

**A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE SOCIALIST JOURNAL “AYDINLIK”
WITHIN A MARXIAN FRAMEWORK**

VOLUME I

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

BY

ERCAN GÜNDOĞAN

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION**

JULY 2005

Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Prof. Dr. Feride Acar

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 in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Assoc. Prof. Dr Mehmet Okyayuz

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz	(METU/ADM)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. O. Galip Yalman	(METU/ADM)	_____
Prof. Dr. H.Ünal Nalbantoğlu	(METU/SOC)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Yetiş	(Ankara U./ADM)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Kürşat Ertuğrul	(METU/ADM)	_____

PLAGIARISM

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

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE SOCIALIST JOURNAL "AYDINLIK" WITHIN A MARXIAN THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Gündođan, Ercan

Ph.D., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz

July 2005, 855 pages

The thesis concerns with the conception of class and revolution in Marxian meta-theory and examines its reception by the Turkish Marxist left through an analysis of the Socialist Journal *Aydınlık* (1968-1971). Survey demonstrates that the reception is obscured by strategic debates, and is also not perfectly realized due to the needs of the rapid development of the Turkish socialist left after 1960s. Marxian theory is used mainly to justify the national democratic revolutionary strategy which is presented as only valid strategy, against socialist revolutionary strategy. National Democratic Revolutionary strategy is suggested to close the gap between Marxian framework which exclusively focuses on the proletarian socialist politics and the undeveloped revolutionary conditions of the underdeveloped societies. However, this gap is closed only at the expense of creating new gaps between Marx and the country. Class phenomena are analyzed in the framework of the imperialism-feudalism-comprador bourgeoisie alliance and popular or national classes. This strategy suggests that only after national democratic revolution is perfectly completed, socialist revolutionary struggle can be valid. It thereby postpones the possibility of socialist struggle and hence Marx to an undetermined future.

Keywords: Dialectic, contradiction, conflict, alienation, emancipation, class, class conflict, class struggle, economic base, superstructure, ideology, revolution, the stages of revolution, capital, surplus-value, National Democratic Revolutionary Strategy, Socialist Revolutionary Strategy, imperialism, feudalism, comprador bourgeoisie, national classes, proletariat, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie, opportunism.

ÖZ

“AYDINLIK” SOSYALİST DERGİ’NİN MARKS’IN KURAMSAL ÇERÇEVESİNDE DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

Gündoğan, Ercan

Doktora, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Mehmet Okyayuz,

Temmuz 2005, 855 sayfa

Tez Marx’ın meta teorisinde sınıf ve devrim kavrayışını ele alır ve Aydınlik Sosyalist Dergiyi (1968-1971) inceleyerek bu kavrayışın Türkiye Marksist solunda nasıl değerlendirildiğini ele alır. İnceleme bu değerlendirilişin strateji tartışmalarının gölgesinde kaldığını, ayrıca 1960lı yıllardan sonra hızla gelişen Türkiye sosyalist solunun ihtiyaçları nedeniyle tam gerçekleştirmediğini göstermektedir. Marx’ın teorisi özellikle sosyalist devrim tezine karşı, tek geçerli strateji olarak sunulan milli demokratik devrim stratejisini temellendirmek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. Milli Demokratik Devrim Stratejisi özellikle proleter sosyalist politikaya odaklanan Marx’ın çerçevesi ile az gelişmiş ülkelerin gelişmemiş devrim koşulları arasında bulunan boşluğu kapatmak için önerilmektedir. Fakat, bu boşluk Marx ve ülke arasında yeni boşluklar yaratma pahasına kapatılmaktadır. Sınıf olgusu emperyalizm-feodalizm-işbirlikçi burjuvazi ittifakı ve halk ya da milli sınıflar çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Bu strateji milli demokratik devrimin mükemmel şekilde tamamlanmasıyla ancak sosyalist devrim mücadelesinin geçerli olabileceğini söyler. Böylelikle de sosyalist mücadele olanağını ve haliyle Marx’ı belirsiz bir geleceğe erteler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Diyalektik, çelişki, çatışma, yabancılaşma, kurtuluş, sınıf, sınıf çatışması, sınıf mücadelesi, ekonomik temel, üstyapı, ideoloji, devrim, devrim aşamaları, sermaye, artı-değer, Milli Demokratik Devrim Stratejisi, Sosyalist Devrim Stratejisi, emperyalizm, feodalizm, işbirlikçi burjuvazi, milli sınıflar, proletarya, küçük burjuvazi, milli burjuvazi, oportünizm

Second gift for Nesrin and Özgür

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis required so much time, energy, love and passion that I could neither attempt at writing nor completing it without my wife, Nesrin and her creative musician son, Özgür. I want to dedicate the thesis to them for their intelligence, goodness; and above all, their presence. As Wilhelm Reich said, knowledge, love and labour are three sources of life. I have had much of them.

I want to thank Professor Okyayuz, my supervisor, because of his support he gave me throughout the process of writing this thesis. This support did not only consist of providing me with valuable scientific information and of establishing an atmosphere of free debate constituting the basis of my argumentation, but also of trusting in me. Furthermore I always contributed from his intellectual sensitivity and scientific accurateness. Professor Okyayuz reminded me always of the fact that Marx's own writings will remain to be worth to be studied again and again.

I also want to thank Professor Nalbantoğlu who did. provide me a lot of valuable information concerning the history of the Turkish Left. His critical statements contributed a lot to the linkage of a theoretical topic with a (still ongoing) Turkish debate.

Furthermore, I want to thank Professor Ertuğrul, Professor Yalman and Professor Yetiş who contributed to my thesis with their critical support.

I would like to thank Metin Çulhaoğlu - an outstanding Marxist theorist and politician - who read and corrected the last draft of the thesis in a short time. I tried to benefit from his comments.

Last but not least I want to thank a medical doctor, Mustafa Güven, who supported this thesis with his medical help. Also Eray and Oğuz, thank you so much for your support.

Despite of all contributions mentioned above possible shortcomings and drawbacks in the thesis belong to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
CHAPTER	

VOLUME I

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. The Context of the Study	1
1.2. The Purpose of the Study	6
1.3. The Methodology.....	7
1.4. The Structure of the Study	8
1.5. From Marx to the Turkish Marxist Movement	18
1.6. The Socialist Journal ‘ <i>Aydınlık</i> ’.....	22
2. CLASS AND CAPITALIST SOCIETY IN MARX.....	29
2.1. Early Development of Class conception in Marx.....	30
2.2. Classes of modern society, trinity of land labour capital. Dialectical Development of inner contradictions of capital62
2.2.1. An Introduction to <i>Capital</i>	63
2.2.2. <i>Capital</i>	71
3. ENTRY OF CAPITAL INTO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND THE DEBATE ON THE MODES OF PRODUCTION IN THE <i>AYDINLIK</i>215
3.1. Subordination of Agricultural Production into Capital	

Ground-Rent	215
3.2. Dissolution of central military feudalism, and the comprador alliance.....	249
3.3. Rejecting the idea of Primitive Capitalism	308
3.4. Dominant Classes in the TWP Program.....	315
4. REVOLUTIONARY STAGES AND STRATEGY.....	322
4.1. Background of the Revolutionary Thought in Marx.....	323
4.2. The Stages of the French bourgeois revolution, 1789 to 1871.....	374
4.2.1. “The Civil War in France”: The revolution completed....	382
4.3. The Stages of Revolution in Turkey.....	398
4.3.1. The National Liberation Struggle.....	398
4.3.2. “The Kemalist Reforms Period”.....	401
4.3.3. Anti-Kemalist Counter-Revolution of dominant classes.....	413
4.4. 27 May Movement.....	424
4.5. The National Democratic Revolution.....	427
4.6. The Permanent Revolution in Marx.....	442
4.7. Mao’s Revolutionary Strategy for Backward Countries.....	446
4.8. WPT and the National Democratic Revolution.....	454
4.9. Military Warning against “ <i>Marxist-Leninist</i> ” uprising.....	468

VOLUME II

TABLE OF CONTENTS	xvi
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xx
CHAPTER	

5. REVOLUTIONARY CLASSES AND POSSIBILITIES.....	487
5.1. (National) bourgeoisie and <i>Revolutionary possibilities</i>	488
5.1.1. The Genesis of the Industrial Capitalist in Marx.....	502
5.1.2. Individual, class and Bourgeois-civil society	504

5.1.3. Purpose of Capitalist Production and the Capitalist.....	528
5.1.4. Merchant’s Capital: Old and Modern.....	545
5.1.5. From usury to modern banking.....	562
5.1.6. Capitalist as personification of capital	578
5.1.7. A Marxian interpretation of cultural-spatial identifications.....	584
5.2. PETTY BOURGEOISIE: AS AN INTERMEDIARY CLASS.....	591
5.2.1. Political fall of the petty bourgeoisie after 1848 June.....	608
5.2.2. The “Middle Classes” in WPT program.....	615
5.2.3. The Kemalist Army.....	618
5.2.4. The Relative Autonomy of the state and bureaucracy.....	619
5.3. PROLETARIAT.....	628
5.3.1. Struggle for a Normal Working Day.....	629
5.3.2. Uncompleted Proletarian Revolution: 1848 February.....	640
5.3.3. The Working Class in WPT program	652
5.3.4. Trade Unions: RTUCT and TUCT.....	665
5.3.5. Worker Resistance in June 70: A Sign of Maturation.....	691
5.3.6. Objective existence of the proletariat, the leadership.....	694
5.4. PEASANTRY: AS AN INTERMEDIARY CLASS	699
5.4.1. “The Foundational Moving Force”	700
5.4.2. Primitive Accumulation and Peasant	701
5.4.3. Small peasants in <i>Capital</i>	708
5.4.4. Small (French) Peasants in 1850s	729
5.4.5. The Peasants in WPT Program.....	734
6. THE PROGRAM OF THE “MOVEMENT”.....	736
6.1. The Program of the <i>Communist Manifesto</i> 1848.....	736
6.2. The Criticism of the <i>Gotha Program</i> in 1875.....	738
6.3. Mihri Belli: Addressing the General Meeting	

in October 1970.....	748
6.4. Class Party for National Front Struggle	761
6.5. The Meeting of October and the Party Question.....	773
6.6. “The Draft Program of the Movement”	789
7. CONCLUSION.....	803
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	824
APPENDIX	
A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	847
VITA.....	855

ABBREVIATIONS

Journals:

The *Aydınlık*: The Socialist Journal *Aydınlık* (Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi) (ASD)

The PRA: The Proleterian Revolutionary *Aydınlık* (Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık) (PDA)

Marx's and Engels' Writings

SW: Karl Marx's Selected Writings

EW: Karl Marx's Early Writings

MESY: Marx and Engels' Selected Writings in *Turkish*

Organisations:

TUCT: Trade Unions Confederation of Turkey (Türkiye İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu) (Türk-İş)

RTUCT: Revolutionary Trade Unions Confederation of Turkey (Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu) (DİSK)

TUT: Teachers' Unions of Turkey (Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası) (TÖS)

AFL-CIO: American Confederation of Worker Trade Unions (Amerikan İşçi Sendikaları Birliği)

AID: American Economic Cooperation Organisation (Amerikan Ekonomik İşbirliği Örgütü)

ICFTU: International Confederation of the Free Trade Unions (Uluslararası Özgür Sendikalar Konfederasyonu)

FRYA: Federation of Revolutionary Youth Associations (Devrimci Gençlik Federasyonu) (Dev-Genç)

Parties:

TWP: Workers Party of Turkey (Türkiye İşçi Partisi) (TİP)

CTP: Communist Party of Turkey (Türkiye Komünist Partisi) (TKP)

PLPT-PLFT: People's Liberation Party of Turkey- People's Liberation Front of Turkey (Türkiye Halk Kurtuluş Partisi- Türkiye Halk Kurtuluş Cephesi) (THKP-THKC)

RWPPT: Revolutionary Workers-Peasants Party of Turkey (Türkiye İhtilalci İşçi-Köylü Partisi) (TİİKP)

DP: Democrat Party (Demokrat Parti) (DP)

JP: Justice Party (Adalet Partisi) (AP)

RPP: Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi) (CHP)

NAP: Nationalist Action Party (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi) (MHP)

NOP: Nationalist Order Party (Mili Nizam Partisi) (MSP)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Context of the Study

The thesis analyses the Marxian theory of class and tries to demonstrate to what extent the Turkish Marxist left utilised that theory in its rising period in the late 1960s when socialist politics in Turkey could find a relatively democratic environment for its development after the military intervention of 27 May 1960. It concerns with the Marxian theory of class in the general framework of Marxian meta-theory and in parallel with this, analyses the reception of this theory by the Turkish Marxism. I exemplify this evaluation with the Socialist Journal *Aydınlık* (hereafter briefly *the Aydınlık*) which appeared between December 1968 and March 1971. The reason behind the selection of this example is related with the period and position it occupied in the history of Turkish Marxist movement. In this period, the left had just met with the revolutionary *Marxist* books and begun to use them in order to find out possible solutions to the problems of the country such as the non-democratic legal structure and insufficient level of economic development. The period pointed to the first take-off of the socialist struggle and the militancy of the workers, the intellectuals and the youth. The case, *the Aydınlık*, also occupies an important position within the revolutionary movement in Turkey. It was the broody of nearly all Marxist-Leninist and Maoist parties, which would be established between 1969 and 1971. The Journal represented the most destructive opposition levelled towards the Workers Party of Turkey (hereafter briefly the WPT), which was established in 1961, and gathered the majority of the left forces in the country and followed a parliamentary and reformist line to seize the power in the name of the workers and the other popular classes.

The second chapter starts with the period of Marx between 1837 and 1845. This chapter is concerned with the formation of Marx's thought and starts by presenting information about political ideologies in Germany, the intellectual thoughts of the left Hegelians, and analyses Marx's early writings about the material base of the ideological and political alienation and the first formulations of the historical materialism. The period demonstrates that all elements of Marxian thought firstly manifest themselves as a totality. Here we have Marx who connected the class phenomena with the question of radical social change, revolution, within the historical consciousness of the revolutionary classes.

In addition, the second chapter deals with Marx who had just connected the theory of historical materialism with the proletarian communist politics towards 1848 revolutions in European scale. It then follows Marx's analysis of class struggle in the French context. Lastly, the chapter deals with how Marx saw the problems of revolutionary transformation in capitalist society and the first phase of communism of the future. Finally, it presents Marx's explanation about the fact that he had focused on the European context in the development of capitalism in *Capital* and then his and Engels' warnings about the petty bourgeois influences in the social-democratic workers' party in Germany in the late 1870s.

Moreover, the second chapter is related with the economic base of the class and class conflict. Marxian economics, which formed itself through several and systematic criticisms of the bourgeois political economy and economic order, is nothing but the economic analysis of the classes, class relations and class struggle. The chapter directly follows Marx's own analysis of "capital" by exposing three volumes of *Capital*, the *Theories of Surplus-Value*, and the *Grundrisse*. The concept of "capital" in Marxian theory points to the bourgeois form of the material production of life. According to this concept, analysis of capital is already an analysis of the classes and class relations of the bourgeois society. Accumulation of capital reproduces the class relations.

Crises in the accumulation process points to the crises in the reproduction of the class relations. Capital is a specific form of wealth peculiar to the capitalist society. Its sub-categories are divided into the wage and surplus-value in general. The latter is divided into profit (plus interest) and ground-rent. These categories are the economic powers of the main great classes of the developed bourgeois society. The variable capital invested on the labour-power and constant capital invested on the materials of production are first of all the economic powers of the capitalists and used by them also as a weapon in the inter and intra-class struggle. The machines are put forward because of not only economic calculation and necessity of the production process, but also a result of the pressure of the workers and the pressure of the competition between the capitalists. For Marx, the division between the forces of production and the relations of production has analytical meanings.

Marx's analysis of capital also demonstrates how capitalist production prepares the *material* foundation of a higher form of society. Capitalist production develops the productivity of labour, creates unnecessary labour force (implying the possibility of free time for all, in a higher form of society), rationalises the production system and makes unnecessary the capitalists for the realisation of the production in a social scale. It also renders the private property historically unnecessary. Marx's analysis of capital concerns with the ideas which were firstly put forward in the *German Ideology*, which suggested that, a higher form of society, i.e. communism (not communist *revolution*), would and could develop from a developed production system.

Marx's analysis of capital utilises numerous empirical information and historical data but does not contain a historical presentation of the capitalist development. This field of interests are mainly the *capitalist mode of production* which first emerged in England and then spread out towards the other parts of the Western Europe from the fifteenth century onward. Analysis of *the capitalist mode of production* demonstrates how the bourgeois society produces its own material life, its classes, class relations and class conflicts.

Analysis of capital is made through the criticism of the bourgeois political economy. For this reason, it also analyses the theoretical understanding of the bourgeois economic relations. This theoretical understanding carries the surface appearances of the market relations to the theoretical sphere. The political economy reproduces the mystified form of the social relations of production, circulation and realisation of capital. In addition, since capital is an alienated form of labour or alienated form of wealth under capitalist production, the analysis of capital demystifies the relations of production by demonstrating the development of this alienation that originates from the production sphere.

The analysis of capital firstly deals with “capital in general”. It then concerns with the particular capitals, that is to say, different categories of capital such as interest and ground-rent. In the case of the particular capitals, Marx *briefly* deals with the genesis of the capitalist farmer, industrial capital, the merchant’s capital, the capitalist ground-rent. As for the pre-capitalist relations and pre-capitalist economic formations, Marx is not directly related with history, but with the definition of the capitalist mode of production *as a specific category*, which is distinct from the other forms of production and related relations of production. Its specificity means that it is limited to a phase of history although many of its internal elements such as commodity production, commerce, and money economy had been seen throughout history. It is the specific product of history which emerged firstly in the Western Europe and had not necessarily appeared anywhere when many of its elements such as the expropriation of the direct producers and the commodity production and exchange had been witnessed as in some eras of the history.

As for the draft about the pre-capitalist economic formations, it is seen that Marx is not related with the pre-capitalist modes of production, but with the dissolution of the primitive communistic society, or community, the private property, and possibly different forms of articulation of the individual with the

community. Marx is interested with the suitable conditions for the formation of the free worker (divorced from the conditions of labour, that is, the land, the means of production) and the free capital (emancipated from the chains of the old structure of society such as the guild system of the feudal cities). He observes that in the Asiatic societies which prevented the development of individualism and private property favouring the state and the community, the dissolution of community and its economic structure is not easily realised and requires an external dynamic in comparison to the communities which permitted private property alongside the state or communal property.

Which periods of history and which part of the globe Marx pointed to is not clear in his draft. The Asiatic community is exemplified also with Peru which is not in Asia. It is not clear whether Marx has in mind the Ottoman society, China, or Russia. In addition, Marx is not interested strictly in the Asiatic mode of production, but in the Asiatic forms of property and the Asiatic form of relationship between the individual person and the community.

The chapter lastly deals with the capitalist ground-rent and completes the *trinity formula* of the bourgeois political economy. The capitalist ground-rent assumed the surplus-profit produced in advance and seems to have pointed to a relationship between capitalist farmer who appropriates profit and the landowner who will appropriate the surplus profit in the form of rent from the capitalist farmer. It also requires a portion of land which can yield a surplus-profit for the capitalist farmer. But it is also possible that rent can be paid out of the wage and normal profit. Here the rent is not capitalist ground-rent proper. However, profit and surplus-profit (rent) can remain in the hands of the *landowner* capitalist farmer just as if the industrial capitalist who uses his own money capital does not pay any interest to the bankers. These possible mixtures of landed property, money capital and industrial capital in fact explains the important place which is occupied by the first Volume of Capital which deals exclusively with “capital in general”, i.e. productive capital of industrial capitalist, his profit covering all surplus-value. However, “capital in

general” is possible for the industrial capital as exemplified by Marx in the first Volume of *Capital*.

Each chapter of the thesis except the second one evaluates the class analysis of *the Aydınlık* against the background of the selective and systematic exposition of the Marxian theory as a whole in the previous three chapters. They concern with how much the theoretical arguments and mode of argumentation of the Turkish Marxism, through the example of *the Aydınlık*, is in accordance with the Marxian theory of class and revolution. The question is also valid in reverse that how much the Marxian theory fits the Turkish case. For this reason, another fruit of the thesis is to look at Marxian theory through the experience of the Turkish Marxism. However, the thesis is not interested in the possible contributions of the Turkish Marxism to the Marxist theory. It is because the thesis is designed as an implicit dialogue between Marxian theory and Turkish Marxism and is not directly related with the relationship between the Marxist theory as a whole and the Turkish Marxism.

1.2 The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of my dissertation is to demonstrate that the Turkish Marxist left has been predominantly interested in the revolution strategy rather than any interpretation of Marxian theory itself, and its internal divisions have been based only on the alternative interpretations of the socialist strategy (by following the examples of Russian, Chinese and European revolutionary experiences). The fact that it did not need directly to focus on Marxian theory itself and its excessive interest in the strategic search, to me, is both a result of the rapid development of the socialist politics after 1960 and a result of anti-communist political, ideological and legal environment of the country before 1960s. The left was inexperienced and rapidly raised and hence needed short guides for struggle. Moreover, whenever an interest appears about the Marxian theory, it has been *at large* a non-academic enterprise.

For this reason, my strategic purpose is to present the Marxian theory of class as a whole and relate it with the internal debates of the Turkish socialists. In other words, my specific purpose is to evaluate how much the Turkish debate connects itself to the origin of the theory. For this purpose, *the Aydınlık* is examined after a selective exposition of the *Marxian* literature itself by focusing on the historical, political, and economic conceptualisations of the class phenomena.

1.3 The Methodology

My dissertation examines and exposes the original (but not in originally German and French editions) texts of Marx from his 1841 Ph.D. dissertation to 1875- *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. My parallel references rarely go to several influential interpretations of the Marxian theory in the twentieth century such as Lenin, Gramsci, Lukacs, and Marcuse. It is sure that Engels could be used as a general guide to understand Marx's intellectual development and his posthumous influence. But, the first part of the thesis which deals with the Marxian theory of class as a whole is a first hand study of Marxian texts. In addition, I have to say that the thesis uses little secondary sources about Marx and Turkey.

Marx always develops his points of view through a critical confrontation with some thinkers. He often changes and develops his original position by criticizing his old philosophical and political friends with whom he had a close contact before. It can be easily argued that Marx could not become Marx without his confrontation with Ludwig Feuerbach, Bruno Bauer, Moses Hess, Arnold Ruge, Proudhon, Bakunin, all of whom he criticized. But my dissertation contains only limited information about the background of these intellectual confrontations because my study is not concerned directly with the original sources of Marx's theory, which is the subject of Marxology, but with their positions and impacts on the internal evolution of his thought in the context of class and consciousness.

As for the Turkish case, I study directly the issues of *the Aydınlık*. However, since I try to demonstrate the theoretical connection of the Turkish Marxism with the origin of the theory, i.e. the Marxian theory of class as a whole, the thesis does not contain a specific history of socialist movement in Turkey. The *Aydınlık* suggested a national democratic revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the proletariat before socialist revolution. The journal was issued to educate the socialist militants theoretically in this direction and the part of the thesis which deals with *the Aydınlık* concerns mainly with the thoughts of *the Aydınlık* and its contributors. Besides the editorial columns which explain the thoughts of the movement of *the proletarian revolutionaries*, and other collective studies such as the party program of the proletarian revolutionary movement, I exclusively focus on the articles of some contributors like Mihri Belli, Muzaffer Erdost, Ahmet Kardam, Mustafa Harman, and Doğu Perinçek. However, Muzaffer Erdost occupies the most spacious place. My survey of the journal demonstrates that nearly all debates over the mode of productions and the relations of production as regards with the revolutionary class alliances is realised by Erdost in a theoretical framework that is very close to the Marxian theoretical framework. My emphasis on Erdost's articles is also related with the observation that Erdost is directly interested in the Marxian concepts in order to scientifically justify the national democratic revolution strategy.

1.4 The Structure of the Study

The distinctive aspect of the Marxian theory of class is the fact that this theory is the central theory to which all other theories are articulated. Radical historical change, i.e. revolution, is and can be realised through class struggle. Class struggle is caused by the class conflicts and the sources of conflict are class divisions themselves. A class dominates the others in order to maintain its superior position and exploitation. The class domination leads into and originates from the exploitation of the direct producer. Marx observes that the class domination is a product of history, but the formation

of the proletariat under the capitalist mode of production points to the possibility of putting an end to the class society. This possibility is realised through a social revolution rather than a partial, political revolution.

For Marx, a socialist or communist politics must put the class struggle to the centre of the political activity. Class politics aims at directing and organising the class struggle for the class interests of the class and for the abolishment of the classes through class dictatorship. However, the form of class politics suggested by Marx has some barriers in the conditions where socialist class politics are inexperienced in objective and subjective terms. Leaving aside the objective barriers such as the majority of the peasant masses in the country, inadequate industrialisation, etc., there is also some theoretical barriers coming from the Marxian theory of class itself. Marx's severe attacks on various socialist lines in his time, such as Proudhon's *petty-bourgeois socialism*, "true socialism" of the left-Hegelians, the *anarchism* of Bakunin and *socialist utopians* such as Owen, Fourier, and the voluntarism of German émigré workers have potentially negative impacts over the political activity which wants to follow the scientific socialism of Marx. For example, speculation, imagination, and the moral considerations in the socialist criticism of the bourgeois order and unorganised and anarchical attacks towards the bourgeois state and institutions can be mobilized in the interest of a revolutionary politics. The scientism of Marx has some inverse effects over his theory of revolution, his notion of class and his understanding of class consciousness. Moral criticism and utopian socialism contain powerful ideological and psychological weapons in the formation of class-consciousness despite their impotence in relation to a radical and rational transformation of the society. In addition, from Machiavelli to Rousseau, it is very well known fact that the ideology of the masses such as religion is a significant force in the movement of history. In his evolution of thought, Marx seems to disregard many features of real politics in his search for the scientific base of socialism and this is a problem for a revolutionary theory.

The Marxism of the backward countries has compensated negative attitude of Marx towards partial solutions and reformism by suggesting a revolutionary process which would develop through stages. These stages were formulated in the Maoist literature in detailed ways. Each stage was realised by the proletarian revolutionaries and had the most possible target to be realised with the widest tactical class alliances of the proletariat. However, the question is not the necessary existence of these *compensation theories* in order to close the gap between Marxian socialist class politics and the backward conditions of the class struggle. As for the Turkish case, the questions underlied the fact that strategy debate dominated the theoretical scientific debates; that the working class was not well evaluated in terms of its development and militancy; that the peasantry was attributed so much importance that the national democratic revolution had to be defined explicitly as a peasant revolution at the end; that national front was envisaged as a unity of the classes rather than a popular front; that national struggle was interpreted in terms of a content of the class struggle rather than the form of the class struggle; that the WPT was criticised for its not being a class party despite suggesting a popular struggle, and popular front in the framework of the national democratic revolutionary struggle.

It is known that socialist class politics and a real revolutionary party have been impossible hitherto in Turkey. The connection between the revolutionary aims of Marx and corresponding theories, and the conditions of the country was tried to be established through the adoption of an implicit version of Maoist revolution strategy, i.e. the national-democratic revolution strategy. This strategy aimed at preparing the conditions of socialist revolution by firstly completing the bourgeois democratic revolution started in the Kemalist era by following a Maoist strategy. For this reason, Maoism established a link between Kemalism and socialism. However, the class alliances, which this strategy suggested between the proletariat, the national bourgeoisie, the urban-rural petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, could not

be established. The movement was represented mainly by the militant socialist youth and was divided into various sectarian groups after 1969.

Marx envisaged a socialist struggle of the working class and theoretically marginalised the other factors of real political life such as army, nationality or religion and predicted that the economic development of the bourgeoisie would continue to revolutionize the consciousness of all sorts, despite seeing the oppressive character of the bourgeois state in the class struggle.

The term “national bourgeoisie” was alien to Marx. Even the worker-peasant alliance was alien to him, too. The Turkish Marxism, in the example of *the Aydınlik*, tried to form a national front of the national classes, attributed a revolutionary potential to the Kemalist army officers, and saw the national section of the bourgeoisie as a potential ally in the national democratic revolution. The small and poor peasants were seen as the most possible ally of the proletariat and as the base force of the revolution. The common enemies of the national front were the big (feudal or capitalist but mainly feudal) landlords, the comprador bourgeoisie and the imperialism. The country was dominated by the imperialism and its local extensions. The country still suffered from feudal relations of production and its ideological extensions. First target of the struggle of the national forces was therefore independence and democracy.

This revolution strategy was never justified by *the Aydınlik* and its contributors with reference to Marx. Only later on, an ex-*the Aydınlik* militant, Mahir Çayan in his “collected writings” (see his “*Permanent Revolution*” in www.kurtuluscephesi.com/eris/mahir/html) would state that behind the national democratic revolution strategy underlay the permanent revolution thesis which Marx used towards 1848 revolutions and left aside after the defeat of the working class in 1848 and which was re-formulated by Lenin for the context of the 1905’s Russian revolution (as regards with the tasks of the proletariat in the democratic revolution). In the third chapter, I deal with this

problem, and try to demonstrate that the problem is not as easy as Çayan suggested.

Throughout the dissertation, I deal with above-mentioned problems by following first Marx's internal evolution of thought exposing his literature and *the Aydınlık*. The structure of the study is erected according to my central hypothesis which is based on the idea that Turkish Marxism can not directly connect itself to the original theory, but to either pre-or post-Marxian ideas exclusively focusing on the Marxist revolutionary experience in the twentieth century.

The second chapter starts with an analysis of Marx's early speculative searches for an instrument or mediator to change the world. Such a search is not peculiar to Marx in his time. The intellectual and political environment of Germany in the 1830s and 1840s witnesses intense debates about the role of philosophy and the future of Germany. After Hegel's death, a humanist and materialist young Hegelian line emerged. In this time period, the "theoretical revolution" of Germany was compared with the revolutionary practice in France. It was a problem of the left-Hegelians how these two sorts of revolutionary change could be fused. Such a problematic was first conceived in the term of "praxis" as a unity of theory and practice. On the other hand, the backward political conditions of Germany as a result of the impotence of the German bourgeoisie made Marx a radical democrat. For these reasons, in the intellectual development of Marx, post-Hegelian debates in Germany and political backwardness in his country are the subject matters, which I deal with here. Marx's search for a historical agent for revolutionary transformation is a responsive involvement to left-Hegelian debates.

Marx's discovery of the proletariat as a historical agent to change the world is a direct result of his confrontation with the socialist theory and worker struggle in France after 1844. The time was in a pro-revolutionary mood.

When he came to Paris, he had a conceptual weapon such as the idea of alienation, and a methodological framework such as the dialectics of Hegel. Marx immediately integrated the labour movement into his theory of alienation in a dialectic way. In his new synthesis, industrial production created the working class, and its alienating effect over workers led to a group consciousness to eliminate alienation. There was a dialectical relationship between capitalists and workers, and this antagonism would be surpassed through a class struggle for emancipation in the future. The notion of alienation, which Marx took from Feuerbach, was integrated to French socialism with a dialectical methodology, which was derived from Hegel.

The key words that are used in time in general and in Marx's works in particular are firstly *consciousness*, *religion*, *alienation*, *civil society*, and the *state*, political versus human *emancipation*. The favoured approach is the criticism of everything, the state, religion, egoistic and atomistic individual, et cetera. The conceptual framework on which all debates are founded is Hegelian philosophy and dialectics. But in time, after 1843 and at least in Germany, socialism is another field of interest.

In this period, Marx conceives the problem of class and class-consciousness in terms of history, and theory; in other words, class-consciousness as a historical-theoretical forms of consciousness in favour and in the name of general human emancipation. It is not something that can be formulated as a psychology of a group. Marx's class conception is completely related with historical consciousness, that is to say, a consciousness of historical mission of the working class.

Again at least my survey of the Young Marx demonstrates that Marx's interest is not directly and completely concerned with the conditions of the working class. For Marx, the question was not the phenomenon itself, but the potential of the existing phenomena that could be mobilised for a socialist society of the future. The proletariat represented not only the present

condition of society but also pointed to a direction of history. Marx's interest in the phenomena of consciousness and class is not related with the empirical analyses of the living condition of the working class, but with the driving forces of history and revolutionary change in this period.

The chapter also deals with "capital in general" and then with particular capitals in main. The method of criticism of *Capital* is completely dialectical, which is epistemology (logic) and method borrowed from Hegel and had been modified and developed by Marx for the analyses of social, economic and political processes of capitalist society since the beginning of 1840s. *Capital* is a search for the contradictory development of the capitalist forces and relations of production, in other words, what Marx calls, the capitalist mode of production. Here the term *mode of production* seems to refer to exclusively to the base of capitalist society, or the productive base of it. But it does not matter if we do not understand from it only the mechanical and technical aspects of production, or only the physical conditions of production. Marx throughout the *Capital* does not deal with capital existing without capitalists, or capitalist class. Likewise, he does not concern the producer, whatever it is named, which is not or not being wage-labourer. What Marx means by production is the production of capital and what he means by producer is the wage-labourer. Similarly, the owners of capital produced by wage-labourers are the capitalists. Therefore, it is rather easy to see that Marx's mode of production is also a mode of relations of production between the producers and the owners of the product (surplus value – value form of the objectified surplus labour in the surplus product - to be realised and capitalised at the market). The mode of production and its corresponding mode of relations of production, at the very beginning of the production process, carry the character of the relation between the immediate producers and immediate owners or appropriators of the products. This immediate relation is the basic class relation (capital-relation as called by Marx) under the capitalist mode of production. It immediately emerges because it is a product of the immediate process of production. But, life does not only

consist of the immediate production since men do not ceaselessly produce at all and since not every body in society is producer or appropriator of the immediate product

The basic class relation is *analytical* and *actually existing axis* and simply assumes that every individual of the society belongs either to the camps of producers, workers of capital or to the command centre of the owners of the products, of capital in general. The situation is evidentially not so, since; first: producers are not all immediate producers or fully employed. The latter is not a usual phenomenon mainly because of the ever-existence of the industrial reserve army; second, capitalists are not all immediate appropriators of the products. We have not only a labour *divided* but also capital *divided* in content and in form. If analytically said, after capital (surplus value) is *immediately* produced and appropriated by the capitalist, it is shared among the different hands of capital which holds different forms of capital. Nonetheless, exclusive, bi-sided distribution of the products of the immediate production process between the producer and the capitalist is assumed by Marx for the analytical purpose. Capital or the capitalist is assumed in its “general form” that appropriates all surplus-value that emerges at the end of the immediate production. *Capital 1* analyses exclusively productive labour of the industrial wage-worker and productive capital of the industrial capitalists. Different hands or forms of capital, many of which stands outside the immediate production process are labelled by Marx as the ruling classes of the capitalist society, encompassing the appropriators of profit, interest and ground-rent, in other words, the appropriators of the different parts of the surplus value that is previously extracted from the immediate producers, or to say, immediate productive labour. By doing so, Marx demonstrates exact material base of the formation of classes and the conflicts between them.

If so, we have in *Capital* analytically formulated class relations into which empirical class relations dissolve. The immediate production of surplus value is based fundamentally on the relation between capitalist and worker. Once

the surplus appropriated, it is shared with the others outside of the immediate production, in other words, in the market through which previously produced surplus value circulates in the different hands and places for the different purposes.

If the process of the immediate production is both the *temporal and spatial centre* and a sphere in which the basic class relation, or to use Marx's concepts, capital-relation emerges, the basic class relation is both *analytical and empirical axis* around which secondary social relations held their locations. By saying these, we are still in the sphere of so called base of capitalist society. But, this kind of architectural metaphors that Marx rarely uses usually deceives the analytical mind and prevents a perfect dialectical inquiry. To say that, for instance, contradictions emerge within the base of the capitalist society and then reflect into the political, ideological, legal or aesthetical forms of the super-structure of capitalist society implies a *false deduction*, and correspondingly entails a *false reduction* in the reverse side. Here, it is typical that *derivation* is confused with *mediation*. A contradiction emerges and is transformed from one sphere to another through the mediation (or agency) of the third agent, or sphere. This is what Marx calls the *middle term*. Only thanks to the middle term, or mediating process, we can say that something is reflected into something else. For example, capitalist individuals merge into a capitalist class through the mediation of their political power, i.e. the state. This does not mean that the state can be reduced to the capitalist individuals. Besides this conceptualisation of the transition from individual to class, Marx (and Engels) suggests in *the German Ideology*, that class is the middle term or medium between the individual and society.

In Marx's analysis of *capital in general*, capital or the capitalist was seen in its "general form" that appropriates all surplus-value that emerges at the end of the immediate production. *Capital 1* analysed the productive labour and productive capital in the context of immediate production. But it did not deal

with the reproduction or circulation process of capital, and not with the different hands or forms of capital, many of which stands outside the immediate production process, encompassing the appropriators of profit, interest and ground-rent, in other words, the appropriators of the different parts of the surplus value that is previously extracted from the immediate producers, or that is to say, immediate productive labour.

After the analysis of *capital in general* Marx begins to deal with the circulation of capital or reproduction process of capital through which value newly produced must be realized and a portion of it must come back to the immediate production sphere to produce new capital, in other words, new surplus value. Production-circulation-realization spheres of capital must be connected to each other, if we will continue to have a capital-relation or a capitalist mode of production at all. However, the reproduction process of capital inevitably faces many problems caused by the nature of capital itself, and this process is frequently interrupted because of the contradiction between the profit searching character of capitalist production and the relations of production. Due to this contradiction, capitalist reproduction process cannot escape from crises. The most dramatic form of crisis is caused by the overproduction phenomena according to Marxian analysis in *Capital*.

Apart from crisis-riding nature of capitalist production, Marx points to the temporary character of capitalist mode of production and its self-destruction. The tendential fall in the rate of profit, despite all counteracting tendencies, points to the internal limitation of the capitalist mode of production and implies final collapse in the long run. As the capitalist production develops, the necessary labour decreases in favour of surplus labour due to the rising productivity of social labour. But, in this development, though the mass of surplus value and profit increases, the rate of profit (rate of surplus value to the total capital advanced) decreases because more dead labour is used in production and correspondingly less new value is produced.

In the analysis of capital as a whole, Marx observes that capital itself prepares the economic conditions of a higher form of production. This also means that workers politics should induce its socialist arguments from the analysis of the contradictory nature of the capitalist mode of production rather than from any petty bourgeois, anarchist or ethical considerations (I have mentioned above the negative sides of this scientific development). In the same analysis, Marx also presents the differentiation of capital into commercial capital, interest-bearing capital, banking capital, and ground-rent or surplus-profit in general, which stems from positive differences, advantages or monopolies of some capital over others.

As for the class structure of the modern bourgeois society, Marx states that the framework of this society is formed by the three *great* classes: the one *working class*, the second, *bourgeoisie*, and the third, *landowner s*. Between the bourgeoisie and the working class, ever-growing middle classes or petty bourgeoisie is located. Class polarisation, for Marx, is not related with the distribution of population into capitalist and working classes. But it is related with the development of contradictions between capitalists and working population. The statement in the *Communist Manifesto* that modern bourgeois society simplifies the class relations seems to be compatible with these definitions in *Capital*. Marx does not say that *classes* are being simplified, but he states that *class-relations* are being simplified.

1.5 From Marx to the Turkish Marxist Movement,

As for the remaining **part** of the thesis, **each sequential** chapter critically evaluates the utilization of the Marxian theory of class in its relation to the context of the Marxian meta-theory by the Turkish Marxist left of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The Turkish Marxist left was rather absent before the new political and ideological conditions of 1960s had created a favourable democratic

environment for the working class politics and socialist organizations. Before then, the Marxist left had been represented by illegal and ineffective Communist Party of Turkey (hereafter briefly the CPT), which had been formed in September of 1920 and had overtly supported newly emerged Turkish Republic and his leader Mustafa Kemal. It saw the Kemalist revolution as an anti-imperialist national revolution in the condition where the historical stage of the country did not have a proto-socialist revolutionary potential. Nevertheless, despite its support to Kemalist Republic, new political system tragically oppressed the CPT and assassinated its top leaders at the end of 1921. Hence, the CPT could not participate in Turkish political life until 1970s.

Kemalist Republic also oppressed the working class movement at its early attempts for organization. In 1925, working class met with the legal restrictions and then with the new fascist penal code that was inspired by the Italian Fascism. The fate that the CPT lived was also valid for the workers till 1960s if we put aside some limited freedoms after 1945 when multi-party regime was established and by the 1950s when the first federation of the trade unions, The Trade Unions Confederation of Turkey (hereafter briefly the TUCT) , was formed under the Democratic Party (hereafter briefly DP) rule.

The Turkish left in fact emerged after the 27 May 1960 military coup, which was supported by the progressive elements of the society. Because of this progressive base in the society, military coup also brought with itself relatively democratic constitution in terms of freedom in association, and in expression for the workers, and the university communities. On the ground of this free political condition, 1961 witnesses first legal workers party that is established by some socialist trade unionists, including socialist intellectuals, and young students. The WPT won 15 seats in the parliament in 1965. After this successful result, there emerged a parliamentary-based, reformist illusion for the socialist revolution in the new left circles. However, the WPT

suffered from the internal conflict that was caused by the Soviet's intervention to Czechoslovakia and ideological divisions within itself. In addition, it confronted with the political and ideological attacks of the old the CPT adherents, who were then advocating National Democratic Revolution thesis (hereafter briefly NDR thesis) against so-called socialist revolution thesis of the WPT.

Meanwhile, socialist oriented trade union leaders within the TUCT formed another federation called the Revolutionary Trade Unions Confederation of Turkey (hereafter briefly RTUCT) in 1967. The workers movement was rapidly growing and organizing large and influential strikes after the mid 1960s. The most open sign of this growing influence was seen in the June 1970 events in Istanbul when the RTUCT called the workers to protest the law that prevented its steadily growing power. The June 1970 events signalled that an independent, socialist oriented and non-bureaucratic workers movement was maturing.

However, neither the success of the WPT in the legal parliamentary arena, nor the growing power of the organized workers' movement would preclude the Turkish socialist left from its searching for the alternative strategies of revolution, be it socialist or national democratic, that was not to be directly based on the proletarian politics. Some NDR adherents hope the beginning of the revolutionary change from the possible left juntas within the military, and the other NDR supporters was shifting to guerrilla strategy. But, none of them was to be successful when the coup in the 12 March of 1971 would come and temporally destroy the socialist left which would not recreate it till 1974.

My survey of Marxian theory of class tries to demonstrate that the Turkish Marxist movement in the example of *the Aydınlık* was interested mainly with the revolution strategy in order to complete the bourgeois democratic revolution to prepare the conditions of socialist revolution. For this reason, it

was deeply interested in the democratic struggle of the popular classes against the imperialism and its extensions in the country. Its interest in Marx was based on the need to justify that capitalist development was inadequate for socialist struggle and revolution. This is a negative interest in the Marxian theory. However, *the Aydınlık* seems to have utilised Marx's analyses of 1848 revolutions and his criticism of bourgeois political economy in *Capital* through the mediation of Lenin's and Stalin's studies. However, the main source of theory comes from Lenin's strategy related with the 1905's Russian Revolution (the role of the proletariat in the democratic revolution). Despite these historical inspirations and references, *the Aydınlık* always insisted, "all revolutions follow a national path" (Mihri Belli). But it seems to have forgotten that revolutions also follow a universal path. The main weakness of NDR strategy is the definition of counter-revolution in Turkey after the Second World War. The other weakness is related with the perception of the stages within or continuity of the revolution (permanent revolution). However, the strength of the NDR strategy of *the Aydınlık* is the fact that it perfectly sees that Marxian class politics predominantly centres on class struggle *itself* rather than only on the parliamentary struggle of the representatives of the classes, strata, sections, etc. It also perfectly recognises that the proletariat cannot be the only revolutionary class in the revolution, and have to win other classes which are close to it for any sort of revolution, although it is the only revolutionary class to the end.

If we evaluate to what extent *the Aydınlık* benefited from the Marxian theory, certain positive and negative points can be emphasised: The positive points are: anti-imperialism, centrality of class struggle, patient and common sense for the development of the workers' politics and organised socialist struggle, and realism rather than adventurism. The negative points are: underemphasise upon the rising power and militancy of the working class, definition of counter-revolution, peasantry overemphasised in terms of its revolutionary potential despite the absence of significant peasant mobilisation, domination of the debates of strategy over theory, class

organisation and politics suggested for the popular struggle and popular front, limited and indirect interest in the Marxian theory and hence in the experience of the socialist struggle in Marx's time and before. Finally it was taken for granted that Marx was exclusively valid for the capitalism of free competitive era while Lenin, Stalin and Mao were valid for the monopoly era of capitalism.

1.6 The Socialist Journal 'Aydınlık'

In its opening issue, it was declared, in those days when "the Mustafa Kemal's idea of national revolution" and the ideas for the democratisation of Turkey and the feeling of independency which originated from the national liberation war are tried to be dulled, the duty is to "bring socialist militants" who will "lead" the national democratic revolution. *The Aydınlık* is published for the realisation of this duty and it summarises its position: "*the Aydınlık* participates in the struggle for 'independent and democratic Turkey', by advocating the ideology of the working class" (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:31).

The *Aydınlık* appeared between 1 November 1968 and March-April 1971, including 30 issues. The *Aydınlık* is a circle, a movement, and a centre around which a Marxist revolution strategy was advocated and developed. This strategy was called *national democratic revolution strategy*. It assumed that the revolutionary agenda before Turkey was a national democratic revolution (NDR) before socialist revolution. For this, it suggested the establishment of a national front, which would consist of all national classes, which were the proletariat, urban and rural petty bourgeoisie, military-civil intellectual stratum, national bourgeoisie and the poor peasantry. But the proletariat would be the leading class while the poor peasantry would be the base. The target of the NDR struggle was imperialism and its extensions in the country, which were comprador bourgeoisie and feudal and semi-feudal land holders. Liberation of the country from these imperialist and feudal agents would be followed by socialist revolution. All stages of revolution from

NDR to socialist revolution would be under the leadership of the proletariat in terms of ideology, organisation.

However, *the Aydınlık's* analysis of Turkish social, economic and political conditions, demonstrated that the proletariat was not yet a powerful organised political force. It did not have its own political organisation and not a class ideology in terms of revolutionary tasks for any stage of the revolution towards socialism. The only organisation, which would be a nominee for the political organisation of the proletariat, was the WPT. But it was under the control of "opportunist" cliques (Aybar-Aren-Boran opportunism) despite a socialist base in it and it followed a parliamentary democratic revolution strategy for socialist power. For this reason, the NDR circle levelled its opposition to the criticism of this opportunism in the WPT in order to seize the power in the party. The opposition was called *Proletarian revolutionary Group* or *Proletarian revolutionaries*.

The first split in *the Aydınlık* circle, which was under the ideological leadership of Mihri Belli, occurred in late 1969 and in early 1970 and a Maoist line established its own *the Aydınlık* journal called Proletarian Revolutionary *Aydınlık* (hereafter briefly PRA) under the leadership of Doğu Perinçek, who criticised left deviations (left opportunism) in the circle and the theories of pioneer's war by advocating the Maoist mass line theory of struggle and political organisation. PRA also rejected the international social hegemony of the Soviet Union in favour of the Chinese Communist Party. The second split appeared in the beginning of 1971 before 12 March military intervention and a group which originated from the Federation of Revolutionary Youth Associations (hereafter briefly the FRYA) and was closely connected to Mihri Belli up to then and established its own journal (*Kurtuluş*) and party called the Popular Liberation Party of Turkey-Popular Liberation Front of Turkey (PLPT-PLFT) under the leadership of Mahir Çayan. Mahir Çayan advocated a theory of vanguards' war before the organisation of the popular war in future. His guerrilla warfare echoed the Cuban revolutionary experience. Both Perinçek

and Çayan continued to accept Mihri Belli's NDR strategy in the different forms of struggle and organisations.

For the justification of the NDR strategy, *the Aydınlik*, on the one side, focused upon the feudal and semi-feudal relations of production and upon the development of the peasant movement, and on the other side, upon the development of the anti-imperialist mobilisation in Turkey after 1965. The Vietnam War pointed to the beginning of a new phase in the national liberation movements against imperialism. If Kemalist revolution was the first national liberation war, the Vietnam War was a new example of the national liberation wars. Although Turkey experienced a national democratic war under the leadership of revolutionary petty bourgeoisie between 1919 and 1945, it had not completed its bourgeois democratic revolution because of the anti-Kemalist counter-revolution which had seized the power after the Second World War. However, 27 May 1960 revolution opened the path towards national democratic revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

The subjects *the Aydınlik* deal with concerns firstly the social structure of the Ottoman Empire and its dissolution in order to justify the NDR strategy. The Ottoman Empire is described as a central military feudalism. It was destroyed by the intervention of the foreign capitalist penetration and there emerged a semi-dependent, semi-feudal agricultural social structure. As a reaction to this sort of society, a new radical petty bourgeoisie, composed of civil and military intellectual cadres, realised first national democratic revolutions in 1908 and 1920s. In addition to these section of petty-bourgeoisie, urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie, small and middle holders in the countryside in the context of capitalist and semi-feudal structure of the countryside are the other subject matters concerned by *the Aydınlik* theorists.

The detailed content of *the Aydınlik* is given at the end of the thesis. *The Aydınlik* has an intellectual division of labour in itself. General ideological framework belongs to Mihri Belli who is an ex- CPT member and developed a

“national democratic revolution” (NDR) strategy for Turkey after 27 May movement. This strategy in fact originated from early CPT, which was a member of the Comintern in 1920s. The Comintern by following Lenin suggested this sort of strategy for the socialist parties of semi-dependent, semi-feudal societies. It would be developed by Mao far more for peasant societies later on.

Mihri Belli seems to be the ideological leader of *the Aydınlık* circle. He wrote about nation, nationality, internationalism, Asiatic mode of production, revolutionary principles, revolutionary solidarity and cooperation, and about the WPT.

If the ideological framework of *the Aydınlık* is designed by Mihri Belli, it is Muzaffer Erdost who tries to construct this framework on the scientific base through the analysis of the existence of feudalism besides the dependent development of capitalism in Turkey. The preponderant existence of the peasantry and the domination of the economy by agriculture, on the one hand, and the impotence of the national bourgeoisie in comparison to the imperialists and their compradors, including the feudal landowners, on the other hand, implied that newly rising proletariat could and had to make a national democratic revolution before any possibility for socialism was to be created. The revolution would be national and democratic in the sense that the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie, and the feudal landowners were to be replaced by the popular democracy of the national classes. Only after this national democracy was established, socialism could be the agenda of the socialists. It was a controversial point that whether this revolution was to be led by the proletariat or any other forces such as the democratic petty bourgeoisie or the pioneer warriors of the proletariat at least at the beginning of the revolution in the name of the proletariat and the poor peasantry. The peasantry, the proletariat, and the petty bourgeoisie were the main subject areas that were mainly discussed by Muzaffer Erdost. Hence, I will present his writings in detail now.

Muzaffer Erdost wrote these articles in *the Aydınlık*: “An Outline for the Sources of Feudalism in Turkey and Its Present Condition” (Türkiye’de Feodalizmin Kaynakları ve Bugünkü Durumu Üzerine Bir Taslak) (March 1969), “The Feudal Characteristics of the Stock-raising in the Eastern Anatolia” (Doğu Anadolu’da Hayvancılığın Feodal Niteliği) (June 1969), “On the Dominant Relations of Production in Turkish Agriculture” (Türkiye Tarımında Hakim Üretim İlişkisi Üzerine) (November 1969), and lastly “A Criticism of New Opportunism” (Yeni Oportünizmin Eleştirisi) (May 1970) where he replied to Korkut Boratav’s article published in the PRA (1-15)., criticising his article “On the Dominant Relations of Production in the Turkish Agriculture”. Apart from Erdost, a similar contribution was made by Şahin Alpay. He wrote “XIX. Century Commercial Treaties and Their Impacts on the Ottoman Social Structure” (XIX. Yüzyıl Ticaret Sözleşmeleri ve Osmanlı Toplum Yapısı Üzerine Etkileri) (April 1969). However, this writer left *the Aydınlık* after 13.issue together with other members of the PRA. He did not see the proletariat as a leading force in the national democratic revolution because of its objective immaturity and pointed to the possible continuation of the political leadership of the democratic petty bourgeoisie in the present phase of the revolution. Muzaffer Erdost replied to these claims in his “The Place of the Petty Bourgeoisie in The revolution” (Devrimde Küçük Burjuvazinin Yeri) (February 1970).

Muzaffer Erdost and Ali Kaymak’s “On the Present Problems of Our revolution” (Devrimizin Bugünkü Sorunları Üzerine) (February 1971) and *the Aydınlık*’s collective contribution “The Outline for the Programme of the Proletarian revolutionary Movement” (Proleter Devrimci Hareketin Program Taslağı) (March-April 1971) are two syntheses of all debates about the historical development of Turkey, the position of classes and the revolutionary agenda of Turkey. In addition, these articles I have mentioned above are the scientific foundation of the debates which are made throughout *the Aydınlık*. Moreover, they seem to have benefited, much more compared with the other articles, from Marxian theory itself.

In the beginning issues, another ex-CPT member, Hikmet Kıvılcımlı wrote several articles about classes, parties, class politics, organisation of the masses, religion, and the relation between strategy and tactics and bourgeois and petty bourgeois socialism. Kıvılcımlı's place in *the Aydınlık* seems to be related with his ex-CPT background, and with the fact that he saw *second* national liberation struggle as the revolutionary agenda of Turkey before socialist revolution.

In the intellectual division of labour, Muzaffer Erdost provides the main body of the Aydınlık's theoretical weapon. Theoretical base of the NDR strategy mainly comes from Erdost's articles about feudalism, its origins and existence in Turkey, agricultural structure of Turkey, modes of production, revolutionary agenda of Turkey, revolutionary culture. Similar intellectual contribution also comes from Şahin Alpay for a while, before he left *the Aydınlık*. Alpay wrote about the dissolution of Ottoman economy in the 19. Century and the formation of semi-dependent modern Turkey. He also wrote about the main studies of Marxist literature and essential books for a Marxist education. In addition, he reviewed Doğan Avcıoğlu's *Türkiye'nin Düzeni* (The Order of Turkey).

Among the other writers, Doğu Perinçek's analysis of the WPT's structure of membership, his writings about parliamentarism and youth movement and his addressing text about the death of Ho Shi Ming are politically important and demonstrates the political milieu of the time. On the other hand, Halil Berktaş, who would leave *the Aydınlık* circle after the 15.issue together with Perinçek and Alpay, introduced a theoretical position of NDR strategy and other stages of revolution from NDR to communism. His article is the only one which presents NDR strategy in formulas.

Foreign affairs have important place in *the Aydınlık*. The Soviet intervention to Czechoslovakia, Vietnam war, militarist industrialisation of West Germany, Cyprus question, Palestine's liberation struggle, revolutionary struggle in

India, The Soviet-China conflict are, among the others, concerned for justification purposes in terms of NDR strategy.

Last point is concerned with the differences between the thoughts of the contributors. The differences among them firstly become clear towards 13.issue of *the Aydınlık*. After then a group, called PRA, followed a Maoist line. Later on, at the beginning of 1971, another split emerges and a group around Mahir Çayan forms its own party. Before two official splits emerge, the differences among *the Aydınlık* contributors can be seen in the different attributes towards the young militant movement and in the debates for the party organisation of the movement and lastly and importantly in the role which the proletariat would play in the NDR. However, common point among all *the Aydınlık* members is the NDR strategy and its essential arguments for the social structure of the Ottoman Empire, its dissolution, the place of the Kemalist revolution, anti-Kemalist counter-revolution after the Second World War in Turkey, attributes towards parliamentary road of the WPT and the acceptance of peasantry as the foundational power of the revolution through NDR process before socialist revolution.

CHAPTER 2

CLASS AND CAPITALIST SOCIETY IN MARX

The chapter tries to demonstrate that the different intellectual backgrounds of Marxian thought and that of the *Aydınlık* also cause the gap between Marxian conception of class and revolution and the stance of *the Aydınlık*. The background of Marxian thought covers the criticism of religion, the state in all forms and lastly the bourgeois-civil society. The last one is the field of economic, egoist life of man. The state is based on the bourgeois civil society. The religion is the field of alienation through which creator and created is inverted. The same relation is seen in the bourgeois economic relations. These problems are not the interest area of the Turkish left. The criticism of the state, religion and the bourgeois order of Turkey are taken away from the scene in which the completion of the democratic revolution and the debates over the most suitable revolution strategy for this completion are the most urgent problems. Not capital and capitalist, but national and comprador capital and capitalist are concerned. The analysis of the bourgeois order disappears in the semi-feudal underdeveloped agricultural society. Rather than the dissolution of the feudal remnants of the past under the domination of ever-developing capitalist economy, the continuation of the semi-feudal dependent relations are seen more important. Marx's *Capital* is utilised by *the Aydınlık*'s contributors for the analysis of the semi-dependency of the rural structure on semi-feudal relations and natural economy. The bourgeois order, the state of the bourgeois society and a possible rupture from this order is not taken for granted. Dependency, imperialism, compradorship, democracy and semi-feudal relations required different theoretical framework. On the other hand, Marx in the Germany and France of 1840s could think of these problems in the context of socialism, socialist criticism of the bourgeois order. One of the most important differences

between Marx and his followers in Turkey is the fact that Hegel and the left-Hegelians created a “theoretical revolution” in Germany. This revolution corresponded to French revolutions for them.

2.1 Early Development of Class conception in Marx

Marx’s conversion to Hegelianism (from his romantic idealism, from Kant and Fichte through Schelling) is completed through his systematic reading of Hegel’s works and his joining in a Hegelian discussion group (McLellan; 1970, 49). In Hegel’s *the Philosophy of Right* classes in the civil society are presented as a) “the *substantial* or immediate [or agricultural] class; b) the reflecting or *formal* [or business] class; and finally, c) the *universal* class [the class of civil servants]” (1958; 131).

The “substantial class” requires an ethical life that is “immediate, resting on family relationship and trust” and “the agricultural mode of subsistence remains one which owes comparatively little to reflection and independence of will” (1958; 131). On the other hand, formal, reflecting class, in order to survive, is “thrown back on its work, on reflection and intelligence, and essentially on the mediation of one man’s needs and work with those of others”. What this class do is to produce and enjoy itself, its own industry (1958; 132) and the universal class

“has for its task the universal interests of the community. It must therefore be relieved from direct labour to supply its needs, either by having private means or by receiving an allowance from the state which claims its industry, with the result that private interest finds its satisfaction in its work for the universal” (1958; 132).

The universal class, or let us say bureaucracy, is located not only in the state but also civil society at the beginning.

In the group, called *Doctors’ Club*, Adolf Rutenberg, a geography teacher and journalist, Karl Friedrich Köppen, a history teacher and an expert of

Buddhism, and the most significantly, Bruno Bauer, who was the theology lecturer at the university and was to be the closest friend of Marx for the next four years. Another member of the Club was Eduard Gans, a professor of Law at the university. He elaborated Hegelian ideas in the studies of history and law. He advocated an English sort of monarchy and sympathised with the 1830 Revolution in France and the Saint-Simonists as well (McLellan; 1970, 50). In 1836, Gans wrote a book, which would introduce the ideas of the Saint-Simonists. Therein, ideas about the bipolar class struggle in history were put forward; some observations about the existing condition of the proletariat were made, and the more significantly, foresights about the future class struggle that would occur between the proletariat and the middle classes, and that would result into the free co-operation and socialisation, were mentioned. But, these ideas had little influence over Marx for this time period (McLellan; 1970, 51). His main interest was philosophy and he took some notes about Hegel, Aristotle, Spinoza, Leibniz, Hume and Kant. In this time Marx tried to obtain a university post and for this purpose he designed a doctoral thesis, which he begun at the end of 1838 and submitted in the April of 1841. In the preliminary study of the thesis, there were notes about the Epicurean philosophy, relation between Epicureanism and Stoicism, the notion of sage in Greek philosophy and Plato's and Socrates' thoughts on religion, finally the condition of the philosophy after Hegel (McLellan; 1970, 52-3).

The Rheinische Zeitung: Marx wrote his article "Communism and the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*" when he became the editor of *The Rheinische Zeitung* in order to answer *The Augsburger Allgemeine*. This newspaper had criticized *The Rheinische Zeitung* for his publication of Moses Hess's reports on the thoughts of some Fourier's followers, and reprinting a paper from Wilhelm Weitling's journal about workers' housing. This article, which was written at the end of 1842, demonstrates Marx's ideas about communism in the time. David McLellan, editor of Selected writings we now use (editorial note to SW; 25) argues that the article "reveals Marx's initially

hostile reaction to French socialism". Marx states that "The *Rheinische Zeitung* does not even concede *theoretical* validity to communist *ideas in their present form*, let alone desire their *practical* realisation, which it anyway finds *impossible*, and will subject these ideas to a fundamental criticism" (*emphasis mine*). Marx's emphasis is over the impractical and ideal (utopian) character of the existing communist ideas. According to the latter terminology, Marx does not see the existing ideas of communism as scientifically theorised. In addition, the works of Leroux, Considérant and above all of Proudhon, states Marx, "cannot be criticised by superficial and transitory fancies but only after consistent and probing study. We have to take such theoretical works all the more seriously". Despite this theoretical carefulness, Marx, nevertheless, saw the real danger more in the theoretical development of the communist ideas than in its practice. But Marx sees the question as "the crisis of conscience caused by the rebellion of man's subjective desires against the objective insights of his own reason" and the *Augsburger Zeitung* "has neither reason of its own, nor insights, nor even conscience..." (SW; 25-6). For Marx, communism is a question of conscience and related with the rebellion of the subjective desires at the expense of objective insights. This early opinion about communism of the time, for me, demonstrates only that theoretical perfection and validity, or scientific ground of the ideas is far more important than the ideas itself. Otherwise, the question turns into a question of conscience. In addition, we should concern the editorial position and responsibility of Marx, who works for the liberal bourgeoisie.

Critique of the Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Critique of the Hegel's Philosophy of Right reduces the state into its real material foundations. At the beginning, Marx's argumentation is that Hegel's political philosophy is incompatible both with his methodology and with the concrete reality of state and the society in the time;

For Marx, the state can exist only in the form of the political state whose totality can be provided only with the legislative power. Participation into this power implies participation to the political state and that the citizen participates, in order to affirm and realise his existence as a member of the political state, or the state. In addition, the representative element in the state, assemblies forms the political existence of the bourgeois-civil society. "The aspiration of the *bourgeois -civil society* to transform into a situation of *political society*, in other words, to change the political society into the *real society* seem to be an aspiration possibly for a general participation" (Marx, 1997b, 173).

Hegel holds that representatives are elected for public works. But he defines them as the representatives of the corporations (guilds). The ones who are elected to represent their interests must work for the public works. But by this way, says Marx, Hegel elects the representative of the corporation according to the view of the state rather than that of the corporation (Marx, 1997b, 178-9). But Marx says that Hegel mentions the real reason finally: the representatives of the bourgeois-civil society come together in the assemblies that are the only real political will of the bourgeois-civil society. The division between the political society and the bourgeois-civil society seems a division between the representatives and those that are represented. But the representative is not the *little servants* as the representatives of the private concerns (Marx, 1997b, 180-1). To Hegel, aim of the representation is related with the common interests and the citizenship. However, private interests form the material of the representation and the spirit of this private interests form the spirit of the representatives (Marx, 1997b, 185).

Like Hegel, Marx accepts that the bourgeois-civil society is the sphere of particular and private interests. But he, unlike Hegel, does not deal with the identity (Marx, 1997b, 73, 76, 78,80, 100) ,and dichotomy (Marx, 1997b, 75, 107)between the state and civil society, but goes beyond this dilemma by

defining the political state as the political form (Marx, 1997b, 76) of the material state (Marx, 1997b, 50), that is, the bourgeois-civil society. Marx identifies consciousness with the particular interests within the civil society rather than with the individualisation and the particularisation of the state concept. Class differentiation within the civil society changes into a political differentiation (Marx, 1997b, 106).

For Marx, for a common interest to become the common interest, it must be the interest of the bourgeois-civil society. Hegel, on the other hand, defines the common interest as the interest of the execution, *etceteras*, before civil society begins to materialise it. Only an actually existing general interest becomes a formal general interest (Marx, 1997b, 91-2). In this way, the legislative power has not any function for the popular participation and the popular definition of the common interest. Such a formal position of the legislation, for Marx, is put forward in order to create an affirmation and the legitimisation of the fact that “assemblies constitute the interest of the state, the state that of the people and the people that of the state” (Marx, 1997b, 96-7). In fact, the assemblies mean a contradiction between the state and the civil society that is located within the state (Marx, 1997b, 100) and the constitution of the state is not but a compromise between the state and non-political state (Marx, 1997b, 86).

Private sphere elevates into the political sphere. Class difference becomes political difference. From this transition, Hegel derives an identity between the bourgeois civil life and political life. This identity is also seen in the identity between the classes of the bourgeois-civil society and the political assemblies. But, Marx observes that this identity is valid in the middle ages where the civil society was the political society. But, Hegel starts from the dichotomy which Marx sees as a fact in the time (Marx, 1997b, 107). In the middle ages, the assemblies were the state of the classes and the political state represented only the nation (Marx, 1997b, 107-8). The legislative acts of the classes of the civil society did not imply any transition from the private

sphere to the political activity. The fact that Hegel first accepts and secondly tries to eliminate the dichotomy is caused by his attempt to demonstrate the state supreme and the universal against the particularity and the materiality of the civil society and by the fact that he does not want any confrontation between them. However, says Marx, Hegel forgets that the relationship between them is a reflection and does nothing without recognising the division (Marx, 1997b, 109).

Marx appreciated Hegel for his observation of the contradiction between the civil society and the state but states that Hegel's solution is a mystification that shows the illusion as the thing itself. On the other hand, the thinkers whom Hegel criticised as atomistic or individualistic are right, for Marx, since they see the results of the contemporary society in which legislation as a political element expresses the division between the state and the civil society (Marx, 1997b, 110). This division demonstrates itself at the singular individual level in a way that citizen as a member of the state is divided from the bourgeois who is the member of the bourgeois civil society (Marx, 1997b, 112). For Hegel, citizen must reject his class position if he would elevate to the level of the political significance and activity; in other words, his own class stands between the individual and the state. But, here Hegel confused the state with the political state, says Marx (Marx, 1997b, 114). But this implies not a sequential elevation, but a material transformation from the private to the universal (Marx, 1997b, 115).

Marx explains the genealogy of the social classes (*soziale Stände*, social Estates) in their differentiation from the political classes (*politische Stände*, political Estates). This transition occurs in the absolute monarchies and would be completed by the French Revolution. By this, class differences within society lose their political significance and are reduced into only mere social differences. Hence, the division between political life and the bourgeois-civil society is completed. The state in its middle age meaning changes into a bureaucracy that is only place where the state and the civil

society are directly identical. Against this state, the civil society, sphere of the private, stands. Class differences no longer imply autonomous communities. The only existing difference becomes a formal and superficial difference between the city and the country (Marx, 1997b, 117). The only determining factor of the classes becomes “the *absence of the property* and the *immediate* labour, concrete labour *class*” which is not a class of the bourgeois-civil society but a ground upon which the groups of the bourgeois-civil society is founded. In a narrow sense, the only class is the class composed of the members of the executive power. The community no longer governs the individual, but class membership becomes a contingent fact, and also, class itself obtains a character, which is not determined by the individual. It is not any longer an objective community that is organised legally. It loses any tie with substantial activity and the real condition of the individual. Professions no longer form a class but are dispersed into many classes. Just as the civil society is divided from the political society, it also in itself divides the social position and the class (profession). The principle of this society is the “*utility* or the capability of the utility” (Marx, 1997b, 118).

For Marx, the man is a human being only in the political sphere since all his other particularities in the bourgeois-civil society seem as in “in-essential”, “external determinates”. Only in his political life, the member of the civil society recognizes himself as “human being” (Marx, 1997b, 118-9). Why such determinates is presented by Marx as “in-essential” or “external”? He says that even though such qualities are meaningful and necessary for the member of the civil society in terms of his existence within the whole and ties to the whole, they can be rejected by the individual. “The present bourgeois-civil society implies the extremely developed principle of *individualism*, an individual existence as the ultimate aim and on the other hand an activity, labour and the content, etceteras, as the *mere means*” (Marx, 1997b, 119). Nevertheless, class-assemblies, when they are not the ruins of the Middle Ages, celebrate the class divisions by making them a social division; in other

words, “*actual man* is the private man of the present organisation of the state” (Marx, 1997b, 119).

In Hegel, class differences have not any political significance although the assemblies reproduce and consolidate such differences in the meaning given to them by the political element. In other words, the class division does not attain its political significance by itself but thorough political sphere. By doing so, Hegel tries to demonstrate the identical relationship between the civil society and the state, which was valid for the middle ages. The legislation is located as a middle term (*mixtum compositum*), or mediator between the Crown (empirical universality) and the bourgeois-civil society (empirical individuality). The middle term as put forward by Hegel, says Marx, refers to the hidden opposition between the universality and the individuality (Marx, 1997b, 123). The only real opposition seems to be only between the execution (the government) and the assemblies as two constitutive powers of the legislative power (Marx, 1997b, 125). Just as the government (the execution) is the mediation Jesus between the Crown and the bourgeois-civil society, the assemblies are the mediating priest between the bourgeois-civil society and the Crown (Marx, 1997b, 126). Here, Marx says that Hegel who inverses everything, sees the government as the representative of the King (Marx, 1997b, 127).

These conclusions, according to Marx, are similar to saying that philosophy includes the religion, *Christianity*. Rather the inverse is true; philosophy confronts religion (Marx, 1997b, 130-1). One of the extremes is more real than the other in Hegel. What he wants is that the state determines the bourgeois-civil society. However, in reality, the legislation is a power which is under pressure of the classes, the Corporation and other social categories. The characteristics of these classes determine everything; it means a power implemented by the private over the universal. The opposition within the assemblies stems from the opposition between the political state and the bourgeois-civil society; in other words, “*self-contradiction of the abstract*

political state" (Marx, 1997b, 133). The bourgeois-civil society begins to organise within the assemblies and to attain a political existence. The assemblies refer to its material transformation. In this sense, the assemblies are completely the political state which includes the Crown, the execution and the bourgeois-civil society. They are the "*bourgeois -civil society of the political state*" (Marx, 1997b, 131). Marx locates the real opposition into the assemblies that are the power which has to be formed by the bourgeois-civil society against the power of the Crown, the government (execution) (Marx, 1997b, 131).

Marx states that Hegel's main fault underlies his conception of the contradiction as a unity in the Idea. On the other hand, "the contradiction that is immanent in the legislation is not but the self-contradiction of the political state, hence the self-contradiction of the bourgeois-civil society". What is to be done is to understand the particular logic of the object in its particularity" (Marx, 1997b, 133).

While Hegel forms the assemblies on the ground of the class differences of the bourgeois-civil society, he does not want the particularities of these classes effect the assemblies (138). The guarantee of this is the naturally ethical class, the landed property (Marx, 1997b, 141). Marx observes that this means that a patriarchal class is injected into a non-patriarchal sphere, the political area (Marx, 1997b, 139). In addition, Hegel transfers the class division of the civil society into the assemblies. By doing so, he changes the citizen to the private man on the contrary to his general aim (Marx, 1997b, 140). The result is that the basic duality between the Crown and the assemblies are neutralised by a two-chambered system and that the assemblies lose their political significance (Marx, 1997b, 142).

In this argumentation, Marx refers to the French experience which he appreciates as the contemporary example of the state idea. Therein, the constitution of the aristocratic chamber has no link with the bourgeois-civil

society but defined by the King. The contemporary idea of the state is not but the abstraction of the civil society (Marx, 1997b, 166).

Introduction to the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: *The introduction* begins with the declaration as regards with German in the early 1840s that

the princes are in conflict with the monarch, the bureaucracy with the nobility, bourgeoisie with all of them, while the proletariat is already beginning its struggle with the bourgeoisie. The middle class hardly dares to conceive the idea of emancipation from its point of view before the development of social conditions, and the progress of political theory, show that this point of view is already antiquated, or at least disputable (EW, 57).

practical life is as little intellectual as intellectual life is practical, no class of civil society feels the need for, or the ability to achieve, a general emancipation, until it is forced to it by its *immediate* situation, by *material* necessity and by its *fetters themselves* (EW, 58).

But, even before its complete development, it seems that this is even not necessary; the proletariat is given a liberating function that implies simultaneous emancipation from both *modern* future of Germany and its pre-modern conditions. It is no longer a partial or political emancipation that is meaningful for Germany.

Germany will not be able to emancipate itself from the *Middle Ages* unless it emancipates itself at the same time from the *partial* victories over the Middle Ages. In Germany *no* type of enslavement can be abolished unless *all* enslavement is destroyed (EW, 59).

The *emancipation of Germany* will be an *emancipation of man*. *Philosophy* is the *head* of this emancipation and the *proletariat* is its *heart*. Philosophy can only be realized by the abolishing of the proletariat, and the proletariat can only be abolished by the realization of philosophy" (EW, 59).

The alliance between philosophy and the proletariat is formulated as an alliance of the material and intellectual weapons:

Just as philosophy finds its *material* weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its *intellectual* weapons in philosophy and once the lightning of thought has penetrated deeply into this virgin soil of the people, the *Germans* will emancipate themselves and become *men*" (EW, 59).

1844 Manuscripts: Philosophy and Political Economy: Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (EW) were written in the period between April and August 1844 just after *Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* had been completed in January of the same year. According to the titles, given by Marx himself and the ones by the editors in 1932, the book has three parts: the first divides into "wages of labour", "profit of capital", "rent of land" and "alienated labour"; the second into "the relationship of private property"; the last and the third part into "private property and labour", "private property and communism", "needs, production, and division of labour", "money" and finally "critique of Hegel's dialectic and general philosophy".

"Wages of labour": Marx's first study on political economy follows the arguments of the founders of this "science of wealth". From the very beginning, Marx does not separate discussion of wage from the worker, capital from the capitalist, and rent from the land owner: "Wages are determined by the bitter struggle between capitalist and worker. The necessary victory of the capitalist" (EW, 69). For Marx, numerical statements are the results of the living struggle of the living subjects. The more important thing is that he never deals with labour and labourers without capital or capitalists.

Marx's first aim is to expose the opposing, contradicting and antagonising characters of the labour-capital relation in the industrial production of wealth. In this relation, "the existence of the worker is reduced to the same conditions as the existence of any other commodity" (EW, 69). The interest of the workers oppose with that of the capitalists: "*The worker does not necessarily gain when the capitalist gains, but he necessarily loses with him*" (EW, 70).

Ever-disadvantaging position of the worker demonstrates itself in every kind of situation: “where worker and capitalist both suffer, the worker suffers in his existence while the capitalist suffers in the profit on his dead mammon” (EW, 71). A society of increasing wealth may seem the most advantage for them since demand for them increases when competition among capitalists rises. But, even in such a favourable situation, “the raising of wages leads to overwork among the workers”, and “they shorten their lives” (EW, 71). Furthermore, this kind of economic environment assumes the increasing division of labour and the previously accumulated capital, which is “accumulated labour”. The result is that “the worker becomes even more completely dependent upon labour, and upon a particular, extremely one-sided, mechanical kind of labour”. In the end, “the growth of the class of men who are entirely dependent upon work increases competition among the workers and lowers their price. In the factory system this situation of the workers reaches its climax” (EW, 72). This result is furthered by the increasing competition among capitalists. The capital concentration increases and “the large capitalists ruin the small ones, and some of the former capitalists sink into the working class which... suffers a further decline in wages and falls into still greater dependence upon the few great capitalists” (EW, 72-3). This result diminishes the competition among capitalists. This also raises the competition among workers (EW, 73).

It is clear that why Marx even at its very beginning follows *bipolar* class analysis. Population of the workers must increase while at the same time, a section of the capitalists falls into proletariat. As the capital accumulation increases, the numbers that are dependent upon work will also increase in a greater proportion.

In the most favourable economic conditions, “the inevitable result for the worker is overwork and premature death, reduction to a machine, enslavement to capital”. “Rising wages awake in the worker the same desire for enrichment as in the capitalist, but he can satisfy it by the sacrifice of his

body and spirit". In addition, the accumulation of capital and rising wages "increasingly alienate the product of labour from the worker". In addition, "the division of labour makes him increasingly one-sided and dependent, and introduces competition not only from other man but also from machines". "Since the worker has been reduced to a machine, the machine can compete with him. Finally, the accumulation increases both capital and the working population, and hence the products, overproduction emerges. Overproduction leads into either unemployment or the reduction of wages to the minimum (EW, 73).

The original principles of the political economist such as that

the *whole product* of labour belongs to the worker" (EW, 74);
everything is bought with labour (EW, 74-5),
labour is the only unchanging price of things (EW, 75),
the interest of the worker is never opposed to the interest of society (EW, 75),

contradict with "the theoretical and practical claims of the workers" (EW, 74) such as:

The worker receives only the smallest and absolutely indispensable part of the product; just so much as is necessary for him to exist as a worker" (EW, 74),
the worker, far from being able to buy everything must sell himself and his human qualities (EW, 75),
nothing is more fortuitous nor subject to greater fluctuations than the price of labour (EW, 75),
society is always and necessarily opposed to the interest of the worker" (EW, 75).

The conceptions of proletarian and labour in the political economy have an alienating character. It "treats the *proletarian*, i.e. one who lives, without capital or rent, simply from labour, and from one-sided, abstract labour, merely as a *worker*". It "does not deal with him in his free time, as a human being, but leaves this aspect to the criminal law, doctors, religion, statistical tables, politics and the work-house beadle" (EW, 76). "In political economy

labour appears only in the form of *acquisitive activity*” (EW, 77). It “conceives the worker only as a draught animal, as a beast whose needs are strictly limited to bodily needs” (EW, 79). The more productive definition, Marx takes from Wilhelm Schulz, is the concept of “relative poverty” that means that even when average incomes of all classes increase, income differentiation also increases because increase in the total production increases the needs, desires and wants. Whereas absolute poverty diminishes, relative poverty may grow. In a developing society, workers become more needy (EW, 78). Here, Marx closes the door to the piecemeal reforms and trade unionist socialism.

Profit of capital”: ““The basis of capital” is the basis of “private ownership of the products of other men’s labour”. Such an ownership occurs “through *positive law*”. Marx does not attribute to the private ownership any naturalism as in natural law school. It is a product of society and posited as law as positive law implies.

Marx, following Jean-Baptiste Say and Adam Smith defines Capital as such:

Capital is...the *power of command* over labour and its products. The capitalist possesses this power, not on account of his personal or human qualities, but as the *owner* of capital. His power is the *purchasing power* of his capital, which nothing can withstand.

Capital is stored-up labour” (EW, 85).

But, he at the beginning says that not only “the capitalists, by means of capital, exercises his power of command over labour”, but also “capital itself rules the capitalist” (EW, 85). Smith says, Marx quotes, “The consideration of his private profit is the sole motive which determines the owner of any capital” (EW, 89); “The plans and projects of the employers of stock regulate and direct all the most important operations of labour, and profit is the end proposed by all those plans and projects...To widen the market and to narrow the competition, is always the interest of the dealers...an order of

men whose interest is never exactly the same with that of public, who have generally an interest to deceive and even to oppress the public” (EW, 89-90).

This class opposes not only to the interest of society, but also to itself because of the competition among itself. “Accumulation, which means, under the rule of private property, *concentration* of capital in a few hands, is a necessary consequence when capitals are left free to follow their natural course”. Consequently, “a large capital accumulates more rapidly, in proportion to its size, than does a small capital, quite apart from any deliberate competition”. “With the increase of capitals, the profits of capitals diminish, as a result of competition. Thus, the first to suffer is the small capitalist” (EW, 91). Our small capitalist is obliged to either “cease to be capitalist” or to sell cheaper the things he produces expensively. “If...the large capitalist wants to squeeze out the smaller capitalist, he has the same advantage over him as the capitalist has over the worker” (EW, 93). In a competitive situation, large capital has advantages of money, stock, fixed capital, and etcetera. “If...large capital is opposed by small capitals with small profits, as happens under the assumed conditions of intense competition, it completely crushes them. The inevitable consequence of this competition is a general deterioration of goods, adulteration, shoddy production, universal contamination, as in found in large towns” (EW, 93-4). With the advance of industrial capital, “capital of a small capitalist does not suffice to provide him even with the necessary fixed capital” (EW, 95).

Marx’s emphasis on bipolar class formation is also supported with the observations of Schulz that combinations of the productive forces and the branches of production and common utilization of the savings in different production areas create common interest for capitalists. “Thus their interests also become many-sided, and the conflicts of interest between agriculture, industry and trade are moderated and fused”. Nonetheless, this opportunity for capitalists just leads into “the conflict between the owning and non-owning classes” (Marx quoted in Schulz, EW, 101-2).

“Rent of land”: Just as “Wages are determined by the bitter struggle between capitalist and worker (EW, 69), so that, Marx says,

“The rent of land is established by the struggle between tenant and landlord” (EW, 105),

and he goes to generalise this sort of mutual but unequal determination as such:

In all political economy we find that the hostile opposition of interests, struggle and warfare, are recognised as the basis of social organisation (EW, 105).

As Marx observed above in the case of exclusive interests of the capitalist at the expense of the society in general and of the worker in particular, he states that

the interest of the landowner is bitterly opposed to the interest of the tenant, and hence to a large section of society”(EW, 110).

Likewise,

the interest of the landowner is just as bitterly opposed to the interest of the agricultural labourers as is the interest of the manufacturer to that of his workers. It forces wages down to a minimum.

The landowner has a direct interest in depressing the wages of industrial workers, in the growth of competition between capitalists, in overproduction, in industrial misery (EW, 110).

It is clear to see that Marx here applies the trinity formula of the bourgeois political economy as regards with the inner division of surplus product, that is; profit, rent and interest excepting wages. “The interest of one landowner is not even identical with that of another” since “large landed property and small landed property stand in the same relation to each other as do large capital and small capital” (EW, 111). In the other example, Marx says:

The small landowner who works on his own account stands, therefore, in the same relation to the large landowner as does the artisan who possesses his own tools to the factory owner. The small estate has become merely a tool. For the small landowner rent of land disappears entirely (EW, 112).

The struggle first occurs among the qualities, and then terminates among the quantities.

We should note here that these definitions are all the “propositions of political economy itself”. The political economy uses a conflict theory for the conflicting interest in the production and the distribution of the wealth. It is seen that Hegel’s dialectical methodology extremely fits the propositions of the political economy.

Capital requirement for the land cultivation and the determination of the land prices in terms of the interest rates puts the landed property into the general market relations. Competition among the landowners leads into the accumulation of landed property:

the competition between landowners who do not lease their land to tenants increases. Some of the landowners are ruined and there is further accumulation of large landed property.

This competition has the further consequence that a large part of landed property falls into the hands of capitalists, who then become landed proprietors; while the smaller landowners, generally speaking, are already nothing but capitalists. Thus a part of large landed property becomes industrial property.

The final result is, therefore, the abolition of the distinction between capitalist and landowner, so that broadly speaking there remain only two classes in the population, the working class and the capitalist class...transformation of the land into a commodity is the final ruin of the old aristocracy and the complete triumph of the aristocracy of money (EW, 113).

Not only labour but also land together with labour has become commodity under “the aristocracy of money”. Hence, to Marx, aristocracy loses its class character in its old sense of the medieval orders. It must either be apart of

industrial property or a part of the agricultural tenant. Nonetheless, we can argue that what aristocracy loses is nothing but its independent and dominant position, not its class character. Another reservation is related with the small peasantry. It is already Marx who is aware of the fact that, following Schulz,

where legislation allows the continuous partition of land, as in France, the number of small, debt-ridden proprietors increases, and they are thrust into the class of the needy and unsatisfied by the continuous subdivision of land (EW, 95).

On the other hand,

Where legislation maintains large landed property, the surplus of a growing population crowds into the workshops; and it is, therefore, the field of industry where the greater part of the proletarians are massed, as in Great Britain (EW, 95).

But, we must note again that Marx himself had defined the “economic system” as “a society of private interests” (EW, 74) and identified “the aim of political economy” with that of “civil society” (EW, 76). In addition, at the beginning of the *Manuscripts*, he announced that:

I shall...publish my critique of law, morals, politics, etc. in a number of independent brochures; and finally I shall endeavour, in a separate work, to present the interconnected whole, to show the relationships between the parts, and to provide a critique of the speculative treatment of this material. That is why, in the present work, the relationships of political economy with the state, law, morals, civil life, etc. are touched upon only to the extent that political economy itself expressly deals with these subjects (EW, 63).

If so we cannot criticise Marx for that his economic analyses are limited to the classes of civil society and not extended directly to the levels of state and jurisprudence. In this sense, Marx’s class analysis here is confined to the civil society and political economy. Only economic life of the classes is concerned. Even the romantic sentiments of old aristocracy and its advocates, for example, is concerned only in the context of political economy: “Romanticism always confuses the infamy involved in this *disposal of land*

with the wholly reasonable and, within the system of private property, *necessary and desirable consequences of the disposal of landed property*" (EW, 113-4). The land that had been disposed in the old feudal system is now under the disposal of the landed property. It was already, Marx says, feudal landed property itself had been "alienated from men and now confronting them in the shape of a few great lords. In the past, also, "the ownership of the soil appears as an alien power ruling men" (EW, 114).

The rule of private property begins with the ownership of land, which is its basis (EW, 114).

Difference is that

Landed property assumes an individual character with its lord, has its own status, is knightly or baronial with him, has its privileges, its jurisdiction, its political rights, etc. It appears as the inorganic body of its lord.

The rule of landed property does not...appear as the direct rule of capital. Its dependents stand to it more in the relation in which they stand to their fatherland. It is a narrow kind of nationality.

Feudal landed property gives its name to its lord, as a kingdom gives its name to a king. His family history, the history of his house, etc., all this makes the landed property individual to him...Similarly, the workers on the estate are not in the condition of *day-labourers*, but are partly the property of the lord, as in the case of serfs, and partly stand to him in relations of respect, subordination and duty. His relation to them is therefore directly political and has even an *agreeable* side (EW, 114).

Finally, the lord does not try to extract the maximum profit from his estate. He rather consumes what is there, and tranquilly leaves the care of producing it to the serfs and tenant farmers. That is the *aristocratic* condition of landownership which reflects a romantic *glory* upon its lords (EW, 115).

But, "this appearance should be abolished",

the naked rule of the private property, of capital, dissociated from all political colouring; that the relation between property owner and

worker should be confined to the economic relationship of exploiter and exploited; that all personal relationships between the property owner and his property should cease...that in the place of the honourable marriage with the land there should be a marriage of interest, and the land as well as man himself be reduced to the level of an object of speculation”

It is inevitable that immovable monopoly should turn into mobile and restless monopoly-into competition...in this competition, landed property, in the form of capital, should manifest its domination over both the working class and the property owners themselves, who are being ruined or advanced by the laws governing the movement of capital.

So the medieval adage...is replaced with a new adage...which expresses the complete domination of living men by dead matter (EW, 115).

Marx states that “Private property ...is everywhere based upon division” (EW, 117), but the division

negates the *large-scale monopoly* of landed property, i.e. abolishes it, but only by *generalising* it. It does not abolish the basis of monopoly, private property: It attacks the existence, but not the real essence, of monopoly, and in consequence it falls victim to the laws of private property (EW, 116).

Division of land which results in “the division of the implementation of production and separation of labour” (EW, 116) leads to the competition-accumulation-monopolisation sequence. The only alternatives to the division of landed property is “to return to an even more hateful form of monopoly, or to negate and abolish the division”, in other words, “the abolition of private property in land altogether”. However, at this point, Marx while he was mentioning about the alternatives to the division of land, he points to the question of the “supersession of monopoly”. He says that

The first supersession of monopoly is always an extension and generalization of it.

The supersession of monopoly which has attained its widest and most inclusive existence is its complete destruction”.

We can say that Marx seems to favour, and to suggest the *association* as the “widest and most inclusive” supersession of the monopoly:

Association, applied to the land, has the advantage from an economic point of view of large-scale ownership, while at the same time it realizes the original tendency of the division of land, namely equality. Moreover, association restores the intimate relationships between man and the land in a rational way, instead of through serfdom, overlordship and a foolish mystique of property. The land ceases to be an object of sordid speculation, and through the freedom of work and enjoyment becomes once more man’s real personal property (EW, 116).

One great advantage of the division of landed property is that the property of the masses is destroyed in a different way from that of industry, and they are no longer willing to accept serfdom (EW, 116-7).

I think we should interpret the passages above in detail. First, For Marx, *association* is not a communal property but the best possible equalization of the divided property under the common control of the masses. The second, Marx differentiates the private property from “man’s real personal property”. The third, association is still in the sphere of ownership and just realizes the equalising tendency of the division of land. Association is the extended and generalised form of the monopoly over the land in favour of the producers. Finally, while the division of land makes the original producers a worker, “they are no longer willing to accept serfdom”, in industry, the fact that the small capitalists and artisans become workers does not mean that they reject their previous social positions.

The large estates, Marx says, propagates the economic advantages of the large landed property against the small landowners as if they both do not share the same trading spirit. He says that “even in their feudal form-not to speak of the modern English form in which the feudalism of landlords, and the trading and industry of tenant farmers, are combined” (EW, 117). In England,

large landed property has cast off its feudal character and has taken on an industrial character...It gives the owner the highest possible rent

and the tenant farmer the highest possible profit on his capital. Consequently the agricultural workers are soon reduced to the minimum level of subsistence, and the farmer class establishes the power of industry and capital within landed property (EW, 118).

The relationship of the farmer class which is the unity of the owners of land, and of capital invested on land to the agricultural workers reflects the same relationship of the industrial capitalist to the industrial worker.

On the other hand, the large landed property under the rule of industrial capital can maintain its feudal character and avoid the penetration of the “universal laws” of the commodity relations only “with the help of a monopoly against foreign countries” and “by force”. But the first resistance, as exemplified in England, is eliminated in away that industry “opposes foreign monopolies to that of large landed property and forces the latter into competition with foreign landed property” (EW, 117-8). But, “Once thrown into competition it must conform with the laws of competition like any other commodity which is subject to them” (EW, 118).

As for the coercive alternative, Marx says: “In the end, large landed property which has been kept in existence by force and has created alongside itself a formidable industry, leads more rapidly to crisis than does the division of landed property alongside which the power of industry remains in second place” (EW, 118).

Marx has explained that when the rule of the competition penetrates into the land and hence transforms the class relations in it, “the agricultural workers are ... reduced to the minimum level of subsistence” (EW, 118). But he is in a hurry to conclude that

“Alienated labour”: Just as Marx’s relation to Hegel starts from a critical attitude by following the terms and presuppositions of Hegel, so his relation to political economy follows a similar line. He says that

We have begun from the presuppositions of political economy. We have accepted its terminology and its laws. We presupposed private property; the separation of labour, capital and land, as also of wages, profit and land; the division of labour; competition; the concept of exchange value, etc. From political economy itself, in its own words, we have shown that the worker sinks to the level of a commodity, and to a most miserable commodity; that the misery of the worker increases with the power and volume of his production; that the necessary result of competition is the accumulation of capital in a few hands, and thus a restoration of monopoly in a more terrible form; and finally that the distinction between capitalist and landlord, and between agricultural labourer and industrial worker, must disappear, and the whole of society divide into the two classes of property *owners* and *propertyless* workers (EW, 120).

Some separations appear simultaneously with the disappearance of the many distinctions. Though capital is separated from land, profit from rent, the distinction between capitalist and landlord disappears. Dispersion of the labourers into land or industry loses their significance. A competitive stage necessarily results in a more monopolistic situation. Although the separation of labour, land and capital does not lead to a distinction between capitalist and landlord, the separation of labour, capital and land divides the whole of society into the two classes of property owners and propertyless workers. The emphasis is upon the property ownership, in other words, private property, the separation of the economic categories, competition-monopoly sequence and the social misery of the propertyless class. These are the own presuppositions of the political economy. What Marx adds is that political economy “conceives the *material* process of private property...as laws”, but, “It does not *comprehend* these laws; that is, it does not show how they arise out of the nature of private property”; “what should be explained is assumed” (EW, 120). The question of genesis and the reasons behind the development is ignored; “The only motive forces which political economy recognises are *avarice* and the war between the *avaricious*, *competition*” (EW, 121), but this is explained in terms of external and accidental conditions rather than “simply the expression of a necessary development” (EW, 120). The beginning of the explanation of this development must not start from “a legendary primordial condition” as in economics of the time. The explanation of the economist, for

Marx, follows the same line of the theology, which “explains the origin of evil by the fall of man”; in other words, which “asserts as a historical fact what it should explain”. We understand that Marx sees the explanation of the political economy as the other example of *inverted world consciousness*.

through alienated labour the worker creates the relation of another man, who does not work and is outside the work process, to this labour. The relation of the worker to work also produces the relation of the capitalist (or whatever one likes to call the lord of labour) to work. Private property is, therefore, the product, the necessary result, of alienated labour, of the external relation of the worker to nature and to himself.

Private property is thus derived from the analysis of the concept of *alienated labour*, that is, alienated man, alienated labour, alienated life, and estranged man (EW, 131).

But, although the notion of alienated labour is derived from the analysis of private property and its movements, Marx says, the true subject-predicate relation is from alienated labour to the private property, “just as the gods are *fundamentally* not the cause but the product of confusions of human reason. At a later stage, however, there is a reciprocal influence” (EW, 131). Here, there is no temporal sequence from alienated labour to the private property, but a relationship between cause and consequence. Marx extends his analysis to all societies that are based on private property over the means of life, rather than confining the analysis to the capitalist society. Nonetheless, the final stage reveals the secret by demonstrating the private property as the product and the means of the alienated labour:

Marx states that his analysis sheds lights over some “unresolved controversies”. Firstly, although “Political economy begins with labour as the real soul of production”, it “attributes nothing to labour and everything to private property”. He says that Proudhon favour labour as against private property. However, this contradiction is the self-contradiction of alienated labour. In addition, since the wages are the result of the alienated labour, increase in wages implies only “a *better remuneration of slaves*, and would

not restore, either to the worker or to the work, their human significance and worth". A demand for "the *equality of incomes*", (in Turkish translation, *the equality of wages*, E.G.) as Proudhon does, is to see the society "as an abstract capitalist" (EW, 132). It is difficult to understand why Marx rejects this idea of the equal wages. However, it can be said that; wage equality assumes the absence of the *real and practical* capitalists and capitalist competition and; capitalist in the face of wage equality can only be an abstract capitalist since only an abstraction of mind can fulfil this equality. Secondly,

From the relation of alienated labour to private property it also follows that the emancipation of society from private property, from servitude, takes the political form of the *emancipation of the workers* ; not in the sense that only the latter's emancipation is involved, but because this emancipation includes the emancipation of humanity as a whole. For all human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all types of (EW, 132) servitude are only modifications or consequences of this relation (EW, 133).

As mentioned above by Marx, alienation of worker summarises the alienation of man through the mediation of private property. Alienation is at the beginning the *necessary consequence* of the production process since it is first expressed as the alienation of object and the work to the worker. If the alienation is the necessary result of the alienating labour under the domination of capital, there can not be any emancipation from *within* the alienating conditions of the working process. This is first reason why Marx points to the political form of the emancipation. The other reason is that Marx had already demonstrated in *On the Jewish Question* that political emancipation was firstly a particular emancipation of a class in the civil society. But the interest of the workers is the interest of the humanity, and their emancipation is the emancipation of the humanity since "all human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all types of servitude are only modifications or consequences of this relation". The condition of the worker summarises the condition of the humanity. The alienation of the worker to his object and work as described by Marx so

encompasses all the social relations of man that it is logical that *all types of servitude* are seen only as *modification or consequence*. The concepts of alienated labour and private property similarly have the priority over the other categories of political economy.

Marx mentions how these two property owners (movable and immovable capitals) recognised each other and how each of them represented themselves. He says, “each side expresses the truth about the other” (EW, 141). These mutual claims will echo the claims of the political ideologies of the rival property owners and their political parties. For instance, the capitalist “sees the landowner as the idle, cruel and egoistic lord of yesterday” and “regards the landowner as the antithesis of free enterprise and of *free* capital which is independent of every natural limitation” (EW, 141).

On the other hand, the landowner likes a conservative who criticises his liberal opponent: The landowner.

Nonetheless, the development of labour results in industrial labour and capital everywhere. The agriculture only becomes a subject of industry together with the transformation of the slaves into free workers. And the landowner becomes “a lord of industry, a capitalist” (EW, 140). The distinctions between the forms of wealth, revenues, sectors are all historical not natural. They are the historical moments of the capital-labour relationship. As stated above, landed property at the end is articulated into the capital in *general* while slaves into the labour in *general*.

The *distinction* between capital and land, profit and ground rent, and the distinction of both from wages, *industry, agriculture, immovable and movable* private property, is a *historical* distinction, not one inscribed in the nature of things. It is a *fixed* stage in the formation and development of the antithesis between capital and labour (EW, 140).

Where industry opposed to landed property, “labour still appears to have a *social* meaning, still has the significance of *genuine* communal life, and has

not yet progressed to *neutrality* in relation to its content, to full self-sufficient being, i.e. to abstraction from all other existence and thus to *liberated capital*" (EW, 140). On the other hand, "*liberated capital*" and "*liberated industry*" is the developed form of labour and capital relation through which objects are produced as capital and this sort of production both objects and private property lose their social, political and natural characteristics (EW, 139).

The development of the capitalist order is the maturation of the private property, the replacement of previous self-interest and self-consciousness of the landowner with the capitalist's self-interest and self-consciousness.

From the *real* course of development...there follows the necessary victory of the capitalist, i.e. of developed private property, over undeveloped, immature private property, the landowner. In general, movement must triumph over immobility, overt self-conscious baseness over concealed, unconscious baseness, *avarice* over *self-indulgence*, the avowedly restless and able self-interest of *enlightenment* over the local, worldly-wise, simple, idle and fantastic *self-interest of superstition*, and *money* over the other forms of private property (EW, 143).

Landed property is the primitive, undeveloped form of capital which is not yet isolated from political and local prejudices. But, in its word-scale development "it must achieve its abstract, i.e. *pure* expression". For this reason, "The relations of private property are capital, labour and their interconnexions" (EW, 144). In other words, property relation occurs between property owners and propertyless class. The property relation between them is described by Marx in a dialectical relation: first, "*unmediated and mediated unity of the two*"; second, "*opposition between the two*", and "*opposition of each to itself*". In the first movement, there is an initial unity, but later they are separated and alienated. Here Marx seems to refer to a situation in which labour has its own capital as in the artisan production. Labour has not yet separated or alienated from his means of life. In the second situation, it seems to be described the industrial worker's relation to industrial capital: "the worker recognises the capitalist as his own non-existence and vice versa; each seeks to rob the

other of his existence". The third situation seems to imply both the internal divisions of the capital into profit, interest, and wage and the possible transformation of a class into its opposite. In addition, "Labour divides into labour itself and wages of labour". The general result is the "*Clash of reciprocal contradictions*" (EW, 144). Although Marx's manuscript about this subject ends here, we can conclude that Marx's *bipolar* class analysis can be justified in this way: 1) The development and domination of capital over labour and its articulation of landed property simplifies the class relations, in other words, the relations of private property (property relation of production). The factual development itself leads into class polarisation of the interest. 2) The political economy itself reveals the class polarisation and mutually exclusive interests of the labour and capital. In sum, both class polarisation and bipolar class conception is a theoretically understood practice before Marx. However, it is only an understanding, which has to be elevated in the forms of *concepts* such as the *concept* of private property, the *concept* of the alienated labour. The final conceptualisation is the subject of my later writings, the concept of *capital* or *capitalism*.

"Private property and labour": Marx does not suggest a theory for the sake of theory, but instead of searching a philosophical solution to a philosophical question, he follows and reveals the secrets of the theoretical consciousness of the industrial development, i.e. political economy, in its crystallised form. He stated that this is the "enlightened political economy which has discovered the *subjective* essence of wealth within the framework of private property" (EW, 147) and recognised man as the essence of private property by rejecting the idea of private property as "a *purely objective* being for man" (EW, 147). Marx, referring to Engels, says that Adam Smith is the Luther of political economy. The latter had rejected "*external* religiosity" while the former would reject the conception of wealth external to man (EW, 147). However, the idea of the incorporation of the private property into the essence of man has to explain both the fact of objectification and alienation and has to confront the position of landed property as "last individual and

natural form of private property” (EW, 148). In its later development political economy was to accept that “*labour is the sole essence of wealth*” by the Ricardo School (EW, 148). In sum, from the physiocratic doctrines to the Ricardo School, political economy makes the labour its principle and the essence of wealth; “in the scientific study of the *subjective* essence of private property”, “labour appears at first only as *agricultural labour* but later establishes itself as *labour in general*” (EW, 151). The labour in *general* refers to the stage of industrial capital in which “private property can consolidate its rule over man and become, in its most general form, a world-historical power” (EW, 151). The term *labour in general* can be understood in its comparison of the labour, which “still appears to have a *social* meaning, still has the significance of *genuine* communal life, and has not yet progressed to *neutrality* in relation to its content, to full self-sufficient being, i.e. to abstraction from all other existence and thus to *liberated capital*” (EW, 140). It is the labour that is abstracted from all political prejudices, local and particular context. It is the standard and universal measure of the wealth.

“Private property and communism”: Marx’s relation to German idealism started with critical attitude. His relation to British political economy has also a critical beginning. Likewise, his first approach to the ideas of communism and to the French socialism follows suit and is not the exception in terms of his critical mind.

When Marx makes these formulations, he does not need to be living in the *consumption society* of the twentieth century: “Every product is a bait”. “Every real or potential need is weakness”; “every want is an opportunity” (EW, 169) for the man against other; this is “Universal exploitation of human communal life” (EW, 169). This social situation occurs in such an alienation that “the refinement of needs and of the means to satisfy them produces as its counterpart a bestial savagery, a complete, primitive and abstract simplicity of needs” (EW, 169). Marx points to the living conditions of the worker: for them, “Light, air, and the simplest *animal* cleanliness cease to be human

needs" (EW, 170). "Total and *unnatural* neglect, putrefied nature, becomes the *element in which he lives*". Even the production means for the Roman slaves reappears for the English workers. Marx goes to say that: "It is not enough that man should lose his human needs; even animal needs disappear". "The Irish no longer have any need but that of *eating*", even eating the worst kind. The proletarian misery is widespread and not limited to some towns and to mature worker. Every industrial centre in France and England posses "a *little* Ireland". Thanks to the technical development of industry, child labour is put into the production, even "while the worker himself has become a child deprived of all care" (EW, 170). Marx observes the ironic fact that "Machinery is adapted to the weakness of the human being, in order to turn the weak human being into a machine" (EW, 170). Machines are not used for the man to become superhuman, but for him to become far more little man. This can be repeated for the computers of the late twentieth century, which turns man to a calculating and registering machine.

As for the production- seeking profit rather than need, Marx states that the crudeness of the needs are the source of greater profits in comparison to the refined needs. The cellar dwellings in London bring their landlords more than do the palaces". Industry speculates upon the refinement of the needs, but also upon the crudeness, and "the illusory satisfaction of needs". It creates "a civilisation *within* the crude barbarism of need" (EW, 174). Political economy establishes such a relation between labour and capital that it sees relation of the former with the latter as the question of "life-capital" for his reproduction of labour whereas the relation is seen on the part of capital only as "a factor in the activity of his capital". It also sees this unity or relation as "the unity of capitalist and worker". The factors of labour and capital in the form of labourer and capitalist are explained because of "external circumstances". Marx sees in this externality perception of the facts an example of *fetishism*, which does not conceives "man's own labour" in the production process (EW, 175).

Now, we can follow Marx's manuscript in the context of alienation of man's means of life. Money as a means of life becomes "an *end in itself*" and as other means, "gives me being and possession of the alien objective being". This alienation is exemplified in relation man's living place. Marx says that even the "savage in his cave...does not feel himself a stranger; on the contrary he feels as much at home as a *fish* in water". But "the cellar dwelling of the poor man is a hostile dwelling". "He cannot regard it as his home, as a place where he might at last say, 'here I am at home' ". Human dwelling exists in "the heaven of wealth". Alienation is observable in the facts that the means of life and the desires are the possession of "*someone else*" and that "everything is something different from itself (EW, 177) that "my activity is *something else*" and for both worker and capitalist, "*an inhuman power* rules over everything" (EW, 177-8).

The last form of alienated labour Marx mentions is the *division of labour*, which is "the economic expression of the *social character of labour* within alienation", "the *alienated* establishment of human activity as a *real species-activity* or the *activity of man as a species-being*" (EW, 181). In other words, the division of labour is the alienated form of the socialisation of economic activity. Marx quotes in Smith, who says: in the advanced societies, "Every man...lives by exchanging, or becomes in some measure a merchant, and the society itself grows to be what is properly a commercial society"; also in Destutt de Tracy, who says: "Society is a series of reciprocal exchanges; commerce contains the whole essence of society" (EW, 183). It is already for the economist, that society is "*civil* society, in which each individual is a totality of needs and only exists for another person, as the other exists for him, in so far as each becomes a means for the other". It is the economist himself, Marx says, who "reduces everything to man, i.e. to the individual, whom he deprives of all characteristics in order to classify him as a capitalist or worker" (EW, 181). A man's relation to his fellow man is described well in the conception of civil society of political economy, and bipolar class conception is a direct result of its conception of individual in civil society. For

this reason, no body can criticise Marx on the ground that, he simplify society into two polar camps and that he overemphasised the economic situation of man, or the classification of men into capitalists and workers. It is not surprising that Marx locates his economic classification to the phenomena of the division of labour. It is the divided labour, divided activity, hence alienated labour activity in the society.

Accumulation of capital (rising capitalists) and labour's division within itself goes hand by hand (EW, 183). This supports Marx's previous observations in that labour produces not only capital (hence power of capital's owner), but also its own weakness in the face of capital (and capital owners). Marx's analysis of capital is always the analyses of the reciprocal power relations of the classes. The question of capital and accumulation is the question of alien power of worker whom he himself creates. But, this is such an alien power that he may want to re-appropriate for himself.

Marx gives a summary interpretation of Adam Smith in away that "The motive of those who engage in exchange is not humanity but *egoism*" (EW, 185). It is accepted that in the advanced conditions, "every man is a *merchant* and society is a *commercial association*". He also refers to Skarbek, who distinguishes man's individual power and power created by society that is exchange and division of labour. But, exchange (a power derived from society) is determined by the private property. Thus, this is to say objectively what Smith, Say and Ricardo says: exchange is based on egoism and self-interest (EW, 186).

"Money": *Money* as an alienated form of social power is always productive subject matter for Marx throughout his whole of life. As an expression and medium of alienation, it has a role such as that religion has in the criticism of capitalist social relations. In this sense, it is not surprising that while Marx begins to go away from the criticism of religion, he becomes more interested in the production, exchange and realisation of wealth and power in the

context of political economy. Complete results of the analyses of the production-exchange and realisation of wealth will be presented in his *Magnus Opus*, *Capital*. Here, evolution of his analyses to the commodity relations in *Capital* is being developed in the context of private property-alienated labour and money. Money, like religion, becomes an alienated power, and expresses an inverted consciousness. It changes everything into its opposite. It becomes a real power and turns into “an *end in itself*” (EW, 177).

The German-French Yearbooks: For Marx, “all revolts without exception break out in the wretched isolation of man from his common essence” (SW, 133-7). This essence covers whole life for the workers while for the bourgeoisie it implies mainly a political one. The standpoint of the latter is the state, and their isolations are the isolation from “the top position in the state”. However, “the common essence from which the worker is isolated is a common essence of quite a different reality and compass from the political collectivity. This collectivity from which his own work separates him is life itself, physical and intellectual life, human morality, human activity, human enjoyment, human essence”, which are the true collectivity of man. This isolation is more universal, more unbearable and more contradictory in relation to a political collectivity. Abolition of this isolation is more comprehensive than that of the political one just as the man is more than being a citizen.

2.2 Classes of modern society, trinity of land labour capital. Development of inner contradictions of capital

Marxists of Turkey did not need to study on the categories of bourgeois political economy. For example, they did not have to debate the concept of commodity, the trinity of land labour and capital, sources of profit, ground-rent, etc. The problem of over-production crises, the fall in the rate of profit seemed to be superfluous or unnecessary problems in a country that had a

semi-dependent agricultural economy under the domination of imperialist-comprador-feudal alliance. However, some circles observed that Turkey faced with some main characteristics of capitalist mode of production in the eve of 12 March 1971 military warning. They are above all “over-production crises”, which was accompanied by “over-production of capital” and hence “devalorisation” (for example, see a Marxist economists and planner, Yalçın Küçük, 1985, 334-40). To this criteria of “development” in the economic “sphere, we can add “the rising fascist threat after 1962. These imply that our Marxists theoreticians should not have forgotten the problems of capitalist society for their analyses besides their overwhelming interest in dependency, democracy and peasantry. Below, I must follow Marx many times without accompaniment of Turkish theoreticians because I will concern with the problems that usually did not supply problem for them. This is because these problems might be thought as irrelevant for Turkey of late 1960 and early 1970.

2.2.1 An Introduction to *Capital*

Volume 1 of Capital was published in 1867 and was a product of ten years study of Marx. Its sub-title “*A Critique of Political Economy*” demonstrates that Marx is not a political economist but a critic of it. The method of criticism of *Capital* is completely dialectical, which is epistemology (logic) and method borrowed from Hegel and had been modified and developed by Marx for the analyses of social, economic and political processes of capitalist society since the beginning of 1840s. From the outset, we can argue that one of the most important characters of *Capital* is its dialectical method, in the search of the contradictory development of the capitalist forces and relations of production, in other words, what Marx calls, the capitalist mode of production. Here the term *mode of production* seems to refer exclusively to the base of capitalist society, or the productive base of it. But it does not matter if we do not understand from it only the mechanical and technical aspects of production, or only the physical conditions of production. Marx throughout the

Capital does not deal with capital existing without capitalists, or capitalist class. Likewise, he does not concern the producer, whatever it is named, which is not or not being wage-labourer. What Marx means by production is the production of capital. And what he means by producer is the wage-labourer. The word “producer” can also be attributed to the capitalist, but only in the sense that he uses his capital for production. The owners of capital produced by wage-labourers are the capitalists. So it is rather easy to see that Marx’s mode of production is also a mode of relations of production between the producers and the owners of the product (surplus value – value form of the objectified surplus labour in the surplus product - to be realised and capitalised at the market). The mode of production and its corresponding mode of relations of production, at the very beginning of the production process, carry the character of the relation between the immediate producers and immediate owners or appropriators of the products. This immediate relation is the basic **class** relation (capital-relation as called by Marx) under the capitalist mode of production. It immediately emerges because it is a product of the immediate process of production. But, life does not only consist of the immediate production since men do not ceaselessly produce at all and since not every body in society is either producer or appropriator of the immediate product

The basic **class** relation is the *analytical* and *actually real axis* and simply assumes that every individual of the society belongs either to the camps of producers, workers of capital or to the command centre of the owners of the products, of capital in general. The situation is evidentially not so, since; first: producers are not all immediate producers or fully employed. The latter is not a usual phenomenon mainly because of the ever-existence of the industrial reserve army; second, capitalists are not all immediate appropriators of the products. We have not only a labour *divided* but also capital *divided* in contend and in form. If analytically said, once the capital (surplus value) is *immediately* produced and appropriated by the capitalist, it is shared among the different hands of capital that holds different forms of capital.

Nonetheless, exclusive, bi-sided distribution of the products of the immediate production process between the producer and the capitalist is assumed by Marx for the analytical purpose. Capital or the capitalist is assumed in its “general form” that appropriates all surplus-value that emerges at the end of the immediate production. *Capital 1* analyses only productive labour and productive capital.

Different hands or forms of capital, many of which stands outside the immediate production process are labelled by Marx as the ruling **class** of the capitalist society, encompassing the appropriators of profit, interest and ground-rent, in other words, the appropriators of the different parts of the surplus value that is previously extracted from the immediate producers, or to say, immediate productive labour.

If so, we have in *Capital* analytically formulated **class** relations into which empirical **class** relations dissolve. The immediate production of surplus value is based fundamentally on the relation between capitalist and worker. Once the surplus appropriated, it is shared with the others outside of the immediate production, in other words, in the market through which previously produced surplus value circulates in the different hands and places for the different purposes.

But the circulation of the surplus value presupposes the surplus value produced. For this presupposition to be met, value newly produced as such must realize itself and in a certain degree, must come back to the immediate production sphere to produce new capital, in other words, new surplus value. Production-circulation-realization spheres of capital must be a connected, continues and circular processes if we will have a capital-relation, or a capitalist mode of production at all. Marx labels different forms of capital in this process as the metamorphoses of capital.

If the process of the immediate production is both the *temporal and spatial centre* and sphere in which the basic **class** relation, or use Marx's concept, capital-relation emerges, the basic **class** relation is both *the analytical and empirical axis* around which secondary social relations held their locations. By saying these, we are still in the sphere of so-called sub-structural level of capitalist society. But, this kind of architectural metaphors that Marx rarely uses usually deceives the analytical mind and prevents a perfect dialectical inquiry. To say that, for instance, contradictions emerge within the base of the capitalist society and then reflect into the political, ideological, legal or aesthetical forms of the super-structure of capitalist society implies a *false deduction*, and correspondingly entails a *false reduction* in the reverse side. Here, it is typical that *derivation* is confused with *mediation*. A contradiction emerges and is transformed from one sphere to another through the mediation (or agency) of the third agent, or sphere. This is what Marx calls the *middle term*. Only thanks to the middle term, or mediating process, we can say that something is reflected into something else. For example, capitalist individuals merge into a capitalist **class** through the mediation of their political power, or the state. This does not mean that the state can be reduced to the capitalist individuals.

First draft version of Capital is written in 1857-8 and is published only in 1939 under the title *Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Grundrisse)*. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, which is later on located by Marx in a new and short form into Capital 1, is published in 1859.

Grundrisse is the *personal and preparatory* study, a sort of sketch for a more developed version of the critique of political economy. For this reason, it seems to be left unpublished by Marx. Despite this fact, like 1844 Manuscripts which were also not published by him, *Grundrisse* has been elevated to a status that Capital holds, by many Marxist writers of the twentieth century. This is a part of the usual attempts to *re-write* or *re-read* Marxian theory in the different directions. But we know that Marx does not

use all the materials and formulations that are existed in the manuscripts in his *published* studies. After he eliminates many points that are existed and adds many points that are not existed in his preparatory works, he publishes his works. The peculiar position of the *Grundrisse* as such is also valid, to a certain degree, for the 2nd, 3rd and 4th volumes of *Capital*, which are rearranged and published by Engels (1884, 1894) and Kautsky (1905).

Grundrisse covers the materials and subjects in terms of its chapter design made by its editors such as:

Preface: Preface. Production, Consumption, Distribution, Exchange (Circulation),

On money: Critique of the Proudhonion Theories of Crises, Commodity, Exchange-value, Money, Money and Circulation of Money, Looking at Social Relations in the Level of Simple Exchange, two introductory texts

On capital: 1) Transition From Money to Capital: transformation of money into capital, relation between capital and labour, valorisation process of capital and surplus value, re-circulation of capital and limits to the production based on the capital, reproduction of capital, primitive accumulation of capital, pre-capitalist modes of production, 2) Circulation Process of Capital: circulation of capital, critiques on the theories of capital, constant and variable capital, productive capital-transformation of surplus value into profit, Profit, appendix: interest and profit.

It is seen that the subject matters of *Grundrisse* are used by Marx mainly in the preparation of *Capital* volume 1 and the rest in the manuscripts of the other volumes. Likewise, Marx states that *Capital* 1 forms the continuation of *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* and that the first chapter of *Capital* 1 summarizes the substance of this earlier work (preface to *Capital* 1; 89).

A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy has content as such:

FIRST BOOK: ON CAPITAL: First Part: Commodity (simple historical thoughts about the analysis of commodity), Second Part: Money or the simple exchange (theories on the money as the means of exchange) (theories on the means of circulation and money),

INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY; A- Introduction: 1-Production, Consumption, Distribution, Exchange (circulation), 1.1 Production, The Maintenance of the historical relations of production, Production and distribution in general, Property, 1.2 General relation between production and distribution, exchange, consumption, 1.2.1 production is also consumption, distribution and production, exchange and production, 1.3 the method of the political economy, 1.4 Production, means of production and relations of production. Relations of production and the relations of circulation; State and the forms of consciousness according to the conditions of production and circulation; juridical relations, Family relations.

It is seen that the general plan of *Capital* made in 1858, in terms of the issues held, seems to be unfolding the substantial schema of the *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* in which economics, politics, law and ideological analyses are tried to be put together in an initial form at the theoretical and historical levels. Indeed, the general plan of *Capital* within 6 volumes was as such:

1. Volume on *Capital*, a-Capital in general. Process of production of capital, Process of circulation of capital, Profit and interest; b-On competition, c-On credit, d-On joint-stock companies
2. Volume on *Landed property*
3. Volume on *Wage Labour*
4. Volume on *the State*
5. Volume on *international trade*
6. Volume on *the world market and the crises*

But, 1865-6 the general plan of Capital is changed into 4 volumes works and mainly based on the substance of the first volume plan in 1858 as such:

1. Volume: Process of production of capital,
2. Volume: Process of circulation of capital
3. Volume: Forms of the Process in its totality
4. Volume: History of the Theory

It is clear that Engels and Kautsky accepts the 1865-6 plan of the general project of Capital in their editions and publications of the Volume 2,3, and 4 of Capital although the last volume was titled the name *the Theories of Surplus Value*.

In comparison to the completed and published versions of Capital, subject matters in the volumes 4, 5, 6 of it in the 1858 general plan were not written by Marx. Studies on *the State, international trade, the world market and the crises* would be the main interest area of the twentieth century Marxism from Hilferding, Lenin, Luxemburg, to Mandel, from the members of the Dependency School, to the Regulation School, and to the recent attempts to build up a theory of the *historico-geographical* materialism.

Publication of the volume 1 of *Capital* dates 1867. But its manuscripts together with its other posthumously published volumes are written in turn: in 1861-3 *Theories of Surplus Value*, or to say Capital 4, some parts of the manuscripts also exist in Capital 1 and 3; in 1864-5 subjects concerned in Capital 3; in 1865-70 materials of Capital 2; in 1866-7 the final version of Capital 1

Here, it should not be neglected that Marx's 1858 general plan of the project of Capital in general follows completely a Hegelian schema of development. However, for Hegel as the development of spirit reaches a maturity and alienates from its contradictory nature at a higher level of its development, for Marx, the development means the development of contradictions by

spreading the contradictory potential over a wider area. As demonstrated in the first part of thesis, Hegel's *The Phenomenology of Mind* (1967) has three main sections: *consciousness*; *self-consciousness* and *free concrete mind*, which has within itself four divisions such as *reason*, *spirit*, *religion* and *absolute knowledge*. These sections and divisions in fact form the sequential moments of the knowledge or consciousness from *its primitive stage of the sense-certainty to the moment of absolute idea*. Hegel's philosophy is a comprehensive theory of the development of consciousness and reason. It presents the logic of development for the case of consciousness that it seems to be easily implemented to the logic of the development of the *things* and *relations* in nature and society. It is already that Hegel does not differentiate the two sphere of development. The development of idea is at the same time the development of things. Thus, it can be argued that any inversion of Hegel in terms of the relation between ideas and material base of life (as attempted by Left-Hegelians) means, at least a transformation of Hegel's language of development into the language of social life.

Hegel's *Science of Logic* (1976) is divided into two volumes: the first introduces the *objective knowledge*, which encompasses the doctrines of *being* and *essence*. The second explains the *subjective knowledge* or the *doctrine of the notion*. As in *The Phenomenology of Mind*, the book ends with the notion of the *Absolute idea*. The part related with *the Spirit* in *The Phenomenology of Mind* concerned the *objective spirit* or the *ethical order* in the context of family, ethical action, government, the discipline of culture and civilisation and the moral view of the world.

Likewise, *Volume 1 of Capital* begins with the analysis of commodity as the elementary form of the capital. This form emerges in the process of immediate production. It is contradictory in itself as represented in the unity of and division between its use-value and exchange value. Marx follows and analyses the dissolution of this *elementary* contradiction into higher levels by exposing the metamorphoses of capital: the *process of Capital*: an amount of

money (M) invested, for the conditions of production (P), of commodity (C) for the sake of more money (M). In other words, capital is invested, produced, circulated, realised and then re-invested. This process develops in a form of spiral. In the 1858 general plan of *Capital*, Volume 1 would deal with the processes of production and circulation of capital, profit and interest; competition, credit, joint-stock companies and would be integrated into the higher level of analyses of *the State*, *international trade* and finally the *world market* and *the crises* in the other sequential volumes

2.2.2 Capital

Marx states that things are external to men, and hence alienable. But, for this alienation to be reciprocal, men must treat each other as the private owners of the alienable objects. Such a reciprocal relation does not exist in the primitive communities, but in their boundaries in which they contact to other communities. Only through this contact, use-values for direct consumption and use-values for exchange becomes observable. Therefore, we can have distinguished use-values of the things from their exchange-values (Marx, 1990a, 182). Marx makes another striking observance that the nomadic people first developed money form since they had moveable and hence alienable possessions, and since their way of life made their contact with foreign communities possible. Their possessions and their way of life made possible the exchange of products. The “primitive material of money” was seen in the form of slave, but not the land or soil as in the case of the bourgeois society. In fact, the latter was a product of “the French bourgeois revolution” (Marx, 1990a, 183).

This sort of labour-power implies a relation which has *not* a “social basis common to all periods of human history. It is clearly the result of a past historical development, the product of many economic revolutions, of the extinction of a whole series of older formations of social production”. This definition shows that Marx limits his analyses with “the result of a past

historical development” which culminates in a new formation of “social production”. In addition, formation of labour-power that is free from other persons and free from the conditions of production requires a social basis which does not exist in all periods of history. Marx’s approach is *historical*, but not *trans-historical*. Furthermore, Marx had demonstrated above that the value relation and the concept of value was a recent phenomenon of the history. Marx does not ignore that “the economic categories... bear a historical imprint”. However, which part of history Marx is interested here is “one particular mode of production, the capitalist one” under which “all, or even the majority of products take the form of commodities”. For the products to be commodity, it is enough that they “cease to be produced as the immediate means of subsistence of the producer himself”. The commodity production can be found in “definite historical conditions”. Moreover, the commodity production and circulation “can still take place even though the great mass of the objects produced are intended for the immediate requirements of their producers, and not turned into commodities, so that the process of social production is as yet by no means dominated in its length and breadth by exchange-value”. Such a mode of production needs “a level of development of the division of labour within society such that the separation of use-value from exchange-value, a separation which first begins with barter, has already been completed”. But, this sort of development is seen in “many economic formations of society (*ökonomische Gesellschaftsformationen*), with the most diverse historical characteristics” But, here Marx is not interested in the history of commodity production, but commodity production under capitalism (Marx, 1990a, 273).

Commodity, Money and Capital; the Commodity: There are two factors for the determination of a commodity; its use-value and value (let us say for now, exchange-value). The former refers to the usefulness of the commodity, “the physical body” of the commodity. In the capitalist society, they are also “the bearers (*trager*) of...exchange value” (Marx, 1990a, 126). Every commodity has many values for its exchangeability, so they have many exchange

values. But, for exchange to occur between them there emerges a common element that is different from the use-values of the commodities (Marx, 1990a, 127). Here we meet the phenomenon as money in its different forms. In terms of this common element, and for the conditions of exchange of the commodities, commodities lose their contents, use values and differ among themselves only in their quantitative aspects of their exchange values. By this, all “sensuous characteristics are extinguished” in the commodity. But, “the useful character of the kinds of labour embodied in them also disappears; this in turn entails the disappearance of the different concrete forms of labour”. Then, we no longer distinguish the different kinds of the concrete labour, which “are all together reduced to the same kind of labour, human labour in the abstract”. In the commodities, we have only “quantities of homogeneous human labour”. Human labour accumulates in the commodity and forms their common characteristic. This labour is the “commodity value”, and hence the “social substance” of the commodities. Alienated from its use value, commodity retains its value. But this value must be necessarily the exchange value that is its own “necessary mode of expression, or form of experience” (Marx, 1990a, 128). Even for now, it is clearly seen that Marx begins to apply a labour theory of value to its analysis of the commodity. This theory assumes that all wealth of the society can be reduced to the social labour that is nothing but the collective and creative activity of the labourers.

Behind the value-relation that commodities enter in, the material content of the commodity, its use-value loses its peculiarity, and “becomes the form of appearance of its opposite, value” (Marx, 1990a, 148). In addition “the relative value-form of a commodity... express its value-existence as something wholly different from its substance and properties... this expression itself therefore indicates that it conceals a social relation”. Expression of the different commodities in terms of an equivalent form finds itself perfectly in the form of money. Marx says that bourgeois vision of the political economist attributes a mystical character to some equivalent forms

such as gold and silver (Marx, 1990a, 149). In the money form, the relation between the use-value and the exchange value, and hence “concrete labour” and “abstract human labour” is reversed, and “the question is stood on its head” (Marx, 1990a, 150). However, properties of the commodities do not stem from their relations to other commodities, but from their use-values, although they are “merely activated by such relations” (Marx, 1990a, 149).

Marx observes that to decipher the hieroglyph as such, history offers a maturity and a ground for scientific activity: “Reflection begins *post festum*”. The “money form” is the “finished form of the world of commodities...which “conceals the social character of private labour and the social relations between the individual workers, by making those relations appear as relations between material objects, instead of revealing them plainly” (Marx, 1990a, 168-9). In comparison to this historical maturity, medieval Europe, Marx observes, is a period in which “there is no need for labour and its products to assume a fantastic form different from their reality”, and in which “the social relations between individuals in the performance of their labour appear at all events as their personal relations, and are not disguised as social relations between things, between the products of labour”. There, “we find everyone dependent”. “Personal dependence characterises the social relations of material production” (Marx, 1990a, 170).

Whenever commodity production develops, it creates an effect to dissolve society. For this reason, traders exist only “in the interstices of the ancient world such as “the Jews in the pores of Polish society”. “Those ancient social organisms of production are much more simple and transparent than those of bourgeois society” (Marx, 1990a, 172). But in them, man is either immature as an individual, or there is a servitude (Marx, 1990a, 173). Therein, relation between both man and man and between man and nature is not developed because of the low level of development of the productive power of labour in terms of the reproduction of “material life”. This impotence is seen in their “worship of nature” and “tribal religions”.

In the commodity circulation, commodity and money confronts each other. The owners of the commodities meet as “the representatives of equivalents” (Marx, 1990a, 232). In the means of payment, purchase occurs before payment is done. The buyer is the “representative of future money”. “The seller becomes a creditor, the buyer becomes a debtor”. Money here fulfils the function of payment. The relation between creditor and debtor is “a money-relation” and here “the money-form” was “the only reflection of an antagonism which lay deeper, at the level of the economic conditions of existence”. “The **class** struggle in the ancient world, for instance, took the form mainly of a contest between debtors and creditors, and ended in Rome with the ruin of the plebeian debtors, who were replaced by slaves. In the Middle Ages the contest ended with the ruin of the feudal debtors, who lost their political power together with its economic basis” (Marx, 1990a, 233).

For Marx, pure monetary crises can occur only where “the ongoing chain of payments has been fully developed”. Their impact area is banking, finance and stock exchange (Marx, 1990a, note 50, 236). This demonstrates that in contrast to general understanding of bourgeoisie, that claims that money is purely imaginary, “only money is commodity” (Marx, 1990a, 236).

Hoarding changes its form as the “bourgeois society (*die bürgerliche Gesellschaft*) develops into “the form of the accumulation of a reserve fund of the means of payment” (Marx, 1990a, 240). In fact this is the expanding system of credit (Marx, 1990a, 238). “With the concentration of payments in one place, special institutions and methods of liquidation develop spontaneously” and “The greater the concentration of payments... the less is the mass of the means of payment in circulation” (Marx, 1990a, 235).

The Transformation of Money into Capital: the general Formula for Capital: (Surplus-value first considered) Marx says that “modern history of capital” starts in the sixteenth century, and the starting point of capital is the commodity circulation. At the beginning, capital in the form of money, in the

form of merchants' capital and usurers' capital confronted with landed property. Although this is the historical origin of capital, it repeats itself everyday since every new capital starts its process in the form of money. The difference between money as money and money as capital emerges in their stage in the circulation (Marx, 1990a, 247). M-C-M is the formula that implies that money is transformed into money only for more money. Hence, capital acquires a capital function. The result is the exchange of money for money (M-M). In addition, it is absurd to exchange of money for the same amount of money or "to exchange two equal sums of money" (Marx, 1990a, 248). If it will not be so, the money must be not only spent, but also should be advanced (Marx, 1990a, 249). Here, money does not circulate as a mere money, but money as capital. The final aim of this exchange is not a use-value, but an exchange value (Marx, 1990a, 250). In the process of M-C-M, there emerges a qualitative change, an increment. "This increment or excess over the original value I call 'surplus-value' ", says Marx (Marx, 1990a, 251). "As the conscious bearer (*Trager*) of this movement, the possessor of money becomes a capitalist", and the "objective content of the circulation" is "the valorisation process", which is at the same time the "subjective purpose" of the capitalist. More wealth is "the sole driving force behind his operations that he functions as a capitalist, i.e. as capital personified and endowed with consciousness and a will". His main aim is neither use-values nor profit appropriated once, but "unceasing movement of profit making" (Marx, 1990a, 254). Capitalist must throw his money into circulation continuously. In the process of M-C-M, capital (M) is money; capital (C) is commodities. Its original value is added a surplus value, so its valorisation is a self-valorisation. "It changes its own magnitude", and "valorises itself independently" (Marx, 1990a, 255).

In the process of circulation M-C-M, value acquires a quality of "self-moving substance" for which money and commodities become mere forms (we know that the substance of value is labour, or the labour is the substance which underlies the forms of value as money, or commodity). Here, value "enters

into a private relationship with itself”, instead of simply representing the relations of commodities”. It is at the beginning original value, at the end, surplus-value, “just as God the Father differentiates himself from himself as God the Son, although both are of the same age and form, in fact one single person”. Value becomes “value in process, money in process, and, as such, capital”. The positions of both merchants’ capital and industrial capital follow the process of M-C-M. In the former, you buy in order to sell dearer, in the latter; in addition, you change money into commodity and then reconvert commodity produced into money (Marx, 1990a, 256). In the case of “interest-bearing capital, we do not have any intermediate stage (C), M-M’ implies that money is worth more money. M-C-M’ is the general formula for capital (Marx, 1990a, 257).

Marx says that when we exchange equivalents, we have no surplus value, and when we do non-equivalents, we still have no surplus-value. “Circulation, or the exchange of commodities, creates no value” (Marx, 1990a, 266). We need, for this, many necessary conditions that are not existed in the simple circulation of commodities. In the merchants’ capital, the role of merchant in the process of M-C-M’ is parasitical. In the case of usurers’ capital (interest-bearing capital), M-C-M’ is not mediated, in other words, the process of M-M’ occurs without commodity (C). Both “merchants’ capital and interest-bearing capital are derivative forms” (Marx, 1990a, 267) in the sense that they play an independent and substantial role for the creation of value:

The money-owner, who is as yet only a capitalist in larval form, must buy his commodities at their value, sell them at their value, and yet at the end of the process withdraw more value from circulation than he threw into it at the beginning. His emergence as a butterfly must, and yet must not, take place in the sphere of circulation. These are the conditions of problem (Marx, 1990a, 269).

With his definition of the *contradiction in the general formula*, Marx has made an introduction to his sub-theories of exploitation, of accumulation of capital, and of crises under the general labour theory of value. The more important

thing is that he has already begun to demonstrate the main differences between capitalist production and socialist production. The former is identified with various and interconnected antagonistic relations that stems in its elementary form from the generalisation of the commodity production in the life-process of society.

The Sale and Purchase of Labour-Power: An increment of value in money that is used for capital does not take place in the money itself. It is here only means of payment and purchase and realises the price of the commodity. For an increment in its value to occur, a change in the value of commodity which is bought by money is required. In other words, this occurs in the consumption of a commodity, in “the actual use-value of the commodity”. “In order to extract value out of the consumption of a commodity”, money owner finds “within the sphere of circulation, on the market, a commodity whose use-value possesses the peculiar property of being a source of value, whose actual consumption is therefore itself an objectification (*Vergegenständlichung*) of labour, hence a creation of value. The possessor of money does find such a special commodity on the market: the capacity for labour (*Arbeitsvermögen*), in other words labour-power (*Arbeitskraft*)”. If value is the objectified, social character of labour, in other words, if the substance of value is labour, labour-power, or the capacity for labour is a *commodity*. “We mean by labour-power, or labour-capacity, the aggregate of those mental and physical capabilities existing in the physical form, the living personality, of a human being, capabilities which he sets in motion whenever he produces a use-value of any kind” (Marx, 1990a, 271). What is *actually* sold and bought are the capabilities of the living personality, i.e. labour-capacity. While labour is substance, labour-power is the capacity, the ability to contain, to receive and to mobilise this potent. The money-owners find on the market the abilities to be realised in the *labouring* of the child of production, new value, in other words, surplus-value. The money-owner as a potential capitalist who enters into the market of labourers is like a free man who looks free women for himself. However, here, these free women are not

necessarily women in sexual terms. Rather, they are the working population as a whole. (The division between labour process and *valorisation* process of capital, which Marx later on makes, is in fact, the division between the *labour process* and *labouring process* of capital).

As for the money, it requires a level of development of exchange (Marx, 1990a, 273) and a level of development of the commodity circulation. As a result, there emerge different forms of money such as means of payment, hoard, and world currency according to the level of social production. However, money as capital requires more than the circulation of money and commodities. It emerges only when the free workers that are available on the market, sell their own labour-powers to “the owners of the means of production and subsistence”. Marx observes, “this historical pre-condition comprises a world’s history”. The “capitalist epoch” is a new one in which “the labour-power, in the eyes of the worker himself, takes on the form of a commodity which is his property” and “it is only from this moment that “the commodity form of the products of labour becomes universal” (Marx, 1990a, 274, note 4).

The continuation of this sort of activity day by day requires sufficient means of subsistence for the maintenance of a working individual. Natural needs are influenced by the climatic and spatial peculiarities. On the other hand, necessary and sufficient requirements, both in quantity and in quality, are the “products of history, and therefore to large extent depend on the level of civilization attained by a country, in particular they depend on the conditions in which, the **class** of free workers has been formed”. The value of labour power, unlike that of other commodities, contains “a historical and moral element”. Nonetheless, in a given country of a certain period “the average amount of means of subsistence necessary for the worker is a known datum” (Marx, 1990a, 275).

It is traditional in the countries where capitalist mode of production prevails that labour-power is paid before it exercise itself through work. Marx says that “the worker advances the use-value of his labour to the capitalist” (Marx, 1990a, 278). A contract fixes the price of the labour-power although the price as such is realised later on, “like the rent of a house”. For the consumption of labour-power, the money owner pays the prices of the other necessary commodities such as raw materials. But the consumption of this peculiar commodity, labour-power, is the production process of commodities, and of surplus-value. This process occurs in the “hidden abode of production”, not in the market in which everything occurs in the surface and in “full view of everything” (Marx, 1990a, 279). The place of the “secret of profit-making” is this hidden resistance. The sphere of circulation, of exchange of commodities is “in fact a very Eden of the innate rights of man. It is the exclusive realm of Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham”. Contracts among free persons, who are “equal before the law”, means freedom. Exchange of equivalents means equality. That each person disposes of his own property means property. That each seeks his own advantage means Bentham. The base of the relation is “selfishness, the gain and the private interest of each”. The others do not matter. As a result, they all work for “common interest”. But when we leave this sphere of circulation, the money owner appears as a capitalist, and the owner of labour-power as the worker of the capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 280).

The Production of Absolute Surplus Value: Neither labour, nor labour-power is peculiar to capitalist mode of production. The former is a process between man and nature, the latter is the capacity for labour. If so, transformation of nature is related with the term labour process not exclusively with capitalist labour process (Lois Althusser incorrectly identifies economic level with this transformation of nature by men. Hence, he has reduced the economic level of capitalist mode of production into its labour process, the most technological, mechanical phase of production. Then it is logical to think that the transformation in the means of production leads into

other “secondary” relations and forms of society. So called “economism”, which Althusserian circles tries to surpass, emerges in more crude form in their theories).

The labour process, the working activity, changes the objects of labour via the instruments of labour. This change is conceived at the outset of the process. In the sense that “the object has been worked on”, “labour has been objectified” (this does not yet implies an alienation, but only “an alteration in the object of labour”, an objectification of labour”. That objectification is confused with alienation is seen in Lukacs’ *History and Class Consciousness*. The latter *may* follow the former in the form of alienation of worker from his products and the conditions of production. Even the petty commodity production does not necessarily leads into this sort of economic alienation. It is no need to say that socialist production also requires the objectification of labour. In sum, Marx has not yet mentioned the valorisation process that is articulated and integrated with the labour process of capitalist mode of production).

Marx calls the instruments and object of labour “means of production”, and the purpose of this production considered, the product, it is said that “the labour itself is productive labour”. The productive labour is not limited with the capitalist mode of production (Marx, 1990a, 287, and note 8). Use-value emerges at the end of labour process. But it is also the product of previous labour that is existed in the means of production. “Products are therefore not only results of labour, but also its essential conditions” (Marx, 1990a, 287).

Labour process is common to all forms of society (Marx, 1990a, 290). But, in the capitalist process of labour, we meet “two characteristic phenomena“: First, “the worker works under the control of the capitalist to whom his labour belongs” (Marx, 1990a, 291). Secondly, the product is the property of the capitalist”, rather than that of “its immediate producer”. Labour process becomes the process between things under the property of capitalist. “Thus

the product of this process belongs to him just as the wine which is the product of the process of fermentation going on in his cellar” (Marx, 1990a, 292).

Marx refers to and quotes from Cherbuliez’s book (*Richesse ou pauvreté*, 1841): “Products are appropriated before they are transformed into capital”; and “The proletarian, by selling his labour for a definite quantity of the means of subsistence..., renounces all claim to a share in the product”. The capitalists supply raw materials and the means of subsistence for the proletarian. The “law of appropriation” is opposed to its “fundamental principle” in that “every worker has an exclusive right to the ownership of what he produces”. If it is said that the labourer receives wages in return of his work, this means that “the capitalist is then the owner not of the capital only (i.e. the means of production, added by Marx) but of the labour also” (Marx, 1990a, 292, note 11). These arguments are based on an exploitation theory, which is not clear in the origin and the division between necessary labour, wages, and surplus labour, and hence surplus value appropriated by the owner of capital, the capitalist. The most serious fault is seen in this phrase: “The proletarian, by selling his labour for a definite quantity of the means of subsistence..., renounces all claim to a share in the product”. Is it renunciation, and otherwise, does the worker have a claim only to a share? Marx argues that all products belong to labour, not a share of it. Wages are indeed a share of the value of product of labour, which is not included in the surplus-value extracted from the labourer. But these are the question Marx will answer in the next pages of *Capital*.

The Valorization Process: The capitalist, as a manufacturer, “has two objectives: in the first place, he wants to produce a use-value which has exchange-value, i.e. an article destined to be sold, a commodity; and secondly he wants to produce a commodity greater in value than the sum of the values of the commodities used to produce it, namely the means of production and the labour-power”. The aim is “to produce not only a use-

value, but a commodity; not only use-value, but value; and not just value, but also surplus-value". Despite the fact that the products as such are "the basis of social progress, and our capitalist is decidedly in favour of progress, he does not manufacture" them "for their own sake". Use-value is not the sake of the capitalist. If so, the process of production must cover not only a labour process but also a "process of creating value (*Wertbildungsprozess*)". Just as the commodity is a unity of use-value and value, so the process of production must be a unity of labour process and valorisation process (Marx, 1990a, 293). (It should be noted that such a unity cannot be applied to socialist production in which, by definition, the sale of labour-power is limited, or, more or less absent and the products are not appropriated by the money-owners who buy labour-power on the open market. Society itself becomes the appropriator of surplus-value. But not every new value can be counted as surplus-value which is created outside the consciousness of the working population. If it is counted as surplus-value, this occurs for the investment purposes; i.e. for the formation of industrial structure of the society. Similarly, capital can be existed in the form of social capital or social fund, without having capitalists. Creating value not necessarily requires valorization, but only an increment in the existing value. The **law of value goes on to operate**, but not in the capitalist form).

The value of labour power and the value valorised by that labour-power are different quantities; "this difference" is "what the capitalist" has "in mind when he" is "purchasing the labour-power" (Marx, 1990a, 300). The decisive thing for the capitalist is "the specific use-value which this commodity possesses of being a source not only of value, but of more value than it has itself". What the seller of labour-power does is that he "realizes (*realisiert*) its exchange-value, alienates (*verausstert*) its use-value". He behaves like the other commodity owners. However, in the purchase of labour-power, the money-owner pays "the value of a day's labour-power", and hence has its use for a day. But, "the daily sustenance of labour-power costs only half a day's labour, while on the other hand the very same labour-power can remain

effective, can work, during a whole day, and consequently the value which its use during one day creates is double what the capitalist pays for that use; this circumstance is a piece of good luck for the buyer, but by no means an injustice towards the seller". Marx states, "Our capitalist foresaw this situation". "The worker therefore finds, in the workshop, the means of production necessary for working not just 6 but 12 hours". What we face here is an "extended labour-process" through which "money" is "transformed into capital" (Marx, 1990a, 301). This transformation does not take place in the process of circulation, on the market, but "entirely confined to the sphere of production". The circulation process is "an introduction to valorization process". The capitalist, who was buyer before, now goes to the market as a seller. He sells the product at its exact value. But he throws more value from the market than that he threw into it at the beginning. At the market, he turned his money into the materials and facts of labour process and incorporates living labour into them. What he has done here is the transformation of money (value of past labour) into capital which can realise its own valorization process. This transformation of money into capital, composed of two sequential processes (M-C-M' or M-C; C'-M'), "takes place through the mediation of circulation because it is conditioned by the purchase of labour-power in the market" (Marx, 1990a, 302).

It points to a time economy in which labour is set in motion for the purpose of new value in the framework of society, which is being governed by the law of value. The concepts of value, time and labour refer not only to quantitative but also qualitative determinations. Value is unity of use-value, and value that is expressed in price terms or exchange terms. Time is not only duration, but also can be divided into different parts of production process. Finally, labour can be expressed in terms of the socially necessary times. It can be useful, productive, and vice versa. On the other hand, spheres such as circulation or market, or workshop, mediums, or the middle terms of all sort of dialectical transformation, even the labourer himself are the spatial aspects of Marx's analysis. A change takes place and becomes a *transformation* of any kind

only through the mediation of something (thing), somewhere (a place, an environment, a location), and someone (a worker, a capitalist, an economist, etc.). The most important middle term is always the social relations themselves with, within and through which producers are transformed into labourers, money-owners into capitalists, labour process into valorization process, and freedom into appearance of compulsion, use-value into exchange-value, or the creators into creations. A transformation of any sort does not occur without finding out a medium, a sphere, a body, an institution or a place; conceptually speaking, a middle term.

The production of a use-value must be realised under the time constraints of society. The time spent for it must not exceed the socially necessary time. More time does not create more value. Secondly, the labour-power must be used under normal conditions. The provision of normal conditions of production is under the responsibility of capitalist. In addition, effectiveness of the worker must be in the normal degrees. The worker must possess the normal degree of skill and speed in terms of its employment sector. The capitalist, on the other hand, must prevent the idleness of the worker, and the wasteful consumption and use of the means of production (Marx, 1990a, 303).

The duration of the capitalist production process, which is the unity of the labour process and the valorisation process is divided into “necessary labour-time” and “surplus-labour time”. The “necessary part of the “working day”, necessary labour-time, is necessary for the worker because it does not depend on any social form of labour. However, it is necessary for capital because the continued existence of the worker is the basis of that world”. On the other hand, during the second part of the labour process, in which “labour is not necessary labour”, labour expends his labour-power and “creates no value for himself”, but surplus-value for the capitalist. Surplus-value is “the congealed quantity of surplus labour-time, as nothing but objectified surplus labour”. Marx states that the differences between the various economic

formations of society is related only with the form in which the surplus-labour is extracted from the immediate producer, be it slave or worker (Marx, 1990a, 325).

The rate of surplus-value is also formulated as surplus labour/ necessary labour, which are a statement in the “living”, or “fluid” form of labour. If so, the rate of surplus-value expresses “the degree of exploitation of labour-power by capital, or of the worker by the capitalist”. But, the rate of surplus value may be the same in different production processes although “the absolute magnitude of exploitation” is different (For example, $6/6$ equals $7/7$) (Marx, 1990a, 326, and note 7). Marx also takes attention to the difference between the rate of surplus-value and the rate of profit. The latter is the ratio of the surplus value to the total capital: It is s / C , or $s / c + v$. The rate of surplus-value reveals the phenomena that worker works a part of day for himself, the rest for the capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 327).

Before we go to the comprehensive analysis of the working day, which the largest section of the question of the absolute surplus-value, the last to mention is “the surplus-product”. It is the “portion of the product that represents the surplus-value”. The rate of the surplus-product is the ratio of the product produced under the surplus-time to the product produced under the necessary labour-time. The important thing is that the size of wealth must be determined not by the absolute quantity created, but by the relative amount of the surplus product (Marx, 1990a, 339). We can say that by this Marx identifies the wealth with the capability of surplus-value production, or with the increment in the rate of surplus-value. It is sure that it is a criterion for the wealth of the capitalist **class**, not for the society in general under capitalist mode of production.

The Working Day: The Sum of “the periods of time during which the worker respectively replaces the value of his labour –power and produces the surplus-value, constitutes the absolute extent of his labour-time, i.e. the

working day” (Marx, 1990a, 339). The working day, if we go on to have surplus value, cannot be reduced to the necessary labour time. This is the minimum that cannot be accepted under the capitalist mode of production. On the other hand, the maximum limit is “conditioned” both by the “physical limits to labour-power” and the “moral obstacles”. The worker necessarily must have a time for his social and intellectual needs, which are also “conditioned by the general level of civilisation”. “The length of the working day therefore fluctuates within the boundaries both physical and social” (Marx, 1990a, 341).

The length of the working day is necessarily is shorter than a natural day: Marx asks how much shorter? The capitalist is “only capital personified”. And, “His soul is the soul of capital. But, capital has one sole driving force, the drive to valorize itself, to create surplus-value, to make its constant part, the means of production, absorb the greatest possible amount of surplus labour”. Although capital has soul, it is “dead labour which, vampire-like, lives only by sucking living-labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks”. Marx transfers these body-soul metaphors to the language of economics: “The time during which the worker works is the time during which the capitalist consumes the labour-power he has bought from him. If the worker consumes his disposable time for himself, he robs the capitalist”. These all stated imply that the capitalist, capital personified, must suck the living labour and consume his labour-power as much as possible (Marx, 1990a, 342). Nonetheless, this sort of consumption of the labour-power by the capitalist can not be realised without trouble because of the workers’ resistance that is based on the consciousness in the way that workers conceive the connection between the working process and the reproduction process of their labour-power, and also the commodification of their labour-power. Marx makes an imaginary worker talk to the capitalist. He says that “The use of my daily labour-power...belongs to you. But by means of the price you pay for it every day, I must be able to reproduce it every day, thus allowing myself to sell it again”. In addition, the worker conceives the source of wealth that is

concentrated in the hands of the capitalist, that is the surplus-labour, surplus-product, or surplus-value in terms of the different forms and expressions of the exploited part of the total value produced. Marx' imaginary worker, working ten hours in a day, goes on to say that: "Using my labour and despoiling it are quite different things. If the average length of time an average worker can live (while doing a reasonable amount of work) is 30 years, the value of my labour-power, which pay me from day to day, is $1 / 365 * 30$ or $1 / 10,950$ instead of $1 / 3650$ of its total value... and you therefore rob me everyday of two-thirds of the value of my commodity...I demand a normal working day because, like every seller, I demand the value of my commodity" (Marx, 1990a, 343). Marx state that in the 1859-60 workers' strikes in England, similar demands are put forward by the strike committee (Marx, 1990a, 343, note 6).

According to the law of exchange, the capitalist buys a commodity and like all commodity owners, seeks to benefit it as much as possible. Nonetheless, the commodity he buys is a special commodity, labour-power of the worker, which creates new value. So, the cost of buying it is less than the value it creates. In the phase of exchange, buying and selling of the labour-power, what is done is to seem that the capitalist buys labour only for the necessary period of the production process. Nonetheless, Marx says that "the nature of commodity exchange itself imposes no limit to the working day, no limit to surplus-labour". The capitalist "tries to make the working day as long as possible". But, the peculiarity of the commodity he buys imposes a limit to its own consumption. In addition, the worker wishes to reduce the working day to a normal length. Being the parts of exchange, the one seller, the other buyer, the worker and the capitalist have rights, but against each other. We have an "antinomy" here, says Marx. "Between equal rights, force decides". By observing this solution of the antinomy, Marx remembers us what Thomas Hobbes says: *the might is right!* "Hence, in the history of capitalist production, the establishment of a norm for the working day presents itself as a struggle over the limits of that day, a struggle between collective capital, i.e. the **class**

of capitalists, and collective labour, i.e. the working class” (Marx, 1990a, 344).

It is seen from **above** that **Marx sees class as a collectivity in which individuality merges into a higher form of identity and becomes a part of the larger entity**. Transition from individual to collectivity or from collectivity to individuality follows the same sort of transition that occurs between the concrete labour and universal labour through the mediation or the operation of the law of value in the society. Formation of universal labour, human labour in abstract, is also the formation of the collective labour. Likewise, the formation of universal capital is based on the existence of human labour in abstract. Can a collectivity be counted a club, army or an organisation to which a man can enter only if he has certain qualities? It is yes because collectivity expresses itself in the form of collective action, collective organisation in the name of collective interest. It is no because **class** collectivity is defined on the ground of the absence or the existence of property of the living conditions. If we follow Hegelian-Marxian logic of development (without ignoring the difference between their forms of explanation), it is seen that a *universality* (the concept of capital, or the concept of labour) manifests itself in the *individuality* (the capitalist, or the worker) only through the mediation of *particularity* (capitalist **class**, or working class). In this case, **class** as a collectivity surpasses individual qualities, and dictates a collectivity as a common interest against other rival collectivises. (In his *the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, Marx stated that with the differentiation of the social **classes**- *soziale Stande*, social Estates- from the political **classes** - *politische Stande*, political Estates-, **class** differences within society lost their political significance and were reduced into only mere social differences. Consequently, the division between political life and the bourgeois-civil society was completed. **Class** differences no longer implied autonomous communities (Marx, 1997b, 117). The only determining factor of the **classes** became “the *absence of the property* and the *immediate* labour, concrete labour **class**” which was not a

class of the bourgeois-civil society but a ground upon which the groups of the bourgeois-civil society was founded. In a narrow sense, the only **class** was the **class** composed of the members of the executive power. The community no longer governed the individual, but **class** membership became a contingent fact, and also, **class** itself obtained a character which was not determined by the individual. It was not any longer an objective community that was organised legally. It lost any tie with the substantial activity and the real condition of the individual. Professions no longer constituted a **class** but were dispersed into many **classes** (Marx, 1997b, 118).

A struggle is presented here as an antagonist act of collective entities (it is funny to say that society is the sum of individuals. This is the total population of the society. The society, on the other hand, is at least a community, a system, or companionship. But in the development of Marxian theoretical background, it is the alienated form of generic or species- life of the human beings). It is not surprising that Marx uses the words “struggle”, “collectivity” and “**class**” at the same place. Here, it seems that **class** is identified with the collectivity that is formed around a collective interest, i.e. **class** interest. The worker as having only labour-power is the individual expression of its own collectivity, or collective entity of the sellers of the labour-power. The capitalist, likewise, is the individual expression, individualisation (personification) of the collective entity of the owners of capital.

Any struggle presupposes an awareness of the situation against which the struggle is directed and hence the parties of the act of struggle. As stated above, the capitalist tries to extend the working day. The solution to this is over-working of the workers, which is the result of the “appetite for surplus-labour”. Nonetheless, numerous Factory Acts (Marx will give the all examples from England in *Capital*) aims to limit the working day by the agency of the state, “but a state ruled by capitalist and landlord”. This regulation is a product of both “the daily more threatening advance of the working-**class** movement” and the requirements of capital (Marx, 1990a, 348).

The over-work is not necessitated by the aims of production in itself, but by the appetite for the surplus-labour. Even when the business is bad, “the less time spent in work, the more of that time has to be turned into surplus labour-time”. Marx mentions the reports of the factory inspectors, which observes this phenomenon (Marx, 1990a, 350-51). Over-working is the source of the surplus-labour, hence surplus-value. “Moments are the elements of profit” (Marx, 1990a, 352).

Although numerous factor acts are issued by the state to regulate and limits the working day and to control the conditions of working in the factories and manufactories, Marx portrays the miserable conditions of the working class in the branches of industry which are not legally regulated by the state. Accumulation of capital occurs in this stage by destroying the all mental and physical conditions of the workers in all ages and sexes (Marx, 1990a, 353-66).

Day-Work and Night-Work the Shift System: Constant capital is capital only when it absorbs surplus-labour. Otherwise, it is a waste of capital for the capitalist. For this very reason, production under capitalism, “drives, by its inherent nature, towards the appropriation of labour throughout the whole of the 24 hours in the day”. This is done with the alternation of the sets of workers (Marx, 1990a, 367).

The Capitalist Character of manufacture: A capitalist starts manufacture on the base of previously established division of labour. But when he increases the variable part of capital, he is also obliged to increase the constant capital as well. Marx observes that the minimum capital that is required for manufacture tend to increase (Marx, 1990a, 480). What capital creates is “the collective working mechanism”, which “a form of existence of capital”. Manufacturing “not only subjects the previously independent worker to the discipline and command of capital, but creates in addition a hierarchical structure amongst the workers themselves”. In contrast to simple

co-operation, manufacture completely revolutionises the individual labour and “seizes labour-power by its roots”. It not only distributes the specialised work into the individual workers, but also divides the individual and transforms him “into the automatic motor of a detail operation” (Marx, 1990a, 481). As it has been show above, capital is based on the previously established division of labour. However, “the division of labour brands the manufacturing worker as the property of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 482). Intellectual direction of work “expands in one direction” and “vanishes in many others. Intellectual potentialities of labour become an alien property and ruling power. Capital becomes “the unity and the will of the whole body of social labour”. This process starts with the simple co-operation, is developed in manufacture where the worker turns into “fragment of himself” and is completed in the phase of large scale industry. Faculties exercised by the independent peasant, handicraftsman or even the savage are turned into the ones that are needed for the working mechanism as a whole (Marx, 1990a, 482). Social productivity is increased by the decreasing power of the individual productivities. Marx recalls here a striking fact: “in the middle of the eighteenth century some manufacturers preferred to employ semi-idiots for certain operations which, though simple, were trade secrets” (Marx, 1990a, 483, quoted in J. D. Tuckett, note 46). In addition, Adam Ferguson is quoted: “Ignorance is the mother of industry as well as of superstition” (Marx, 1990a, 483, note 45). The more striking observation belongs to Adam Smith: “The understandings of the greater part of men are necessarily formed by their ordinary employments. The man whose whole life is spent in performing a few simple operations ... has no occasion to exert his understanding... he generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become”. And Marx goes on to quote in Smith who says that: “The uniformity of his stationary life naturally corrupts the courage of his mind ... It corrupts even the activity of his body and renders him incapable of exerting his strength...”. Specialised worker loses “his intellectual, social, and martial virtues. But in every improved and civilised society, this is the state into which the labouring poor, that is, the great body of the people, must

necessarily fall” (Marx, 1990a, 483, and note 47 page 483-84, *where Marx says that Smith saw the negative effects of the division of labour, and also at least in passing indicated it as “the source of social inequalities”. Marx also argues that he was the first to show that the manufacturing division of labour was specific form of capitalist mode of production in his the Poverty of Philosophy*).

The development of machinery-based production in the sub-braches of industry affects the whole sector in turn. Inserting the machinery into one sphere of production necessitates a similar transformation in other branches and leads into new inventions (Marx, 1990a, 504-05). Revolution in the industry and agriculture leads into necessary changes in the conditions of the production in general, in the transportation infrastructure. Just as the manufacturing period had found inadequate the infrastructure inherited from the old urban and rural economy and revolutionised it, so the large-scale industry became “fettters on the large-scale industry” in terms of its velocity, extent and its connection with the world market. New economy needed huge machines that are made up of iron, which could not be constructed by the manufacturing trades. Hence, large-scale industry had to construct machines by the aid of machines (Marx, 1990a, 505-06).

The Most Immediate Effects of Machine Production on the Worker: Machinery lessens the needs of muscular power, hence creates the possibility of using more women and children. It then penetrates into the family without making any distinction of age and sex (Marx, 1990a, 517). If the value of labour-power is determined not only by the reproduction cost of the individual labourer but by the reproduction cost of his family, machinery “spreads the value of the man’s labour-power over his whole family. It thus depreciates it”. In this sense, machinery raises the exploitation’s degree (Marx, 1990a, 518). Now the capitalist buys the every members of the family. “Machinery... revolutionises, and quite fundamentally, the agency through which the capital-relation is formally mediated, i.e. the contract between the

worker and the capitalist” (Marx, 1990a, 519). Now, our worker “sells wife and child. He has become a slave-dealer” (Marx, 1990a, 519). One of the results of the child labour is the high rates in the mortality of the children because of the mother’s work and the “estrangement between mother and child” (Marx, 1990a, 521).

The revolutionary Impact of Large-Scale Industry on Manufacture, Handicrafts and on the Division of Labour. The development of the factory system affects all other branches of industry. The principle of the factory production becomes the standard for the other spheres of production. It changes the composition of the collective labourer of the other production areas. The division of labour is extended to involve “cheap labour” of women, children of all ages and of all unskilled labourers. The affect as such is so penetrating that even the domestic industries follows the similar pattern that fits the factory production. So we have now a “modern domestic industry” which is completely different with the old domestic industry which involves the independent handicrafts and peasants and “above all, a dwelling-house for the worker and his family” (Marx, 1990a, 590-91). The outmoded domestic industry, says Marx, is now only “an external department of the factory, the manufacturing workshop, or the warehouse”. The factory concentrates not only concentrates the workers in the manufactures and the handicrafts and command them, but also dominates “the outworkers in the domestic industries, who live in the large towns as well as being scattered over the countryside”. Marx gives striking definitions to the theorists of the so-called new production paradigms under the label of the post-Fordist, or to say, flexible production that has emerged in the recent period of capitalism: “An example: the shirt factory of Messrs Tillie at Londonderry, which employs 1000 workers in the factory itself, and 9000 outworkers spread over the country districts”. It is sure that in manufacture that is controlled by the factory system shows “more shameless” exploitation of the cheap labour. This is more valid for the modern domestic industries as the direct results of the declining power of the dispersed workers and hence their declining power

of resistance, and of the competition of these industries with both the factories and the manufactures. In addition, “poverty robs the worker of the conditions most essential to his labour, of space, light and ventilation” together with the irregular employment (Marx, 1990a, 591).

Transition from modern manufacture and domestic industry to Large-Scale Industry, and revolutionary Impact of the factory acts over this transition: If the socially and legally observed problems produced by capital are seen as in the above bourgeois view, the Marxian answer could be giving by these definitions: “The cheapening of labour-power, by sheer abuse of the labour of women and children, by sheer robbery of every normal condition needed for working and living, and by the sheer brutality of over-work and night-work, finally comes up against certain insuperable natural obstacles”. There is nothing to be promised by capital except for the “natural obstacles” with which it confronts. Capital cannot maintain itself without changing its modes of exploitation. If natural limits no longer permit the cheapening of labour-power, along with its methods, the introduction of machinery and the transformation of the dispersed domestic industries and the manufactures necessarily come into the agenda (Marx, 1990a, 599). The surplus-production in the manufactures had been largely based on the minimum wages paid and the long working hours. “The basis of the old method, sheer brutality in the exploitation of the workers, accompanied by the more or less systematic division of labour, no longer sufficed for the extending markets and for the still more rapidly extending competition of the capitalists”. And in the case of textile industry, says Marx: “The hour of the machine had struck. The decisively revolutionary machine, the machine which attacks in an equal degree all the innumerable branches of this sphere of production, such as dressmaking, tailoring, shoemaking, sewing, hat-making and so on, is the sewing-machine” (Marx, 1990a, 601). An extension of the market and the corresponding extension of the competition among the capitalists put far more developed forms of production into the agenda of the capitalists as

soon as the old technical forms become inadequate for the *profit-seeking capitalists*.

Impacts of machinery over the workers are manifold. The children are removed from their families and put into the industry (*this expression is absent in English edition I am using, for the complete sentence, see 1974 Turkish edition in Odak Publications, Kapital 1-2 page 159*). Wages of the workers', who work with the machines increases according to the domestic workers, who are predominantly "the poorest of the poor". The handicraftsmen's situation is destroyed because of the competition of the machines. The machines were mainly used by the girls and young women who destroyed the monopoly of the male labourers over the heavy works and replace the old women and very young children in the light works. The fierce competition of the workers crushes the weakest manual labourers (Marx, 1990a, 601). As the machine process develops with the extension of the markets, all machines that are owned by the domestic workers begins to be concentrated within certain capitalists. The more cheap machines make the older ones depreciated and to be sold to the larger capitalists (Marx, 1990a, 603). The competition of the higher forms of technology, steam, with human body lead into a concentration of both the workers and the machines into large factories and the transformation of manufacture and handicrafts and the domestic work into the factory system. "This industrial revolution" is also artificially supported with the factory acts in the industries where women and children are employed. The relay system for the children and the restrictions for the child labour under certain age, along with the more normal working day, required more machines and the substitution of the steam for the body power (Marx, 1990a, 604). Capitalists compensated the loss of time by concentrating greater amount of the means of production and greater number of workers in one spot. The greater capital must be advanced in the production process. Restriction of the working day and the exclusion of little children from the manufactures and the domestic industries helped the development of the factory system at the expense of old forms of production.

The only advantage for the compatibility for these old forms would be only the unlimited exploitation of the cheap labour-power (Marx, 1990a, 605).

The development of the factory system, on the other hand, transfers the old spontaneously divided production knowledge and skills into the principles of “the modern science of technology”. The whole of the accumulated experience and knowledge are turned into “riddles, not only to outsiders but even to the initiated” (Marx, 1990a, 616). “The varied, apparently unconnected and petrified forms of the social production process were now dissolved into conscious and planned applications of natural science” (Marx, 1990a, 616-17). The technical base of the modern industry, says Marx, is “revolutionary, where all earlier modes of production were essentially conservative”. By means of its technical development, “it is continually transforming not only the technical basis of production but also the functions of the worker and the social combinations of the labour process, it thereby also revolutionizes the division of labour within society, and incessantly throws masses of capital and of workers from one branch of production to another. Thus large-scale industry, by its very nature, necessitates variation of labour, fluidity of functions, and mobility of the worker in all directions”. However, it also re-produces the old division of labour under the capitalist form (Marx, 1990a, 617). Apart from the technical development of the modern industry, life situation of the workers lose its “all fixity and all security”. The worker’s specialised functions and his means of subsistence are threatened. The technical development stands in contradiction with this negative side of the same development. Marx had shown above that the factory development required a large number of unskilled workers. But here, we are presented the term “the variation of labour” for the different kinds of labour, which must be a general law of production; “the disposable working population held in reserve, in misery, for the changing requirements of capitalist exploitation, must be replaced by the individual man who is absolutely available for the different kinds of labour required of him; the partially developed individual, who is merely the bearer of one specialised

social function, must be replaced by the totally developed individual, for whom the different social functions are different modes of activity he takes up in turn". For the large-scale industry, the variation of labour and the fitness of the labourer for different jobs and trades become the "question of life and death" (Marx, 1990a, 618). The large-scale industry not only one-sided, life-long jobs that require limited skills, but also brings with itself into the variation of labour by making flexible the labour force according to its changing dynamics. Marx observes that technical and agricultural schools are the results of the technical development of large-scale industry (Marx, 1990a, 618), but "there can be no doubt that, with the inevitable conquest of political power by the working **class**, technological education, both theoretical and practical, will take its proper place in the schools of the workers. There is also no doubt that those revolutionary ferments whose goal is the abolition of the old division of labour stand in diametrical contradiction with the capitalist form of production, and the economic situation of the workers which corresponds to that form. However, the development of the contradictions of a given historical form of production is the only historical way in which it can be dissolved and then reconstructed on a new basis" (Marx, 1990a, 619).

Engels defines in his editorial note to *Capital 1* that Robert Owen, in contrast to the ideas of his followers, saw the factory system as "the point of departure for the social revolution" (Marx, 1990a, 635, Note 46). In this sense, Marx follows the idea of Owen about the revolutionary potential of the factory system.

Large-Scale Industry and Agriculture: The impact of the machinery over agricultural worker has less injurious physical effect in comparison to its effects over the factory worker. But, the machinery in agriculture creates more redundant population and meets less workers' resistance. Its impacts over the population size may be various. The extension of the cultivated lands may either diminish the population size, or keep its size (Marx, 1990a,

636-37) On the other hand; large-scale industry has a more revolutionary effect than elsewhere in the agricultural areas.

However, while capitalist production destroys the metabolic interaction between man and the earth, “it compels its systematic restoration as a regulative law of social production, and in a form adequate to the full development of the human race”. Marx has not yet explained how this compulsion is determined. But, the clue may be seen in his explanation about the changing living conditions of the producers. He says that capitalist transformation in agriculture, as in manufacture, appears “as a martyrology for the producer; the instrument of labour appears as a means of enslaving, exploiting and impoverishing the worker; the social combination of labour processes appears as an organised suppression of his individual vitality, freedom and autonomy”. These “appearances” all can not yet been accepted as the compulsory reason for the “systematic restoration” as stated by Marx above. Moreover, in addition to the “intellectual life of the rural worker” that is destroyed by the capitalist transformation, the “dispersal of the rural workers over large areas breaks their power of resistance, while concentration increases that of the urban workers” (Marx, 1990a, 638). Nonetheless, as stated above, the most revolutionary impact of large-scale industry over rural areas is the fact that “it annihilates the bulwark of the old society, the ‘peasant’, and substitutes for him the wage-labourer”. In addition to this, it creates such conditions that “the need for social transformation, and the antagonism of the **classes**, reaches the same level in the countryside as it has attained in the towns”.

Capital accumulation always preserves the laws of exchange and the property rights related with commodity production. “However long a series of periodic reproductions and preceding accumulation the capital functioning today may have passed through, it always preserves its original virginity”. and since the relations of exchange and the commodity production, taken in isolation, are based on the relations of mutually independent persons, in

other wards, on the concrete individual persons, the capitalist **class** is nothing but the totality of the statistically concrete individual persons who occupy similarly same position within the process of capital accumulation, i.e. the production of social wealth, that begins with the totality of every single acts of the purchasing of labour-power by the capitalists in order to make production for additional capital: “As long as the laws of exchange are observed in every single act of exchange-taken in isolation- the mode of appropriation can be completely revolutionised without in any way affecting the property rights which correspond to commodity production” (Marx, 1990a, 733).

The accumulated wealth of the capitalist is not the non-consumed part of the surplus-value appropriated by him. Marx says that when Owenism in Britain and the Saint-Simonism and Fourierism in the Continent began to spread after the July revolution (Marx, 1990a, 743-44), “The hour of vulgar economics had arrived” and the abstinence theory was proclaimed by Nassau W. Senior. He argued that the capital was the abstinence on the part of the capitalist and later on claimed that the profit of capital was “the unpaid ‘last hour of the twelve hours of labour’” (Marx, 1990a, 744). Moreover, “the conditions necessary for the labour process are ... converted into acts of abstinence on the part of the capitalist” (Marx, 1990a, 744). But, Marx replies that “In economic formations of society of the most diverse kinds”, there occurs “reproduction on an increasing scale” (Marx, 1990a, 745). Furthermore, this does not occur necessarily like the process of capital accumulation and not necessarily appear as the function of a capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 745-46).

In England from fifteenth century onwards, the transformation is demonstrated with the enclosure movement through which “arable land” was turned into “sheep-walks”, and “pasture” in order to supply the wool manufacture that begins to develop in Flanders. For the pastures, there was only need for a few herdsmen, instead of the arable lands on which many

people and families worked for cultivation. The transformation was so rapid that there was a “gulf between the fifteenth and the sixteenth century”. Marx states that Thornton says that “the English working **class** was precipitated without any transitional stages from its golden age to its iron age”. Marx says that observers of the change reveal that there occurred “the revolution in the relations of production” (Marx, 1990a, 879). In “The prelude to the revolution that laid the foundation of the capitalist mode of production”, between “the last third of the fifteenth century and the first decades of the sixteenth”, the mass of free proletarians flowed into the labour-market by “the dissolution of the bands of feudal retainers”. The royal power furthered the dissolution. The great landlords in their opposition to the king and Parliament, created the masses of proletarians by driving the peasants from the land (Marx, 1990a, 878). The nobility lost its power in the great feudal wars. “The new nobility was the child of its time, for which money was the power of all powers” (Marx, 1990a, 879).

Despite the dissolution of the old conditions of landed property, Marx observes that even at the end of the seventeenth century, “the yeomanry, the **class** of independent peasants” exceeded the numbers of “the **class** of farmers”. In the previous century, they had been the main supporters of the Cromwell’s strength. However, in the mid of eighteenth century, it had disappeared. And, at the end of the eighteenth century, the agricultural labourer lost its link with the common land (Marx, 1990a, 883). At this point Marx leaves on one side “the purely economic driving forces behind the agricultural revolution” and begins to “deal only with the violent means employed” (Marx, 1990a, 883).

Under the Stuart line, between 1603 and 1714, “the landed proprietors” realised the “act of usurpation” through “legal means” and also abolished the feudal rights over land. They compensated the loss of the state that was the result of this abolishment by charging the taxes on the peasantry and the rest of the people (Marx, 1990a, 883). In this way, they got “the rights of modern

private property in estates". At the end of the seventeenth century, the "glorious revolution' brought into power...the landed and capitalist profit-grubbers". Since it demonstrates how capital's primitive accumulation begins in the context of the public or state properties, we follow Marx:

They (the landed and capitalist profit-grubbers. E.G) inaugurated the new era by practising on a colossal scale the thefts of the state lands which had hitherto been managed more modestly. These estates were given away, sold at ridiculous prices, or even annexed to private estates by direct seizure. All this happened without the slightest observance of legal etiquette. The Crown lands thus fraudulently appropriated, together with the stolen Church estates, in so far as these were not lost again during the republican revolution, form the basis of the present princely domains of the English oligