was a result of a rich historicisation attempt of modern state and modern sources of sovereignty which were in this study demystified and contextualized under the comparative study of the capitalist development in England. Furthermore, Wood discussed on the civil society and democracy which were two other conceptualizations of the mainstream and structural approaches that commonly associated with the rise of bourgeois and popular resistance cultures. In this reconsideration, Wood applied the discussion on bourgeois paradigm, reemphasizing the reading of rise of capitalist development. In that sense, the historical mission of civil society and democracy were contextualized according the class character they had been represented and the class struggle that they were first emerged in[66] (Wood, 1991). Wood's remarks continued in her study *Origin of Capitalism (1999)* and *Agrarian Origins of Capitalism (1998)*, where she discussed the approach to transition debates in with a more detailed focus on agrarian capitalism, which is the capitalist mode of production based on land (Wood, 1999) (Wood, 1998).

The contributions of Wood, Comninel and Mooers following Brenner's path on the origins of transition to capitalism, successfully contained a large content that was historicized, contextualized, and nevertheless reformulated. The historicisation attempt was a step forward to reformulate an alternative approach to use of method in accordance with historical materialism. Furthermore, the large content of historicisation, brought in new dynamics for historical materialism to explain the grounds of social reality.

4.3 The Emergence of 'Social History of Political Theory' as Method

As one of the pioneers, Ellen Meiksins Wood had contributed to the tradition in various fields of political science, regarding the method she has developed during her attempt to approach history of political thought writing. In this regard, it is vital

[66] Ibid.

to examine her methodological construction in relation with several stages she had passed while finally naming the method of 'social history of political theory'.

4.3.1 Determining Methodological Position

The departure points of Wood appeared firstly in her debut in *The Retreat from Class (1986)* [67] , where she had established her position against the structural approaches of Marxism, regarding the significance of socialism after the dissolution of USSR. It was mainly notable positions in the contemporary Marxism, that Wood considered as a departure from the actual method historical materialism.

Firstly, Wood argued that after the dissolution of USSR, the existing orthodoxies had lost all of their explanatory power, with an ideological wave that surrounded Marxism, and harshly questioned the previous authority of it. In relation to this the emergence of 'New True Socialism(s)' carried a large potential to replace these authority vacancies, in a way confirming on a new position of Marxist approach, with a strong retreat from the concentration on class. Due to the reaction to these NTS towards the class reductionism and the economist tendencies in the orthodoxies, it is for Wood not possible to consider class for NTS once more as an explanatory category.

> "In the 1980s, we seem to be witnessing a revival of 'true' socialism. The new true' socialism (NTS), which prides itself on a rejection of Marxist 'economism' and 'class-reductionism, has virtually excised class and class struggle from the socialist project. The most distinctive feature of this current is the autonomization of ideology and politics from any social basis, and more specifically, from any class foundation"[68] (Wood, 1999).

The main feature of this socialist attempt, was to reconsider Marxism not in relation to the foundations it had been discussed, rather on the new fundamentals that could carry the promising idea further and actual. The fundamental arguments of NTS were considering firstly the working class as a failed category that could run the social change, the necessity to disconnect economics and politics in a way both autonomizing them, thirdly disconnection of working classes with politics, the necessity of establishing a socialist movement autonomous from working class category, fourthly reformulation of 'people' as a new and more promising category,

[67] Wood, E. (1999). *The Retreat from Class: The New 'True' Socialism* (1st ed.). London: Verso.
[68] Ibid., pp.2.

and lastly a necessity to gather up all inequalities both identical and exploitative together[69] (Wood, 1999). However, for Wood the considered fundamentals of NTS were based on several deformations on the method of historical materialism.

To start with, it was the departure from class as an explanatory category which used to be an important variable that could only be summarized from the examination of social property relations. Although the established structural approaches used class as a category to read history from a comprehensive narrative, their approach, because of ignoring the social property relations in context, remained deductive. However, the reality of the method had based on a wide range examination of empirical observation, meaning the examination of context. Wood located that, by ignoring class based explanation regarding the context, it was a definite departure from the method itself.

> "To displace the working class from its position in the struggle for socialism is either to make a gross strategic error or to challenge this analysis of social relations and power, and at least implicitly to redefine the nature of the liberation which socialism offers. It is significant, however, that the traditional view of the working class as the primary agent of revolution has never been effectively challenged by an alternative analysis of social power and interest in capitalist society… The point is simply that none of these alternatives has been supported by a systematic reassessment of the social forces that constitute capitalism and its critical strategic targets. The typical mode of these alternative visions is voluntaristic Utopia or counsel of despair - or, as is often the case, both at once: a vision of a transformed society without real hope for a process of transformation."[70] (Wood, 1999).

Furthermore, Wood indicated the attempt of 'Eurocommunism' had carried large potential of similarities for NTS, since the main idea of them were based on this kind of concentration.

Apart from this critique, Wood suggested that this departure of NTS, had grounded on an already established framework, although it found its context after 1980's. According to Wood the true source of NTS, can be traced back to Poulantzas. Poulantzas for Wood had carried the embryos of the ideas of NTS, regarding his approach on Marxist theory on state and the autonomy of classes.

---

[69] Ibid., pp.4.
[70] Ibid., pp.15.

> "Poulantzas's theory of the state, for all its scholasticism, was from the beginning motivated by strategic considerations and the need to provide a theoretical base from which 'scientifically' to criticize some political programmes and support others. In *Political Power and Social Classes*, Poulantzas constructed an elaborate theoretical argument largely to demonstrate and explicate two principal characteristics of the capitalist state: the unitary character of its institutionalized power, and its 'relative autonomy' vis-a-vis the dominant classes"[71] (Wood, 1999).

The departure points of Poulantzas were located by Wood to elaborate on the autonomization of ideology and politics which she identified as the major characteristics of the NTS. The separation and autonomization of politics and ideology, appeared mainly by Ernesto Laclau on his approach on Poulantzas. For Wood the positioning of Laclau, and later Chantal Mouffe triggered a deep questioning of Marxist method, reasserting the main arguments of it, in a way considering the spheres, political and ideological as separate. In other words, Wood argued that while taking relative autonomy on spheres of ideological and political, Laclau and Mouffe fails to consolidate the harmony of Marxism rather they deform it by their attempt of autonomizing[72] (Wood, 1999).

Wood's criticism later touched upon another crucial characteristic of NTS, consolidating the positioning of Wood for her methodological approach. That was the randomization of history and politics, by NTS in order to support their claim to necessity to disconnect from the idea of class based historical reading. It was naturally the orthodoxies which formulated historical progress from the aspect of productive forces and relations of production arguing that it was inevitable to ignore the development of productive forces in historical progress, the variable that needs to overcome the relations of production. NTS's attempt seem to be reacting this reductionist historical reading, however for Wood, their actual attempt was to de-emphasize history and politics in the shape of braking the old discourses. Rather it was a serious departure to assume the history randomly engages with politics since, de-linking them as previously mentioned, decomposes the claim of multi-dimensional explanation capacity of the historical materialist method. Moreover, it is not clear for Wood to construct a comprehensive logic building while randomizing politics(Wood, 1999).

[71] Ibid., pp.27.
[72] Ibid.

Retreat from Class, settled the outlines for Wood to determine her methodological positioning for her major project of critically rewriting history of political thought, also with the contributions she had continued on the debates on transitions. Therefore, the problematics she had discovered in *Retreat from Class*, directed her to formulize the essential characteristics of capitalism for the methodological purposes. That was the attempt of formulizing 'the separation between economic and political' in capitalism, the formulation that Wood avoided to confirm until she had challenged with the structural approaches. Rather than the previously mentioned separations of structural approaches, Wood historicized the understandings of spheres in capitalism, in a way creating an alternative narrative on the spheres.

4.3.2 The Separation of the 'Economic' and the 'Political' in Capitalism

> "What does it mean to say that capitalism is marked by a unique differentiation of the 'economic' sphere? It means several things: that production and distribution assume a completely 'economic' form, no longer (Karl Polanyi put it)[73] 'embedded' in extra-economic social relations, in a system where production is generally production for exchange; that the allocation of social labour and the distribution of resources are achieved through the 'economic' mechanism of commodity-exchange; that the 'economic' forces of the commodity and labour-markets acquire a life of their own; that, to quote Marx, property 'receives its purely economic form by discarding all its former political and social embellishments and associations'[74]"[75] (Patriquin, 2012: 18).

One of the essential contributions of Ellen Meiksins Wood to the evaluations of historical methodological approaches towards capitalism was her formulation of the 'separation of the 'economic' and the 'political' in capitalism' (Wood, 1994). It was an attempt to link the findings of transitions debates, which indicated set of unique historical processes towards capitalist mode of production, with the methodological approach towards capitalism in a way describing a new framework to understand the relationships between social, political and economic spheres. The assumptions on the separations between the spheres had already been discussed by the structural approaches under the guidelines of 'base-superstructure' metaphors regarding the determination between them. On the other hand, it was the *Poulantzas-Miliband*

[73] Polanyi, K. (2014). *The Great Transformation* (1st ed.). Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press.
[74] Marx, Karl (1967) [1894]. *Capital*. Volume III, Progress Publishers: Moscow.
[75] Patriquin, L. (2012). *The Ellen Meiksins Wood Reader* (1st ed.). Leiden: Brill.

Debate[76] that problematized the reading of state and capitalism, with the mark of Poulantzas namely the 'relative autonomy of the state' (Poulantzas, 1969, 1978). Although these debates, the frameworks explaining the relations between these spheres (either assuming their separation or relative autonomic standing) were considered either deterministic reductions or indefinite conceptualizations for Wood. Except the accounts of the orthodoxies that classically formulate the relationship between political and economic by the schema of the metaphor 'base and superstructure', Wood mentioned other accounts following the orthodoxies had misleading abstractions that depoliticized the understanding of capitalism.

> "Other schools of Marxism have maintained the abstraction and enclosure of spheres in other ways - for example, by abstracting the economy or the circuit of capital in order to construct a technically sophisticated alternative to bourgeois economics, meeting it on its own ground (and going significantly further than Marx himself in this respect, without grounding the economic abstractions in historical and sociological analysis as he did). The social relations in which this economic mechanism is embedded - which indeed constitute it - are treated as somehow external. At best, a spatially separate political power may intervene in the economy, but the economy itself is evacuated of social content and depoliticized" (Wood, 1994: 21).

Apart from these frameworks, the findings of the transition debate had attracted attention to the unique organization of capitalism under its engagement with the various class struggles across Europe, in a way emphasizing the historical characteristics of the capitalist development. Moreover, as the findings in *the Brenner Debate* reasoned the emergence of labor-mobility and the rise of competitiveness in land based produced with mainly the retreat of the extra-economic coercion under feudalism, Wood followed the shift, constituting a wider explanation on the characteristic results of the shift by conceptualization a characteristic property of understanding the capitalism. It was the 'separation of the economic and political' under capitalism that constituted the major and unique properties of illusion on the separation or the relative autonomy theses.

---

[76] Miliband, R. (1970) The Capitalist State: Reply to Nikos Poulantzas. *New Left Review*, 1/59, 53-60.
Miliband, R. (1969) *The State in Capitalist Society*. Quartet Books
Poulantzas, N. (1969) The Problem of the Capitalist State. *New Left Review*, 1/58, 67-78.
Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso.

Wood's attempt was not indicating that there was a separation of spheres in capitalism which may open the doors for confirming the disconnection between the spheres. On the contrary, the separation was based on set of historical consequences that European feudalism experienced in its long decline. In order to illuminate the differentiation of Wood more clearly, it is vital to remember the pre-capitalist mode of productions' characteristics. In the pre-capitalist modes of productions, especially under feudalism, the extraction of surplus labour took place by the maintaining force of extra-economic coercion. Extra-economic coercion was a function of feudalism, which was an order composed of the unified and solidified spheres of political and economic. The social property relations were based on their unification, which was exercised by land owners (aristocracy). By the long decline of feudalism, the extra economic coercion couldn't be maintained as same and by the contribution of labor mobility reasoned by the retreat, the political had lost its total control over the economic activities. The gradual independence of economic activities, caused even the commodification of the basic needs, in order the regulate the supply and demand. In the development of capitalism, "surplus appropriation is achieving in ways determined by the complete separation of the producer from the conditions of labour and by the appropriator's absolute private property in the means of production" (Patriquin, 2012). In other words, it is possible to describe the differentiation of economic sphere as the transformation of the surplus-labour's extraction from the producer completely under the limits of economic activities. Wood reference was Marx's mention in the *Capital*:

> "In volume I of *Capital*, Marx works his way from the commodity form through surplus value to the 'secret of primitive accumulation', disclosing at last that the 'starting point' of capitalist production' is nothing else than the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production'[77], a process of class struggle and coercive intervention by the state on behalf of the expropriating class. The very structure of the argument suggests that, for Marx, the ultimate secret of capitalist production is a political one" (Wood, 1994: 20).

Nevertheless, this indication does not mention the disappearance of political sphere completely. Rather political sphere gains a regulatory mission to set the outlines that the economic activities would prevail. "Although the coercive force of the 'political'

[77] Marx, Karl (1971). *Capital*. Volume I, Progress Publishers: Moscow. p. 668.

sphere is ultimately necessary to sustain private property and the power of appropriation, economic need supplies the immediate compulsion forcing the worker to transfer surplus-labour to the capitalist in order to gain access to the means of production" (Patriquin, 2012). From Wood's historicisation of this differentiation, her findings about the origins of political, were based on maintaining the form of social property relations on the behalf of the ruling classes.

As the most concrete organ of political, the state, for Wood is the first constitution and composition of this attempts of ruling classes to squeeze the production under the mode of productions that consisted of the unified and solidified the economic and political (Wood, 1994).

> "What can perhaps be said is that, whichever came first, the existence of a state has always implied the existence of classes - although this proposition requires a definition of class capable of encompassing all divisions between direct producers and the appropriators of their surplus labour, even cases in which economic power is scarcely distinguishable from political power, where private property remains undeveloped, and where class and state are in effect one" (Wood, 1994).

On the other hand, in capitalism, as mentioned, the political runs to sustain the suitable ground for economic activities to be diffused. Furthermore, Wood identifies the 'political's privatization in the capitalist mode of production, regarding the capability of property owners in "maintaining private property and the power of surplus extraction without the proprietor wielding direct political power in the conventional sense"[78] (Wood, 1994:40). State in these regards, seems in capitalism like a 'neutral' organization that anyone can intervene. This function of state are the consequences of several properties "The state – which stands apart from the economy even though it intervenes in it – can ostensibly (notably, by means of universal suffrage) belong to everyone, producer and appropriator, without usurping the exploitive power of the appropriator. The expropriation of the direct producer simply makes certain direct political powers less immediately necessary to surplus extraction"[79] (Wood, 1994: 40).

[78] Ibid., pp.40.
[79] Ibid., pp.40.

Wood's formulation of the framework 'separation of the 'economic' and the 'political' in capitalism, in a large extend success bringing in a historicized explanation of the essentials of understanding capitalism unlike the structural and Post-Marxist approaches. By departing the position of depending on 'base and superstructure metaphor' and the theorizations around the 'relative autonomy' on the construction of capitalism, Wood's use of method depends on a logic building according to the historical data and on the empirical observation on social and property relations. Moreover, the formulation of 'the separation of the 'economic' and the 'political' becomes a distinguished framework to understand her approach to historical materialism and her major contributions on rewriting the history of political thought from a materialist ground.

4.3.3 Against Mainstream and Orthodox Approaches in Political Thought

The essential project of Ellen Meiksins Wood, until her interpretations on the findings of transitions, was to critically deconstruct the fields of political theory and history of political thought due to the insufficient engagement of historical materialism with this grounding fields. Wood's departure points while approaching these fields based on a contra-positioning against two established trends.

First one was the mainstream approach on history of political thought, which was largely shaped by with the 'Western political philosophy' tradition, that was based on the textual analyses on the political philosophy. Starting from the 1960's the scholarly debates on the future of political philosophy were largely covered mostly by the American Political Science circles, which considered a division of the studies namely between 'normative' and 'empirical' (Wood, 2008). While the 'empirical' studies considered to be focusing on the 'real' politics, the 'normative' studies ought to be concentrating on the larger frameworks in abstract dimension, formulizing the theoretical patterns of the principles of politics. Although there were counter attempts to reconsider these artificial divisions, as in the example of Sheldon Wolin, it was by the debut of Leo Strauss, the division went more concrete. As a reaction to this distinction, and the a-historicism labelled to it, it was with the emergence of Cambridge School tradition which challenged the considerations on political philosophy.

Cambridge School, with the foundational study of Quentin Skinner, *the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*[80][81] reconsidered the history of political thought, taking Renaissance as a starting point. The main purpose of Skinner was to construct a 'Western Political Theory' regarding rewriting an extended and historical set of explanations on the fundamental thinkers. Moreover, it was an attempt of Cambridge School to touch upon the influences of these thinkers, regarding minor figures who also historically contributed to theorizations. "Under the rubric of 'Cambridge', political theory became incorporated into a history of contested political languages that related political theory to traditions of discourse and the contingent political controversies of the theorist's own historical purpose was to understand the history of political thought on its own terms without engaging in the anachronistic exercise of presuming that the classics had anything to say about our own contemporary problems and predicaments" (Kennedy, 2011:1). It was rather for Wood missing that the contextualization of Cambridge School did not intent to refer social and material conditions as an explanatory supporter. Rather for Wood, although the historicisation of Cambridge School was intellectually and scholarly advanced, the contextualization method of the tradition depended on not the social and material conditions, or social property relations, disregarding the class characteristics of the thinker. "But much depends on what Cambridge School regards as a relevant context, and soon it becomes clear that contextualization has a different meaning than might be inferred Skinner's reference to 'social and intellectual matrix'. It turns out that 'social' matrix has little to do with society, economy, or even the polity" (Wood, 2008:8). Although Wood remarked that there were other attempts by Cambridge School that considered focusing on the economic or political relationships, with a method extending once again the intellectual origins, Cambridge School disregarded the 'process' and 'reasoning' between the examinations, turning their framework to 'ahistorical' in the sense that they disconnect from the attempt of narrating a general outline. The methodological approach of the mainstream tradition was in a large extent composed of either artificial divisions which suggest disconnections between empiric and normative

[80] Skinner, Q. (1978). *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Volume I: The Renaissance* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[81] Skinner, Q. (1978). *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Volume II: The Reformation* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

studies, or ahistorical accounts that disregard contextualization based on social and material conditions.

On the other hand, the fields of political theory and history of political thought were considered by Marxist orthodoxies to be the 'invented fields' since they had been accused of narrated by the 'bourgeois' political thought, only concentrating the aristocrat and bourgeois philosophers. Moreover, there were very few attempts under Marxism that approached history of political thought. Even though these approaches considered history of political thought as a field worth evaluating, the alternative attempt of examining them like as mentioned in the example of C.B. Macpherson, were stucked in deductive analyses, in which the textual production of political philosophers were representations of the early attempts of establishing a class notion on the rising bourgeoisie (Macpherson, 2011). The market society by Macpherson for Wood was an external assertion to a historical period where the development of capitalism by Macpherson overloaded and reduced to the rise of bourgeoisie as a class (Wood, 2008:6).

From the same positioning, it was Neal Wood in *John Locke and Agrarian Capitalism (1978)*[82], who firstly formulated and discussed the term 'social history of political theory'. Rather than a description, Wood's main purpose was to reveal the distress that how political theory and history of political thought were seen under the influences of Cambridge School and Macpherson's canonical narrative. It was the methodological positioning of Neal Wood, that justified the historicisation and contextualization qualities of the historical materialist method, touching upon the debates on history from below. For Neal Wood, the important point is to develop a material ground in which the thinker can be evaluated regarding the class characteristics, his/her positioning in the social and political relations, and the textual quality and properties of his/her production (Wood, 1978). These purposes were also reflecting Ellen Meiksins Wood's approach towards the history of political thought as can be seen from the use of the same term.

[82] Wood, N. (1978). *John Locke and Agrarian Capitalism* (1st ed.). Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

4.3.4 The Social History of Political Theory in Methodological Perspective

"'The social history of political theory' starts from the premise that the great political thinkers of the past were passionately engaged in the issues of their time and place" (Wood, 2008). This includes even their other activities and references where they are engaged with other conversations with their contemporaries, or their personal positioning for a problematic. This does not mean definitely to claim that the setting determined whole of their intentions and purposes of engaging with political theory, rather an indication to the importance of materializing the roots of theoretical production. Unlike the deductive claim that political thinkers were class propogandists, for 'the social history of political theory' approach, they should be seen people who are in action to exercise a persuasion that contribute to a greater narrative, which orients itself to the mainstream political patterns of their time. In these regards, 'social history of political theory' identifies its first positioning against the mainstream approaches.

"The social history of political theory, in its conception of historical contexts, proceeds from certain fundamental premises, which belong to the tradition of historical materialism: human beings enter into relations with each other and with nature to guarantee their own survival and social reproduction"[83] (Wood, 2008:12). In other words, 'social history of political theory' traces the origins of material explanations, considering the characteristics of the historical agent with its engagement with social and material conditions that ground the production in any level. 'The social history of political theory' targets to "understand the social practices and cultural products of any time and place", observing the conditions of survival and social reproduction, considering the specific ways 'in which people gain access to the material conditions of life'[84] (Wood, 2008: 12).

In this point, it is secondly vital to identify the relationship between the method and main premises of historical materialism. Here it significant to remember the formulation of historical materialism once again. It is the major assumption of historical materialism to observe the empirical ground, depending on the social and material conditions that coordinate the relationships between social phenomenon. Regarding this premise, historical materialist method, even at first by Marx and

[83] Ibid., pp.12.
[84] Ibid., pp.12.

Engels, designed to develop explanations that may consider the social and material background of phenomenon that encounter with each other. The first observation nevertheless defines the nature of the social phenomenon, with a material justification of the conditions that illuminate the phenomenon's positioning inside the related setting. According to this positioning, it is observable that the historical agents, primarily consider their survival and reproduction inside the related social setting, adapting themselves to the setting, although not every adaptation prototypes the agent itself. Rather, the historical agents' adaptations contribute to the changes on the social setting, gradually making differentiations. Regarding these notices, 'the social history of political theory' adopts the main premise of historical materialism, consisting a comprehensive definition of an explanatory parameter.

Thirdly, during the processes of historicisation of the relationship, it is the most crucial intention of the method to concentrate on the specific ways of reproduction of the phenomenon since (as can be similarized with the method in transition debates) it is the agents' historical attempts to redesign itself, that formulates the characteristics of the contribution that the agent make all the difference in the related historical context. In these regards, "if different historical experiences give rise to different sets of problems, it follows that these divergences will also be observable in various traditions of discourse"[85] (Wood, 2008:13). Moreover, explaining these diversities in discourse requires not a monistic argumentation that only indicate the origins of the diversities, rather require an approach that 'internally', meaning from the patterns of the origins of the diversities, develop an explanation on the characteristics of the context.

In these regards, 'the social history of political theory' methodologically formulates itself, firstly identifying itself as a method which derives from the main premises of historical materialism on grounding social phenomenon on material basis', secondly a method which tries to approach the field of political thought from in intention to historicize and contextualize the political thinker without any reduction, and thirdly a method, that focuses on the specific ways of reproduction of the related agent, emphasizing the distinguishment between historical conditions.

[85] Ibid., pp.13.

4.3.5 Locating the Beginning and the Journey of Political Thought

It was after formulizing these methodological aspects of the approach, Wood firstly stressed the beginning inside the field of history of political thought. Unlike the mainstream narrative that rapidly introducing political theory from the Ancient Greek political philosophers, for the approach of 'social history of political theory' it was the setting of 'polis' which better explains the rise and fall of the Ancient Greek political philosophers since their major concern was based on the changing context of 'polis'.

The mainstream Western political theory tradition has been depending on Greek political thought for various reasons but most importantly, the content that it philosophized on the nature of private property and power which remains in the center of European political thought. It was in the Ancient Greece 'polis' context that the private property has been formulated with its social and political legitimacy regarding the dominant-appropriating classes who had mostly contributed developing advantageous relations with the productive classes. The formation of state in Greek polis had found its main impression and direction from these complicated relationships, in which the measure of the classes extended, or on the contrary narrowed down.

"The relation between appropriating and producing classes was to change fundamentally with the advent of capitalism, but the history of Western political theory continued to be, in a large part, the history of tensions between property and state, appropriators and producers. In general, the Western tradition of political theory has been 'history from above'[86] (Wood, 2008:22). The notion of history from above is a reflection on the state and need for preservation or change, from the perspective of ruling classes. This need for legitimate power, is one of the most important concentration points for 'the social history of political theory' since it aims to reveal the relationship between the state, propertied classes, and producers in a historical setting, with a material explanation.

The relationships between state, propertied classes and producers, in a large extent never stayed exactly the same under different modes of productions under different historical settings. Although the broad notion of rulers and producers has been a

[86] Ibid., pp.22.

remark which in classical approaches an important divisionary category, the various ways of reproduction of the social and material conditions. Even in the same mode of production, the class relations and state formation went on in several different shapes. "To be sure, the peasant citizen would not survive the Roman Empire, and many centuries would pass before anything comparable to the ancient-Athenian idea of democratic citizenship would re-emerge in Europe"[87] (Wood, 2008:22). Or it is vital to observe that even the ruling classes necessarily did not organize under same type of formation under state. Despite these different forms of reproduction that designed the social and political formation of the related setting, it is the exercise of 'extra-economic coercion' by ruling classes that similarized the division between rulers and producers. Since the producer classes had never acquired the exercise of 'extra-economic coercion' naturally, the distinction between ruling and producer classes had similar schemes although the actual formation of organization of this exercise is historically in reservation due to the context.

Another example can be observed in Roman Empire's historical period, that the distinction between public and private reformulated (as *dominium* and *imperium*) regarding the changing relationship between ruling classes, who organized under a similar aristocratic senate like Ancient Greece, shifting to an imperial order that was legitimized by the emerging law making. The distinction between these notions, was a greater reference for the European political thought, who identified the distinction with its fundamental premises.

"At each stage in this history of political practice, there were corresponding changes in theory and variations on old themes to accommodate new social tensions and political arrangements"[88] (Wood, 2008:24). Through this Western history of political theory, it is significant to observe political theory follows a pathway which had already been opened by the social and political conditions that required new theoretical innovations. Therefore, the theoretical innovations of political thinkers are in close relation with these future projects, regarding mostly the 'preservation' of the ruling classes, although under some circumstances it required or demanded more extended transformations. While these complex relationships between state, ruling and producer classes, the Western political theory had witnessed in a large extent

[87] Ibid., pp.22.
[88] Ibid., pp.24.

unique reproduction periods, where with the requirements of the historical context, several different outputs as political formations and theoretical innovations were produced unlike the other examples around the world, where these relationships followed more straight and static stances.

Regarding these several different reproductions of modes of production, the content of political theory had also carried various efforts of reproduction. On the example of Thomas Hobbes or John Locke, it was the transforming England, with the agrarian capitalism, that required a new theoretical framework which would legitimize the working relations and the relationship between social classes. Or in the example of Jean Bodin, the source of 'sovereignty' relied upon the transforming feudal structure in France, when the long downturn of parcelized feudalism had become an uncontrolled crisis.

As from these short examples, the beginning and journey of political theory from the standpoint of 'the social history of political theory' method is not a direct story between political thinkers, and their relationships, rather a pathway, which only with the examination the relations between social property, classes, state, and the historical context can define.

4.4 The Question of Political Marxism as a Tradition

Following the contribution of Robert Brenner and Ellen Meiksins Wood both on the Transition Debate and in the field of history of political thought, it was widely discussed if they represented a certain new attempt that can be considered as a tradition. This categorization attempt has several findings that try to project that there could be a certain way of considering the contributions of Brenner and Wood in accordance with the common features of both of their methodologies.

In that respect the attempt of contextualizing the historical settings in accordance with the social property relations that could identify the class struggles which puts forwards the 'political' sphere as a significant determinant is one of the major common methodological pathways that Brenner and Wood both followed. Secondly, their common departure point was against the established explanatory schemas by both Marxist Orthodoxies and also the mainstream literature. Thirdly it is vital to observe that the contributions of Robert Brenner provided a suitable debate for Ellen Meiksins Wood to develop a methodological investigation that also reaches the field

of history of political thought. In relation with that it is possible to link the contribution of Brenner with Wood's investigation. Especially for the concentration on transitions from feudalism to capitalism reveals the social property relations that identify the class characteristics of the related historical setting also for Wood's the social history of political theory. Lastly but most importantly it is crucial to mention that these interests of Brenner and Wood are both related with a significant feature namely the reproduction capacities and formations of related modes of productions. As their common concentration on changing social property relations indicate an investigation on social and material conditions which point out the social formations that the structure adapts, it is possible to identify their concentration is in a large extent related with the reproduction capacities. In relation with this, both Brenner and Wood observe and explain the emergence of capitalism from feudalism from the explanations that chase and underline the changing social property relations that in a large extent result with the changes in political formations of the related historical settings.

Although there are common concentration and common empirical observation on the transitions, it not directly possible that Brenner and Wood started a conscious common campaign to start a certain tradition. Their studies are closely linked, and the purposes serve the same common front that challenge the existing explanatory schemas of social reality. However, it was rather another attempt to categorize a certain tradition that depend on the methodological investigation both Brenner and Wood started, namely the attempt of Political Marxism.

> "The term PM was adopted to highlight the irreducibility of historically distinct class struggles in opposition to a more generic conception of class struggle as a passive manifestation of a deeper structural logic… At the root of this new political approach to Historical Materialism, PM offered a radical questioning of the apparently universal features of capitalism- a social system which had too often been loosely generalizes to all societies where markets seemed to play a significant role. Opposing this focus on markets, Political Marxist were keen to redefine capitalism on the basis of social relations, or more specifically social property relations" (Knafo & Teschke, 2017).

The attempt of establishing a certain tradition of Political Marxism, in reference with the studies of Brenner and Wood, projected with the study of Teschke and Knafo

clearly. This attempt assumed that there is a certain continuity with the studies of Brenner and Wood, regarding their methodological investigations and there is a requirement of developing a further generation that would carry their investigation especially focusing on the role of agency and reproduction.

According to this attempt, by the critical and historicized reading of Brenner, the guidelines of Political Marxism had grounded itself on recasting the foundations of modes of production in relation with the reproduction style of the modes of production, and the main motto to radicalize the historical framework of explanation. Moreover, it was the concentration on 'agency' that had by Political Marxist approach, gained a new significance. As the focus on social property relations set up the outlines of the method, agency became one of the significant variables that characterizes how these relations are coded in the related mode of production, with an intensification on class struggles taking place in the related setting. Although it is mainly the class struggles that contribute to the differentiation on the formation of the context, they are never considered according to their given potential as in the structural approaches on historical progress. In other words, it is observable that Political Marxism did not approach to matter of class from a given historical reading rather, conceptualized class from the related context in accordance to the social property relations. Furthermore, as can be observed in the approach of Political Marxism to the transition debate, social property relations are taken in comparative analysis, in a way emphasizing the characteristics of the agencies, and nevertheless the related reproduction style of the modes of production that they had contributed.

The attempt of establishing a tradition of Political Marxism has several further assumptions that in a large extent aim to direct the general tendency of the tradition. As the major objective Teschke and Knafo offer a radical historization of the existing accumulation of studies. This radical historization according to the objectives of Political Marxism would serve to extent the debates on understanding the rules of reproduction.

> "The main obstacle for this turn to radical historicism within PM is the attachment to the idea that capitalism is a system with its rules of reproduction. PM, we argue, took a first step to shift the onus back onto history, but ultimately failed to free itself from the

> narrow blinkers imposed by such a theoretical commitment. The outcome has been a constant tendency to discount historical evidence as secondary to the analysis, even when this approach prides itself for its focus on history and socio-political conflict. In arguing for a radical historicism, we are intent on finding a methodology, or a set of research strategies, which can make history the basis for theorization: not as material we abstract from to formulate generic models, but a real abstraction which creates abstract objects through the practice of historical specification" (Knafo & Teschke, 2017: 25).

Furthermore, emphasizing the role of agency while concentrating on the reproduction process of the historization, will for Political Marxist tradition a milestone that would even challenge with the already existing premises of historical materialism. As Teschke and Knafo put forward, this radicalization would serve to distinguish the complete structural analysis from a historicized and contextualized attempt. As their conclusion remark presents, the attempt of establishing a tradition of Political Marxism, which would definitely refer the contribution of Brenner and Wood in a way developing a advanced generation that could challenge the already existing structural analysis in the literature, should be concerning a wider challenge.

> "If agency and social change become the focus of analysis, structures should be analyzed as mediating social relations rather than as determining them. The point is not to deny the importance of structures, but rather to analyze them from the perspective of agents. As we have argued, the existence of structures does not afford us a useful perspective to historicize for it forces us to abstract from the very material we need to create perspective on the social objects we study. It either dictates that we ignore what people do or that we align their agency with general theoretical abstractions in the interest of clarity of thought, theoretical rigour, and pretence to scientificity, even when we are fully aware that in the last instance it is still people who are making this history. From this perspective, scholars may very well know that there is agency, that people are making capitalism, but they still feel confident in postponing this account to further discussion *ad calendas graecas*, or remain content to read history as a mere validation and manifestation of pre-conceived logics. These moves often result because proper historicisation would be an impediment or challenge to theorization, because it is simply not relevant until we move towards more historically oriented research or specific cases, which center agency rather than structural logics" (Knafo & Teschke, 2017: 26).

The attempt of establishing a tradition of Political Marxism appears to be still in progress although the references of this attempt had already prevailed and enriched the grounds of the discussions on transition from feudalism to capitalism and the field of history of political thought. In regard of this, a consideration of Political Marxism as a tradition including the contribution of Brenner and Wood directly in a way accepting a continuity from their contribution to the attempt of establishing the tradition still remains as a question.

CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Reconsidering the Social History of Political Theory with Historical Materialism

> "Marxism has long been marked by two different legacies. The first rests on a strong exposition and critique of the logic of capitalism, which has been grounded in a systematic analysis of the laws of motion of capitalism conceived as a system. This structural critique has often led to an emphasis on the limited ability of capitalism to overcome its internal contradictions. The second legacy refers to a strong historicist perspective that derives from Marx's Hegelian background[89] and his own critique of the German philosopher's trajectory. This historicism is visible in the conception of social relations an deemphasis on the centrality of power and class struggle to analyze history" (Knafo & Teschke, 2017).

Although these marks of the legacies maintained the existing traditions in Marxism, it is not clearly possible to claim that the existing legacies carried both of these qualities together. Knafo and Teschke's remarks on this definition indicates one of the major dilemmatic problematic in the use of method by Marxism. That appears from their remark on the first legacy which considers capitalism as a system that cannot go beyond its existence due to the permanent problematic of crisis it structural carries. However, from this way of reading capitalism, it is inevitable to use a schematic understanding or pre-acceptance about capitalism. In this regard, assuming that there are laws that capitalism will make it desperate and tended to collapse, can be identified with a pre-confirmed historical reading in which the historical progress is assumed to be step by step processing. Although crisis is an essential feature of capitalist mode of production that rapidly repeats itself, it is observable that capitalist mode of production maintains itself by reproducing itself in different forms in different settings with widely discussed transformations in the social, political and economic spheres. This first perspective on Marxism as far as discussed, overlaps with the approach of orthodoxies especially with the structuralist approaches that contain tendencies to read political thought from the system itself.

[89] The Hegelian legacy splits itself in two traditions, first has the emphasis on 'the historicist praxis-perspective' in Hegel that Marx used in his early writings. Second one focuses on using dialectics 'in order to justify a reading of the concept of capital as a self unfolding category'(Knafo & Teschke, 2017).

In this regard, it is vital to mention that the methodological investigation that Brenner and Wood reintroduced through the content of transition debates, reaching to surround the field of history of political thought by the construction of 'the social history of political theory', represents an alternative methodological structuralizing, in the purpose of bringing in an enriched and extended outlook on the social reality. This mention also requires more evaluation since this structuralizing are dependent to method's perspective that challenged the mentioned positions. There are several conclusions about 'the social history of political theory' becoming a method. These conclusions will also remark the last part of the research emphasizing the characteristics of the method.

To start with one of the essential qualities that gave a unique property to 'the social history of political theory' is its claim to be rediscovering and updating historical materialism. On the behalf of this claim, 'the social history of political theory' formulates itself as not an attempt which can be associated with a political strategy rather a methodological investigation that challenges the existing traditions. This claim also offers an alternative construction of the method of historical materialism in the field of history of political thought, since the existing Marxist methodological traditions either hesitate or do not cover the field from their perspective.

Second essential conclusion can be derived from the method of 'social history of political theory' is that it is an attempt which tries to provide an empirical ground that can identify the results of changing social property relations and class struggles in a specific historical context. By this identification, the main pathways of historical materialism which are empirical observation and contextualization through the dialectical logic is fulfilled since 'the social history political theory' starts with the premise to contextualize the political subject and later place the significance of the agent inside the social and property relations that also illuminate the class positioning of the agent. Rather than assuming the position of the agent as in the orthodox approaches, 'the social history of political theory' also emphasizes the relationship between unique production of the political subject with the context in order to reveal the class positioning.

Thirdly, it is vital to observe that on the one hand, since 'the social history of political theory' as a method distinguishes itself from the orthodox Marxist

approaches because of their interpretation of the method in favor their purposes of their political strategies, it maintains its socially and materially standpoint. On the other, the method does not hesitate emphasizing its strong counter positioning against the epistemological and methodological positions that do not consider class as an explanatory category and context as a requirement of the methodological investigation. In this regard, 'the social history of political theory' provides a distinction with other methods, not directly through ideological references but through the methodological emphasis on the requirement of examining social and material conditions that sustain the dynamism in theory.

Lastly, 'the social history of political theory' is the only systematically constructed attempt to introduce a method which includes the framework of Marxism, in the field of history of political thought. However, it is not only the unique attempt of this method that characterizes it, rather the claim of systematizing historical materialism in order to rethink the debates on history of political thought writing. As mostly discussed earlier, the Orthodox Marxist traditions had much less interest on covering the content that history of political thought writing covers. Moreover, it is the mainstream epistemological and methodological traditions that firstly designed the field so that the ideological artificiality of the field remained for Orthodox Marxist traditions as a reservation. In this regard, the essential characteristics in this point appears to be the methodological application of historical materialism on the field.

These conclusions on 'the social history of political theory' as a method, are presentable as mentioned in above. Furthermore, it is crucial to summarize the main perspective of the research once again this time in relation with these conclusions.

The first goal that this research had tried to accomplish was to critically review the foundations of historical materialist method, in relation with the organization of the method by Marx and Engels. In this part of the investigation the research aimed to establish a ground which the rest of this research could prevail. The examination of the foundations of the method through Marx and Engels provided and analytical ground that also contributed how the Orthodox Marxist traditions emerged. Moreover, this first part of the research also revealed the purposes of historical materialist method and its transformation to Marxism that appears to be the more

referred name of the method since the ideological associations also contained in this reference.

In the second part, research had aimed to examine how the Orthodox Marxist approaches were constructed in relation with the legacy that they herited. Rather than all of the traditions appeared after the period of Marx and Engels, the research focused on the ones which influenced the mainstream Marxism around the world and which had become the official addresses of Orthodoxies in Marxism. Followingly an examination of the transformation of the method under German Social Democratic Party and Karl Kautsky; Plekhanov, Lenin and Bolshevik Party tradition, and finally the British Marxist Historical Tradition which influenced emerging Political Marxism especially with the contributions of E.P. Thompson, had been covered. These examinations focused on how these Marxist traditions used method and formulated and reformulated orthodoxies in Marxism. The purpose of these examinations was to determine the codification of the method once again and to reveal the approach and method used in covering the field of history of political thought. It is also being revealed that Orthodoxies in Marxist traditions had shown no systematic interest on intervening the field of history of political thought writing except Macpherson's methodologically controversial attempt. The major reason in this point was the reproduction capacities of capitalism that was realized very lately.

Last and third part of this research focuses on the emergence Ellen Meiksins Wood's attempt, regarding the analytical tools and frameworks she had developed, from the suitable ground of Brenner's contributions. Before considering the tradition of Political Marxism as a prominent tradition, it was examined the transition from feudalism to capitalism with the unique positioning of Robert Brenner against the Sweezy, Wallerstein and Frank. Brenner's influential investigation triggered an extending interest in a certain generation of scholars who contributed and joined the transition debate. It was a further attempt of this generation to establish a more specific method namely 'the social history of political theory' in this regard, in the field of history of political thought. Since the field of history of political thought literature were already dominated by the interpretations of mainstream approaches, and since the already existing orthodox positions in Marxism were not interested developing an alternative literature in the field, as an alternative methodological

approach ‘the social history of political theory’ found itself a prominent position. From this emergence through large methodological discussions the method ‘social history of political theory’ had made a significant attempt to undermine the existing dominant claims of mainstream approaches in the field of history of political thought regarding especially in the position of contextualization. ‘The social history of political theory’ concentrates on firstly the empirical observation of the phenomenon, secondly attempts to code the social and material conditions of the phenomenon by analyzing the social property relations and class struggles in relation with the context. In this regard, class struggles become one of the determinants which provide an explanation which is directly representative if the relationship between class struggles and the social and political context are established according to the social and material conditions of the mode of production. In other words, in the field of history of political thought, it is essential to consider the political thinker and the production he does, by examining the social and political context that he appears to be in, and later the role of the thinker inside the related contexts’ class struggles. By these ways, ‘the social history of political theory’ successfully manages to provide an explanation regarding the principles of historical materialist position.

The method of ‘the social history of political theory’ open up a prominent pathway for further discoveries and contextualization attempts which will be providing an advanced and enriched empirical ground that could empower the other areas of study as well. From this point, it is vital to observe that, although the methodological approach of ‘the social history of political theory’ appears to be a consistent approach in relation with historical materialism. In accordance with the findings of this research on the methodological contribution of Wood in the field of history of political thought, it is essential to mention that it claims to be an update of the method historical materialism, which can present a vision that do not overlap with the political strategy of an agency like in most of the Orthodox Marxist traditions. This claim of updating historical materialism defines it is positioning not closely with the other traditions but more closely with the foundations of the method and its unique logic.

As the last remark, it is possible to view the attempt of establishing a tradition of Political Marxism, developed with the pioneer-ship of Teschke and Knafo, as an attempt to link the contributions of Brenner and Wood with an alternative methodological investigation that seeks for concentration over the reproduction capacities of capitalism, putting forward an interest on the agencies, and offering a historical radicalization that would compensate the methodological continuity. Although the association of Brenner and Wood with this attempt of establishing a tradition still seeks confirmation, it is possible to address a certain common ground that the contributions of them would be useful for further generations to develop alternative approaches in relation with the premises of historical materialism.

REFERENCES

Anderson, K. (1995). *Lenin, Hegel, and Western Marxism* (1st ed.). Urbana [u.a.]: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Anderson, P. (1984). *In the tracks of historical materialism* (1st ed.). Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.

Aston, T., & Philpin, C. (1987). *The Brenner Debate* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blaut, J. (1994). Robert Brenner in the Tunnel of Time. *Antipode*, *26*(4), 351-374.

Bogdanov, A. (1979). *A short course of economic science*. Westport, Conn.: Hyperion Press.

Bois, G. (1985). Against the Neo-Malthusian Orthodoxy. In T. Ashton & C. Philpin, *The Brenner Debate* (1st ed., pp. 119-137). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boll, M. (1981). From Empiriocriticism to Empiriomonism: The Marxist Phenomenology of Aleksandr Bogdanov. *The Slavonic And East European Review*, *59*(No. 1 (Jan., 1981),), 41+58. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/4208191?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Brenner, R. (1977). The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism. *New Left Review*, *104*, 25-92.

Brenner, R. (1987). The Agrarian Class Structure and Economical Development in Pre-Industrial Europe. In T. Ashton & S. Philpin, *The Brenner Debate* (1st ed., pp. 10-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brenner, R. (1987). The Agrarian Roots of European Capitalism. In T. Ashton & S. Philpin, *The Brenner Debate* (1st ed., pp. 213-237). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brenner, R. (1993). *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

Brenner, R. (2001). The Low Countries in the Transition to Capitalism. In P. Hoppenbrouwers & J. van Zanden, *Peasants into Farmers? The Transformation of Rural Economy and Society in the Low Countries (Middle Ages - 19th Century) in Light of Brenner Debate* (1st ed., pp. 275-338). Turnhout: Brepols.

Brenner, R. (2003). *The Boom and the Bubble* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

Brenner, R. (2006). *The Economics of Global Turbulence* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

Budgen, S., & Lenin, V. (2007). *Lenin reloaded* (1st ed.). Durham [u.a.]: Duke Univ. Press.

Carchedi, G. (2011). *Behind the Crisis: Marx's dialectics of value and knowledge*. Leiden: Brill Academic Pub.

Castells, M., & Lebas, E. (1985). *City, class and power* (1st ed.). Houndmills: Macmillan.

Comninel, G. (1987). *Rethinking the French Revolution: Marxism and the Revisionist Challenge*. London: Verso.

Comninel, George. (2000). 'Marx's Context'. History of Political Thought. Vol. XXI. No. 3. Autumn

Dobb, M. (1984). *Studies in the development of capitalism* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Internat. Publ.

Draper, H. (1977). *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution Vol. I the state and bureaucracy*. New York: Monthly Review Press, U.S.

Engels, F. (1886). *Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang der klassischen deustchen Philosophie*. *Die Neue Zeit*. Retrieved 4 May 2017, from http://library.fes.de/cgi-bin/nzpdf.pl?dok=1886&f=145v&l=192

Engels, F. (1971). *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1st ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Engels, F. (1972). *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* (1st ed.). Intl Pub; 1st edition.

Engels, F. (1978). *Anti-Dühring* (1st ed.). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Engels, F. (1987) [1873–82], *Dialectics of Nature*, in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Collected Works, Volume 25. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Engels, F. (2012). *Dialectics of Nature* (1st ed.). London: Wellred.

Engels, Friedrich. (1966). *Dialectics of Nature*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Frank, A., & Gills, B. (2014). *The World System* (1st ed.). Hoboken: Routledge, Taylor and Francis.

Frank, P. (1961). *Modern science and its philosophy* (1st ed., p. 76). New York: Collier Books.

Gray, R. (1990). History, Marxism and Theory. In H. Kaye & K. McClelland, *E. P. Thompson Critical Perspectives* (1st ed., pp. 153-182). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Harvey, D. (1998). *The Urbanization of Capital* (1st ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Books on Demand.

Hegel, G. (1833). *Wissenschaft der Logik* (1st ed., pp. Vols. 3-5 of Werke). Berlin: Duncker and Humbolt.

Hill, C. (1949). *The English revolution, 1640* (1st ed.). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Hobsbawm, E. (1996). *The age of empire*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Hobsbawm, E. (1997). *The age of capital* (1st ed.). London: Weidenfeld et Nicolson.

Hobsbawn, E. (2014). *The Age of Revolution* (1st ed.). London: Abacus.

Hobson, J. (2016). *Imperialism* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Hunt, Tristram (2009), *Marx's General: The Revolutionary Life of Friedrich Engels.* Metropolitan/Henry Holt & Co.

Jakubowski, F. (1978, February). *Ideology and superstructure in historical materialism* -Franz Jakubowski (1936) ideology and superstructure in historical materialism.Retrieved from https://www.marxists.org/archive/jakubowski/1936/Ideology-Superstructure.pdf

Jordan, Z. (1966). The Dialectical Materialism of Lenin. *Slavic Review*, *25*(02), 259-286. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2492779

Kampffmeyer, P. (1898). Polemisches zur Theorie und Praxis der sozialen Frage. *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, *1*, 3-9.

Kautsky, J. (1994). *Karl Kautsky* (1st ed.). New Brunswick [etc.]: Transaction Publishers.

Kautsky, K. (1898). Aeltere und neuere Kolonialpolitik. *Die Neue Zeit*, *16*(1), 769-81.

Kautsky, K. (1902). *Social revolution* (1st ed.). Nabu Press.

Kautsky, K. (1903). *Karl Kautsky: Materialist Conception of History (1903)*. *Marxists.org*. Retrieved 20 May 2017, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1903/xx/histmat.htm

Kautsky, K. (1911). *Karl Kautsky: Finance-Capital and Crises (1911)*. *Marxists.org*. Retrieved 20 May 2017, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1911/xx/finance.htm

Kautsky, K. (1914). Der Imperialismus. *Die Neue Zeit*, *2*, 919-920.

Kautsky, K. (1914). *Karl Kautsky: Ultra-imperialism (1914)*. *Marxists.org*. Retrieved 20 May 2017, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/kautsky/1914/09/ultra-imp.htm

Kautsky, K. (1979). *The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx* (1st ed.). Westport, Conn.: Hyperion Press.

Kautsky, K. (1988). *The Agrarian Question* (1st ed.). London [u.a.]: Zwan.

Kautsky, K. (1996). *The Road to Power* (1st ed.). Amherst, N.Y.: Humanity Books.

Kaye, H. (1990). E. P. Thompson, the British Marxist Historical Tradition and the Contemporary Crisis. In H. Kaye & K. McClelland, *E. P. Thompson Critical Perspectives* (1st ed., pp. 252-270). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kaye, H., & MacClelland, K. (1990). *E.P. Thompson, Critical Perspectives* (1st ed.). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kennedy, G. (2011). Review Article 'Citizens to Lords: A Social History of Western Political Thought from Antiquity to the Middle Ages'. *Historical Materialism*, *19*(1), 304-318.

Knafo, S. (2010). Critical Approaches and the Legacy of the Agent/structure Debate in International Relations. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, *23*(3), 493-516. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2010.487896

Knafo, S., & Teschke, B. (2017). *The Rules of Reproduction of Capitalism: A Historicist Critique*. Presentation, Sussex University, Brighton, United Kingdom.

Konings, M. (2005). The United States in the Post-War Global Political Economy: Another Look at the Brenner Debate. In D. Coates, *Varieties of Capitalism, Varieties of Approaches* (1st ed., pp. 189-210). New York: Palgrave.

Lefebvre, H., & Goonewardena, K. (2008). *Space, Difference, Everyday Life* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge.

Lefebvre, Henri (1982). *Logique formelle en logique dialectique.* Third edition, Paris: Terrains/Editions Sociales.

Lenin, V. (1916). *Concentration of Production and Monopolies*. *Marxists.org*. Retrieved 10 May 2017, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/ch01.htm

Lenin, V. (1916). *IX. Critique of Imperialism*. *Marxists.org*. Retrieved 10 May 2017, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/ch09.htm

Lenin, V. (1935). *Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky* (1st ed.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Lenin, V. (1965). *Collected Works Vol. 10* (1st ed., pp. 44-49). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Lenin, V. (1968). *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1st ed.). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Lenin, V. (1972). *Philosophical Notebooks* (1st ed.). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Lenin, V. (1973). *Collected Works Vol.15* (1st ed., pp. 360-379). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Lenin, V. (1977). *Materialism and Empirio-criticism: Critical Comments on a Reactionary Philosophy* (7th ed.). Moscow: Progress Pub.

Lenin, V. (1977). *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (1st ed.). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Lenin, V. (1999). *What is to be Done?* (1st ed.). New York: International Publishers.

Lenin, V. (2002). *Materialism and empirio-criticism* (1st ed.). Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific.

Lenin, V. (2010). *Lenin Collected Works: Volume 14*. *Marxists.org*. Retrieved 8 May 2017, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume14.htm

Luxemburg, R., & Howard, D. (1971). *Selected Political Writings of Rosa Luxemburg* (1st ed.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Luxemburg, R., Tarbuck, K., & Bukharin, N. (1973). *The Accumulation of Capital--an Anti-critique* (1st ed.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Mach, E., & McCormack, T. (1960). *The Science of Mechanics* (1st ed., pp. 579, 611). La Salle: Ill.

Mach, E., & Williams, C. (1959). *The Analysis of sensations and the relation of the physical to the psychical* (1st ed., p. 332). New York, N.Y.: Dover.

Macpherson, C. (2011). *The political theory of possessive individualism* (1st ed.). Don Mills (Ont.): Oxford University Press.

Macpherson, C. (2011). *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* (1st ed.). Don Mills (Ont.): Oxford University Press.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1963). *The German Ideology Parts I and III*. New York. International Publishers

Marx, K. (1885). *Der Französische Materialismus des 18 Jahrhunderts*. *Library.fes.de*. Retrieved 3 May 2017, from http://library.fes.de/cgi-bin/nzpdf.pl?dok=1885&f=385v&l=432

Marx, K. (1967). *The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850* (1st ed.). Brooklyn, N.Y.: New York Labor News.

Marx, K. (1974). *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* (1st ed.). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). *Marx/Engels Selected Works, Volume Three* (1st ed., pp. 11-12). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1987). *'Collected works: V. 3: Marx, Engels, 1843-44'*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1998). *The Communist manifesto* (1st ed.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Marx, Karl & Engels, F. (1998). *German Ideology*. London: Penguin.

Marx, Karl & Engels, F. (2002). *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Penguin

Marx, Karl (1967) [1867]. *Capital*. Volume I, New York: International Publishers.

Marx, Karl (1967) [1894]. *Capital*. Volume II, New York: International Publishers.

Marx, Karl (1967) [1894]. *Capital*. Volume III, Progress Publishers: Moscow.

Marx, Karl (1976) [1867]. *Capital*. Volume I, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Marx, Karl (1983) [1858], 'Letter to Engels 16 January', in *Marx Engels Collected Works, Volume 40.* Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. (1967). *Capital; a Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International.

Marx, Karl. (1964). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: International

Marx, Karl. (1970). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Moscow. Progress Publishers.

Marx, Karl. (1973). *Grundrisse*. New York. Penguin Books.

Marx, Karl. (2000). 'Marx's Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, 1843-4'. Retrieved December 5, 2016, from www.marxists.org, https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/index.htm

Marx-Engels Werke in Evans, M., & Bob Jessop with Russell Wheatley (1990). *Karl Marx's Social and Political Thought*. London: Routledge.

Maybee, J. (2017). *Hegel's Dialectics*. *Plato.stanford.edu*. Retrieved 16 July 2017, from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hegel-dialectics/#HegeDescHisDialMeth

Miliband, R. (1969) *The State in Capitalist Society*. Quartet Books

Miliband, R. (1970) The Capitalist State: Reply to Nicos Poulantzas. *New Left Review*, 1/59, 53-60.

Ollman, B. (2003). *Dance of the dialectic*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.

Patriquin, L. (2012). The Ellen Meiksens Wood Reader (1st ed.). Leiden: Brill.

Pierson, S. (1993). *Marxist intellectuals and the working-class mentality in Germany, 1887-1912* (1st ed., p. 7). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Plekhanov, G. (1896). *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Materialismus. Holbach - Hélvetius - Marx* (1st ed.). Stuttgart: J.H.W. Dietz.

Plekhanov, G. (1980). *Selected Philosophical Works, Vol.2* (1st ed.). Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Poulantzas, N. (1969) The Problem of the Capitalist State. *New Left Review*, 1/58, 67-78.

Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso.

Salvadori, M. (1990). *Karl Kautsky and the Socialist Revolution 1880-1938* (1st ed., p. 125). Great Britain: Verso.

Sayer, Derek (1987). *The Violence of Abstraction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sayer, Derek. (1985). 'The Critique of Politics and Political Economy: Capitalism, Communism, and the State in Marx's Writings of Mid-1840's'. *The Sociological Review*. Vol. 33, No. 2.

Singh, S. (2017). *Transition Debate. Academia.edu*. Retrieved 26 May 2017, from https://www.academia.edu/8739698/transition_debate

Skinner, Q. (1978). *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Volume I: The Renaissance* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skinner, Q. (1978). *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Volume II: The Reformation* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, A. (1982). *The Wealth of Nations: Books I-III*. London, England: Penguin Group (USA).

Smith, R. (2017). Aristotle's Logic (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Plato.stanford.edu. Retrieved 16 July 2017, from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-logic/

Struve, P. (1894). *Струве Петр Бернгардович Критические заметки к вопросу об экономическом развитии России. – 1894. – [2], X, 291 с., таб.*. *Books.e-heritage.ru*. Retrieved 3 May 2017, from http://books.e-heritage.ru/book/10085568

Sweezy, P., Hilton, R., & Hill, C. (2006). *The transition from feudalism to capitalism* (1st ed.). Ankar Books.

Teschke, B. (2014). IR Theory, Historical Materialism, and the False Promise of International Historical Sociology. *Spectrum: Journal Of Global Studies*, *6*(1), 1-66.

Thompson, E. (1991). *The Making of the English Working Class* (1st ed.). Toronto: Penguin Books.

Thompson, E. (2008). *The poverty of theory & other essays* (1st ed.). Merlin [u.a.]: Monthly Review Press.

Thompson. E.P. (1978). *The Poverty of the Theory and Other Essays*. London. Merlin Press.

Tudor, H., & Tudor, J. (1988). *Marxism and social democracy* (1st ed.). Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Cambridge University Press.

Valentinov, N. (1968). *Encounters with Lenin* (1st ed.). London.

Vorländer, K. (1926). *Kant und Marx* (1st ed.). Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Vorlander, K. (2016). *Kant und der Sozialismus* (1st ed.). [S.l.]: Forgotten Books.

Wallerstein, I. (2011). *Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1st ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wallerstein, I. (2011). *Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-economy, 1600-1750* (1st ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

White, J. (2015). Lenin and Philosophy: The Historical Context. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *67*(1), 123-142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09668136.2014.990707

Wood, E. (1986). *The Retreat from Class: A New "True" Socialism* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

Wood, E. (1990). Falling Through the Cracks: E. P. Thompson and the Debate on Base and Superstructure. In H. Kaye & K. McClelland, *E. P. Thompson Critical Perspectives* (1st ed.). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wood, E. (1994). *Democracy against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, E. (2005). *Empire of Capital* (1st ed.). New York: Verso.

Wood, E. (2008). *Citizens to Lords: A Social History of Western Political Thought from Antiquity to the Late Middle Ages* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

Wood, E. (2012). *Liberty and Property: A Social History of Western Political Thought from the Renaissance to Enlightenment* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

Wood, E. (2015). *Peasant-Citizen and Slave* (1st ed.). London: Verso.

Wood, E., & Wood, N. (1997). *A Trumpet of Sedition: Political Theory and the Rise of Capitalism, 1509-1688* (1st ed.). New York, N.Y.: New York University Press.

Wood, N. (1978). *John Locke and Agrarian Capitalism* (1st ed.). Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Zen′kovskij, V. (2003). *A history of Russian philosophy* (1st ed., p. 741). London: Routledge.

APPENDICIES

A. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

MARKSİST ORTODOKSİLERE ELEŞTİREL BİR ANALİZ: 'SİYASAL DÜŞÜNCENİN TOPLUMSAL TARİHİ' KATKISI

Dünyayı maddi üretim koşullarına göre açıklamanın yeni bir yolu olan çıkan tarihsel maddecilik, var olan ana-akım bilgi felsefeleri olan (epistemoloji) nomotetik (empirisist) ve hermeneutic (yorum bilgisel) geleneklerin aksine; toplumsal gerçekliğe bilgi edinimi üzerinden yaklaşmak, ve doğal ve toplumsal olanı, objektif ve sübjektif olanı ve yapısal ve pratikte olanı ayrıştırmak yerine, toplumsal ve maddi üretim koşulları üzerinden tarihselliği esas alan bir bütün içinde değerlendirmek üzerine kuruludur. Bütünlüğü sağlamak adına toplumsal ve maddi koşullara tabi bir açıklama üreterek bunun üzerinden tutarlılığı esas alan tarihsel maddeci yöntem toplumsal ilişkileri ve etkinlikleri maddi koşulların nedenselliğinde ve ele alınan olgunun doğallığının bağlamında inceler. Bunun rağmen, tarihsel maddeciliği toplumsal var olma öncüllüğünden hijyenik veya steril biçimde soyutlamayı deneyerek, bu soyutlamayla bir anlatı oluşturmak isteyen 'analitik felsefelerin', tarihsel maddeciliği açıklama kapasitesinin kapsamını açıklamanın içinde yer alan veya almayan kavramsallaştırmalara indirgeme ve bu indirgemeler üzerinden genelleme üretmesi, tarihsel maddeciliğin ortaya çıktığı bağlamın göz ardı edilmesini sağlamış, yöntemin ortaya çıktığında toplumsal gerçekliği maddi koşullara bağlı açıklama hedefini saptırmıştır. George Comninel tarafından da 'liberal' ve 'gelenekselci' materyalizmler olarak adlandırılan, zamanla tarihsel maddeci yöntem konusunda 'ana-akım' anlatı haline gelmiş bu ayrışmalar, tarihsel maddecilik hakkında yöntemsel bir güncellemeyi gerektirmektedir.

Bu araştırmanın hedeflediği, tarihsel maddeciliğin yöntemsel bir analizinden öte, tarihsel maddeciliği kullanarak, siyaset felsefesi alanında yapılan bilimsel üretimleri ve tarihsel maddeciliğin yukarıda bahsedilen ayrışmalarının ve çeşitli geleneklerinin bu alana dönük yaklaşımlarını, tarihsel maddeciliğin ortaya çıktığı bağlamı ve onu

güncelleme iddiasındaki yaklaşımları ele alarak değerlendirmektir. Bu kapsamda tarihsel maddeciliği kullanma iddiasındaki yaklaşımları, yöntemin kendi ortaya çıktığı bağlamın tarihsel devamlılığında kullanan 'Ortodoks Marksist' gelenekler ve bu kapsamın dışında onu şu ana kadar üretilmiş maddi ve toplumsal ilişkileri zenginleştirmek için kullanmak isteyen, bu iddiasıyla da tarihsel maddeciliği güncelleme ve çeşitlendirme hedefindeki 'Siyasal Marksizm' geleneği arasında değerlendirmek, tarihsel maddeciliğin şu ana kadarki kullanımları arasında kapsamlı bir tartışmayı barındıracaktır. Bu iki geleneğin karşılaştırmalı incelemesi sadece tarihsel maddeciliği nasıl ele aldıkları ve kullandıklarından ziyade, iki geleneğin siyaset felsefesi alanındaki yaklaşımları üzerinde de değerlendirilebilir. Bu karşılaştırmalı analizin yapılmasından önce, tarihsel maddeciliğin 'orijinal pozisyonu' olarak iddia edilebilecek bağlamı değerlendirmek ve bu anlamda Marks ve Engels'e dönerek, yöntemi nasıl geliştirdiklerini incelemek önem kazanmaktadır.

Tarihsel maddecilik bulunduğu bağlama, kendisinden önceki maddeci yaklaşımlardan farklı olarak, toplumsal gerçekliği bir bütün içinde; kendi içindeki çatışmaları toplumsal sınıflar, maddi ve toplumsal üretim ilişkileri üzerinden değerlendirerek, ortaya toplumsal ilişkileri tarif eden ve maddi olmayı iddia eden bir açıklama getirmiştir. Tarihsel maddeci yöntemin bu dönüşümünde en kritik rolü oynayan Karl Marks ve Friedrich Engels olmuştur. Marks ve Engels, kendi bulundukları bağlam olan Alman felsefe geleneğinden koparken formüle etmeye başladıkları bu yönteme, üretim ilişkilerini incelerken ele alınması mutlak olarak gereken, siyasal-iktisat alanıyla yön vermiştir. En başta kendilerinden önce ortaya çıkan ve sosyal bilimlerin içinden iktisat bilimi içinde yaygınlaşan 'İngiliz Siyasal İktisat' geleneğinin temsilcileri Adam Smith ve David Ricardo'yu eleştirel olarak inceleyen Marks ve Engels; toplumsal ilişkileri maddi koşullarla değerlendirmesi için geliştirmeye başladıkları yöntemi, zaman içinde kendi bağlamlarında giderek yaygınlaşan kapitalist üretim tarzı üzerinden düşünmeye başlamışlardır. Kapitalist üretim tarzının zemin olarak ele alınması, tarihsel maddeci yöntemin gelişimi için büyük önem taşımaktadır. Tarihsel maddecilik bu zemin sayesinde hızla kapitalist üretim tarzının gelişimi bağlamında dönüşüme uğrayan toplumsal sınıfların doğayı ve kendi içlerindeki ilişkileri incelemesi için açıklama kapasitesine sahip bir yöntem olarak ele alınmaya başlanmıştır. Marks ve Engels kapitalist üretim tarzını inceledikleri tüm üretimlerinde, ampirik gözlemi bir hareket noktası olarak

belirlemiş ve inceledikleri ilişkileri, toplumsal ve maddi olanı çözümlemek için kullanmışlardır. Bunun yanı sıra Marks ve Engels bu yöntemi tarihin diğer aşamalarını incelemek ve bu bağlamda kapitalist üretim tarzının özelleştiği ve geliştiği noktaları değerlendirmek için kullanmışlardır. İncelemelerinin sonucunda tarihsel maddecilik, Marks'ın 'Kapital' (1867) adlı eserinde en sistematik şekliyle somutlamıştır.

Marks ve Engels bağlamında dönüşüme uğrayarak tarihsel maddecilik haline gelen maddeci yöntem, aynı zamanda barındırdığı eleştirel yaklaşım ve sınıfsal karakterle de kısa sürede bilim dünyasında tartışmalı bir yöntem haline gelmiş, böyle olmakla kalmamış ve sosyalist toplumsal hareketlerin resmi yöntemi olarak ideolojik bir nitelik de kazanmıştır. Tarihsel maddeciliğin Marksizm olarak da adlandırılan ideolojik yapılanmasının etkileri Marks ve Engels'in bağlamından sonra da devam ederek, daha sonradan 'Ortodoks Marksizm' olarak kategorileşecek yaklaşımlar ve geleneklerin yöntemi olmuştur.

Ortodoksi kelime anlamı itibariyle, bir ilkesel çerçeve veya olguya doğrudan bağlılık ve onu olguyu içerdiği ilkesel çerçeve ile tutarlı bir şekilde muhafaza etme gibi savunma yönü öne çıkan bir anlama sahip olsa da bu araştırmanın ekseninde ortodoksi daha çok yönteme bağlılık ve bu bağlılığa tutarlı bir ideolojik pozisyon alma olarak değerlendirilmiştir. Bu kapsamda Marksizm için ortodoksi, Marks ve Engels'i takiben işçi sınıfının çıkarlarını gözeten sosyalist bir üretim tarzına geçişi öncelik haline getirmiş ve bu bağlamda siyasal bir devrimi kaygı olarak güden ve kapitalizmin aldığı son hal olan emperyalizmi sorunsallaştıran ve ona karşı mücadeleyi öne çıkaran pozisyon olarak tanımlanabilir. Ortodoks Marksizm işte bu tanımıyla beraber onu karakterize eden ve yöntem kullanımını açıklayan başka temel özelliklere sahiptir.

Ortodoks Marksizm olarak adlandırılabilecek yaklaşımlar aslında bir bütün olmayıp, Marks ve Engels'i takiben bu yöntemi benimsemiş, farklı bağlamlarda ortaya çıkmış, çeşitli sosyalist siyasi geleneklerden oluşur. Bu araştırmanın kapsamında yöntemi kullanımı en belirgin şekilde ayrışan ve günümüzde takipçileri tarafından hala ortodoks olma iddiası taşıyan gelenekler değerlendirilmiştir. Bu çeşitli gelenekler tarihsel maddeci yöntemi de bir bütün olarak ele almamış, kendi bağlamlarında ve kendi bağlamlarındaki mücadele ve organizasyon

yapılanmalarında kullanmak üzere revize etmişlerdir. Bu araştırma kapsamında ele alınan gelenekler; Alman Sosyal Demokrat Partisi, Vladimir İlyiç Lenin ve Bolşevik Parti Geleneği ve İngiliz Tarih Yazımı Geleneğidir. Bu geleneklerin kendilerini Marks ve Engels'in ortaya koyduğu tarihsel maddeciliğe dönük yaklaşımları belirtildiği gibi aynı olmamakla beraber, yöntemde revize ettikleri de farklılıklar gösterir. Ortodoks Marksizm olarak değerlendirebilecek yaklaşımların parçalı olması onu karakterize eden en önemli faktörlerden biri olsa da yaklaşımına güncel şeklini veren başka etkenlerden de söz edilebilir.

Bu etkenlerden biri Ortodoks Marksizm olarak adlandırılabilecek yaklaşımların yöntemi bulundukları bağlamda mücadele ettikleri sınıf çatışmasının bir tarafında bulundukları organizasyonları için bir siyasi strateji üretim aracı olarak kullanma durumlarıdır. Bir başka deyişle, Ortodoks Marksist yaklaşımlar, yöntemi bulundukları maddi zemini çözümlemenin yanı sıra, bulundukları bağlamda bir strateji üretmek, kendi organizasyonlarını güçlendirmek veya işçi sınıfını mobilize edecek ideolojik saflaşmayı yaratma amacı ile kullanmışlardır. Bu Marks ve Engels döneminde de var olan bir durum olsa da yöntemin büyük oranda siyasal strateji üretimi için kullanılması ve bu anlamda taraf belirleyici olacak kadar etkin bir rol oynaması yeni bir durumdur. Bu kullanım aynı zamanda yöntemin olduğu gibi kalmasını değil, aksine siyasal strateji için de uygun hale getirilmesini gerektirmiştir. Dolayısıyla Ortodoks Marksist yaklaşımlar yöntemi siyasal stratejilerine uygun olacak şekilde güncellemiş, yöntemin soyutlama kapasitesini kimi zaman somutlamak adına değişikliklere sokmuşlardır. Bunlardan en belirgin örnek Lenin'in diyalektik ilkeleri ki bu ilkeler tarihsel maddeci yöntemin ortaya çıkışından beri sistemleştirilmiştir, tek bir ilkeye dönüştürmesinde de görülebilir. Bu duruma bir başka örnek de Alman Sosyal Demokrat Parti geleneğinin kurucusu ve önderi Karl Kautsky'nin sistemleştirdiği ve buna paralel yayınladığı tartışmalarda da gözlemlenebilir. Kautsky Engels ile olan ilişkisinin yanı sıra, Almanya'nın bulunduğu dönemde işçi sınıfı içinde en popüler hareketin önderi olarak Marksizm'in resmi sözcüsü olarak kabul edilmiştir. Bu güçlü tanımın da etkisiyle, Marksizm'e dönük müdahaleleri ortodoks müdahaleler olarak kabul edilmiştir. Kautsky, Marks ve Engels'i hem parti içinde hem de parti dışındaki entelektüel tartışmalarda savunmuş ve kaynaklara ulaşımının da etkisiyle, Marksist literatürü belirleyen isim olmuştur. Bunun yanında Kautsky yirminci yüzyılın başına kadar

Marksist klasikleri editörlüğünü kendisinin yaptığı 'Die Neue Zeit' adlı haftalık dergide yayınlayarak Marksist klasikleri entelektüel dünyaya ulaştırmıştır. Ancak daha sonradan bu eserlerin tekrar basılması sırasında Kautsky'nin bazı yayınları kasıtlı olarak seçtiği ve kimi zaman redakte sırasında bazı değişiklikler yaptığı söylenebilir. Kautsky'nin yöntem olarak farklılaştığı en önemli örnek ise kendi bağlamında güncellik kazanan 'devrimci durum' ve 'emperyalizm' kavramlarına olan yaklaşımındadır. Burada Kautsky daha sonra da bahsedileceği üzere yöntemi siyasal pozisyon almasının gerisinde kullanmış ve 'Ortodoks Marksizm' yaklaşımının ortak olduğu ileri sürülebilecek özelliğine katkı vermiştir. Yöntem olarak farklılaşmanın bir başka örneği de İngiliz Tarih Yazımı Geleneğinden verilebilir. Yirminci yüzyılın ikinci yarısında belirginleşmeye başlayan bu gelenek Marksist bir tarih yazımı üretmeyi benimsemiş, sınıf, tarih, siyasal özne, toplumsal mülkiyet ilişkileri ve feodalizmden kapitalizme geçiş tartışmaları üzerine uzun yıllar boyunca üretimler yapmışlardır. Bu gelenek de kendi içinde epey parçalı durumda olup, yöntemi bu parçalı yapı içerisinde farklı konular üzerine yeniden üretmeye çalışmış ancak, aslen tarih yazımı geleneklerinden farklılaşmak üzerine bir taraflaşmayı hedeflemiştir. Bu da bir siyasi pozisyon alma olarak öne çıkmış ve tarih yazımları arasındaki çatışmada yöntemi geri planda değerlendirmiştir.

Ortodoks Marksizm olarak adlandırılabilecek yaklaşımların bir diğer belirgin özelliği ise Marks ve Engels döneminde döne olarak görülebilecek ancak ilerleyen dönemde tüm siyasal ve akademik tartışmalara damga vuracak olan 'devrim' ve 'emperyalizm' gibi tarihsel olguların kavramsallaştırılması sürecidir. Bu süreçte yani b kavramlar kavramsallaştırılırken 'Ortodoks Marksist' yaklaşımlar önemli bir rol oynayarak, işçi sınıfının sosyalist bir iktidar kurmasını gözeten bir mücadele vermişlerdir. Bu kavramlar altında 'Ortodoks Marksizm'in katkılarını derlemek bu araştırmanın da yöntembilimi konusuna dönük arayışını tatmin edici bir şekilde karşılamaktadır.

Öne çıkılan yeni kavramsallaştırmalardan 'devrim' , aslında Marks ve Engels tarafından da çokça önemsenmiş ancak yalnızca 1848'deki işçi sınıfı ayaklanmalarında toplumsal bir zemin bulmuştur. Bu dönemden sonra ise Marks ve Engels başka bir 'devrimci durum' a şahit olamamışlardır. Bu kavram hakkındaki değerlendirmelerini 1848'in hemen öncesinde yazıp daha sonra güncelleyerek

yayınladıkları ‘Komünist Manifesto’ adlı manifesto da dile getirmişlerdir. Bu manifestoda Marks ve Engels kapitalist üretim biçimini, onun oluşturduğu düzeni, burjuva sınıfını, burjuva sınıfının tarih sahnesinde bu zamana kadar en önemli devrimci durumu yarattığı ancak bundan sonra iktidarını korumak ve kapitalist üretim biçimini, devlet aygıtını tarafsız gösterdiği halde kendi çıkarları için kullanarak sürdürmek niyetinde olduğuna vurgu yapmışlardır. Bu manifestonun devamında ise işçi sınıfının giderek büyüyen bir sınıf olarak geleceğin devrimini yapacağını bu devrimin de ‘sosyalist’ nitelikte bir devrim olacağını belirtmişlerdir. Bu devrimlerin etkisiyle sıkılaşan siyasal düzen Marks ve Engels’i Avrupa’da farklı yerlere sürüklemiştir. Marks devrimlerin sonrasında devrimlerin sürekli devam edeceğini Avrupa ve dünyanın farklı yerlerine yayılacağını tahmin etmiştir. Devrim kavramı Marks tarafından burjuva siyasal düzeninin yaşadığı krize cevap olarak da vurgulanmıştır.

Devrim kavramı Ortodoks Marksizm adına ise başka bir bağlamlar dizisinde karşılık bulmuştur. Bu araştırmanın inceleme nesnelerinden olan üç Ortodoks yaklaşıma göre bakıldığında devrim kavramı Marks ve Engels dönemine göre daha kapsamlı değerlendirilmiş ve aslen devlet kuramı üzerinden formüle edilmiştir. Bu yaklaşımlara daha yakından bakmak Ortodoks Marksizm’in kavramsallaştırmalarını yöntembilim açısından incelemek için gereklidir.

İlk olarak ele alınabilecek Alman Soysal Demokrat Parti Geleneği, devrim konusunda parti içinde çok sayıda tartışma yaşamış ve Almanya’da siyasal bir devrim yapma konusunda partideki bazı kanatların da etkisiyle Avrupa’daki herhangi bir devrimci özneye göre çok daha fazla yol almıştır. Devrim kavramı partinin öncü ismi Kautsky tarafından ilk olarak Marks ve Engels’in ortaya koyduğu programlar üzerinden tartışılmıştır. Burada devrimin gereklilikleri tartışılmış, devrim için işçi sınıfının bilinçlendirilmesi konusunun altı çizilerek, ön-koşullu bir anlayış benimsenmiştir. Bu tutumun karşısında ise partinin içindeki çeşitli kanatlar ikna olmak konusunda zorlanmış hatta pek çok kanat parti yönetimine karşı tepki ortaya koymuş hatta bu tepkileri de örgütlemişlerdir. Bu parti içindeki tartışmalarda üç önemli kanat büyük rol oynamıştır. Bu kanatlardan ilki parti içinde siyasal bir yumuşama ve daha sosyal demokrat ağırlık kazanılmasını isteyen sosyal demokrat kanat olmuştur. Eduard Bernstein’in öncüllüğünü yaptığı bu kanat Kautsky’nin

partiyi çok ortodoks bir pozisyon içinde bırakmasından ötürü, tarihsel maddeci yöntemi kısırlaştırdığını, bu yöntemin öncellikle devrimi hedefliyorsa aşamalı bir süreç izlemesi gerektiğini dile getirmiştir. Bu kanata karşılık Rosa Luxemburg'un öncülüğünü yaptığı radikal devrimci kanat, Marksist ilkelere bağlılık konusunda Bernstein hizibini eleştirmiş ve Kautsky yönetimini önce kormuş daha sonra da eleştirmiştir. Eleştirinin temelinde ise gene devrim kavramı önemli rol oynamaktadır. Luxemburg devrim konusunda Kautsky'nin yaklaşımını yetersiz bulmuş ve pasifisizm olarak adlandırdığı yönetim tavrını eleştirmiştir. Bu tavra karşılık ise daha radikal bir tutum izleyerek devrime gidecek yolu partinin kendisinin çizmesi gerektiğini vurgulamıştır. Üçüncü ve daha parçalı olarak adlandırılabilecek kanatta ise parti içindeki parçalı yapı temel aktör olmuş ve Kautsky yönetimini partinin eğilimleri ve devrime yaklaşımları konusunda daha sağ siyasal ağırlıklı bir karşı çıkış örgütlemişlerdir.

Bu eğilimlere dönük Kautsky ise ilk olarak partinin merkez sosyalist çizgideki ağırlığını korumaya dönük Marks ve Engels'in üzerinden kazandığı ağırlığını da kullanarak direnmiştir. Sonuç olarak Alman Sosyal Demokrat Partisi yirmini yüzyılın ilk yarısına ilk çeyreğini, yani Birinci Dünya Savaşı'na kadar olan dönemi devrim kavramı konusunda işçi sınıfını bilinçlendirmek ve parti gövdesini büyütmek üzerine bir stratejiye yaslamıştır. Devrim konusunda kendi bağlamında resmi bir tutum oluşmasında merkezi bir rol oynayan Kautsky ve Alman Sosyal Demokrat Partisi, Ortodoks Marksizm yaklaşımına ait Marks ve Engels döneminden sonra daha kapsamlı bir kavramsallaştırma yapmıştır.

Devrim konusunda Ortodoks Marksizm'in en önemli yaklaşımını Alman Sosyal Demokrat Partisi'nin ardından kavramsallaştıran ise Lenin ve Bolşevik Partisi olmuştur. Lenin devrim konusunda Ortodoks Marksizm'in resmi pozisyonunu belirlemiş ve kendisi ardından gelen tüm gelenekleri bu kavram özelinde de etkilemiştir. Lenin Marks ve Engels yazınına olan ilgisini mentoru Rus devrimci Marksist Plekhanov'dan öğrenmiştir. Bu aşamada Plekhanov'dan kısaca bahsetmek önem taşımaktadır. Plekhanov Rus İmparatorluğu'nda devrimci fikirlerin yayılmasında önemli bir rol oynamış ve Marksizmi Rus entelektüel dünyasına taşımış en önemli isimdir. Plekahnov Marksizmi ise Kautsky'nin yayınladığı kaynaklardan takip etmiş ve bunun yanında Rusya'daki materyalist bilim felsefesine

getirilen eleştirilere cevaplar üretmiştir. Plekhanov'un Rusya'daki ağırlığı, ona dönük eleştirilerin artmasına yol açmış ve özellikle Ernst Mach öncüllüğünde gelişen bilim felsefesi üzerinden materyalist olmayan eleştirileri kendisine karşı bir cephede toplamıştır. Plekhanov'un takip ettiği Marksist literatürün kendi bağlamındaki sınırlılığı Plekhanov'un yöntemi çok kapsayıcı olarak aktarmasını zorlaştırmış, kimi zaman Plekahnov'un kendisine ait yorumları yöntemin içine katmasına yol açmıştır. Plekhanov Marksist yöntemi takip ettiği literatürde Marks ve Engels'in yöntemi formüle ettiği yazınlara erişemediği için, yöntem tartışmalarında özellikle diyalektik ilkeleri takip etmiş, hatta bu ilkeleri kendince yeniden yorumlamıştır. Entelektüel alanda girdiği tartışmalar Lenin'in de ilgisini çekmiş ve o zamanda Rusya İmparatorluğu'nda devrimci örgütlerin parçası olan Lenin, Plekhanov'u da materyalist olmayan idealist yöntemleri benimsemiş eleştirilerden korumak adına tartışmalara dahil olmuştur. Materyalist yöntemi daha sonradan kendi yorumlayan Lenin hem Plekhanov'a dönük eleştirileri yanıtlamış hem de diyalektik ilkeleri yeniden formüle ederek tek maddede somutlamıştır. Bu eleştirilere en kapsamlı yanıt verdiği eseri 'Materyalizm ve Ampiriokritisizm' de Lenin, maddeci yöntemi tartışmış ve kendi bağlamındaki temel eleştirileri yanıtlamıştır.

Devrim kavramı Lenin'in bu yöntem güncellemesinden sonraki süreçte daha da kritik bir rol oynayacaktır. Lenin devrim kavramını inçlerken öncellikle siyasete odaklanmış ve Kautsky'nin aksine işçi sınıfının bilinçlendirilmesi misyonunu yeterli bulmamıştır. Lenin'e göre bu bilinç aşılama süreci beklenebilir veya ön koşullanabilir bir süreç değildir. Tam aksine bu bilinç dışarıdan ve devrimci sosyalist siyaset vasıtasıyla ve Bolşevik parti öncüllüğünde aşılanması gereken bir bilinçtir. Devrim Lenin için işçi sınıfının iktidarı ele geçirmesinden başka türlü amacına ulaşamayacağı bir süreçtir. Bu nedenle Lenin temel hedef olarak Rusya'daki iktidarı ele geçirmeyi hedefleyen bir politik program örgütlenmesini Bolşevik Parti'nin temel misyonu olarak belirlemiştir. Devrim kavramı öncü parti aracılığıyla ulaşılabilecek bir hedef olarak belirlenmiş ve bu doğrultuda en temel amaç iktidarı ele geçirip bir proletarya diktatörlüğü kurmak olmuştur. Bu anlamıyla yöntem tamamen siyasal programa ve burada güdülen hedeflere entegre edilmiştir.

Ortodoks Marksist yaklaşımların yöntembilime bir diğer katkısı da ‘emperyalizm’ kavramsallaştırması üzerinden olmuştur. Emperyalizm özellikle 1870 iktisadi krizinin ardından konu olmaya başlamış ve kapitalist üretim tarzının üretim fazlasını değerlendirmek adına kimi zaman askeri kimi zaman ise iktisadi olarak pazar ve sömürge ihtiyaçları gütmesinden dolayı ortaya çıkan siyasal olayları tartışmak için kullanılmıştır. Her ne kadar Marksist bir yöntembilim üzerinden doğrudan kullanılmaya başlanmadıysa da emperyalizm kavramı Marksist yöntembilime mal olmuştur. Emperyalizm kavaramı üzerine Hobson’un ardından ilk kavramsallaştırmayı yapan Lenin olmuştur. Lenin’e göre emperyalizm kapitalizmin en üst aşamasıdır. Lenin bu tespitine kendi bağlamında küresel kapitalizmi analitik incelemelere tabi tutarak sistemleştirmiştir. İncelemeleri sırasında odaklandığı asıl nokta bu sermaye yapılanmasının yerel ölçekte monopolik küresel ölçekte ise oligopolistik olduğudur. Bir başka deyişle, Lenin kapitalizmin dünya üzerine birkaç sermaye grubu tarafından yönetilmekte olduğunu iddia etmiş ve bu sermaye gruplarını ihtiyaçları doğrultusunda Birinci Dünya Savaşı gibi bir yıkıma ihtiyaç duyduklarını iddia etmiştir. Ona göre bu yıkım sermayenin krizle karşılaştığı çöküşten yeniden bir yapılanma yoluyla onu çıkaracaktır. Bir diğer kavramsallaştırma ise Kautsky’de mevcuttur. Ona göre emperyalizm kapitalizmin en üst aşaması değil, kısa bir süre için büründüğü geçici bir aşamadır. Bu aşama sırasında savaş gerçekleşecek ve bu savaşın ardından bu aşırılaşmış formasyonu kapitalizmin gelişimci çizgisine geri dönmesiyle son bulacaktır. Bu iki yaklaşım emperyalizm konusunda Marksist yöntemin iki temel yaklaşımını oluşturmuşlardır.

Ortodoks Marksist yaklaşımların Marksist yöntembilime kavramsallaştırma farklılığı ile getirdiği yaklaşımlarda mevcuttur. Bunlardan en önemlisi İngiliz Tarih Yazımı geleneğinden E.P. Thompson’ın sınıf kavramsallaştırmasındaki yaklaşımıdır. Bu yaklaşımında Thompson, sınıfı analitik araçlarla incelemiş ve İngiliz Tarihinde sınıf oluşumu üzerine üretim yapmıştır. Thompson sınıfı var olan ve kültürel bir bilinçle birbirine bağlı bir özne olarak tarif etmiştir.

Ortodoks Marksizm bu yöntem bilimsel innovasyonlarla özellikle yirminci yüzyıl boyunca Marksist yöntembilimini etkilemiş ve domine etmiştir. Yirminci yüzyılın ikinci yarısından itibaren ise Post-Marksist akımların yaygınlaşmasıyla yadırganan bir yaklaşım diziş haline gelmiştir.

Bu araştırmanın üçüncü bölümünü kapsayan ve incelenen diğer yöntem ise 'Siyasal Marksizm' olarak adlandırılan yöntem geleneğidir. Bu yöntem geleneği kendisinden önce gelen ve Marksist yöntembilimini domine eden yaklaşımları toplumsal gerçekliği açıklamak için yeterli görmediği gibi, tarihsel maddeci yöntemin özündeki hareket noktasını kaybettiğini iddia etmiştir. Bu anlamda Ortodoks Marksizm belli kavramsal kalıplar üzerinden hareket eden ve ampirik gözlemden yola çıkmayı uzun bir süre önce geride bırakmış, bu anlamda kanonik bir tarih okumasıyla ilerlemeci bir aşamaya geçişi koşullamıştır. Bu anlamda Ortodoks Marksizm indirgemeci bir yaklaşım sergilemektedir.

Siyasal Marksizm bu anlamda Ortodoks Marksizm'e ve Post-Marksizm'e dönük bir eleştiri ve alternatif olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Temel amacı ise Marksist yönteme has olan ampirik gözlemden yola çıkarak, toplumsal mülkiyet ilişkilerini çözümlemek bu yolla sınıf kavramını üretim biçiminin gelişimi üzerinden kendi mantığıyla açıklayarak günümüzde hâkim olan kapitalist üretim tarzının bağlamsal gelişimine dönük açıklamaları farklı bir maddi zeminde geliştirmektir. Siyasal Marksizm'de siyasal olan ise toplumsal mülkiyet ilişiklerinin çözümlenmesiyle belirginleşen sınıf çatışmaları üzerinden tarihsel süreçleri yansıtmaktır.

Siyasal Marksizm geleneği kendi gelişim çizgisinde özellikle ilk jenerasyonunu oluşturan Robert Brenner, Ellen Meiksins Wood, Rodney Hilton, George Comninel gibi isimlerin katkılarıyla 'Siyasal Düşüncenin Toplumsal Tarihi' olarak adlandırılan yöntembilimini kavramsallaştırmıştır. Bu yöntembilimi her ne kadar farklı bağlamlarda kapitalizme geçişi temel olarak ele alsa da aslında amacı Ortodoks Marksizm tarafından pek el değmemiş bir alan olan siyaset felsefesi alanını amaçladıkları zeminde ve ana akım geleneklerin dışında tekrar yazmaktır. Bu konuda Ellen Meiksins Wood, *Yurttaşlardan Lordlara* ve *Özgürlük ve Mülkiyet* adlı eserlerinde on yedinci yüzyılın sonuna kadar olan dönemi ele almış ve siyaset felsefesine Marksist yaklaşımın ilk kapsamlı örneğini üretmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra geleneğin farklı isimleri onun bu eserlerini besleyici ve eserlerinde bahsettiği bağlamları açıklama kapasitesi zengin ve maddi yollarla desteklemiştelerdir.

Siyasi Marksizm'in bir gelenek olarak ele alınması ise daha çok geleneğin ikinci jenerasyonu olduğunu iddia eden Sussex Üniversitesi Grubu tarafından kavramsallaştırılmıştır. Özellikle geçiş tartışmasının sunduğu katkıların ve buna

paralel gelişen ‘siyasal düşüncenin toplumsal tarihi’ metodunun kendisini oluşturan Brenner ve Wood özelinde ise bu geleneğe dönük herhangi bir yaklaşım onaylanmamıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, bu geleneği oluşturan inceleme seti ve veri tabanı ortak bulgulara ve amaçlara hizmet etmeyi amaçlasa da bu katkıların sahiplerinin bir gelenek olma iddiası sadece ikinci jenerasyonun bir kavramsallaştırması olarak değerlendirilebilir.

Bu araştırmanın sonucunda ise ‘Siyasal Düşüncenin Toplumsal Tarihi’ yaklaşımı diğer geleneklerin ürettikleri yaklaşımlar karşılaştırmalı olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu yolla yöntemin kendisinin iddiaları ve bu iddialara şu ana kadar nasıl ulaştığı tartışılmıştır. Siyasal Marksizm bu karşılaştırmaların ışığında Ortodoks Marksist yaklaşımların ortodoksi iddiasını değerlendirmiş ve ortodoksileri güncelleyici bir pozisyon almaktadır. Bunun yanında ana akım geleneklerle arasındaki yöntem bilimsel farklılık onu bu akımlardan da steril tutarak, tarihsel maddeci yöntemin kendisine yaklaştırmıştır.

B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü [ ]

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü [x]

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü [ ]

Enformatik Enstitüsü [ ]

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü [ ]

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Koçak
Adı : Berkay
Bölümü : Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF MARXIST ORTHODOXIES: A CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL HISTORY OF POLITICAL THEORY

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans [x] Doktora [ ]

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. [ ]
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. [ ]
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. [x]

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: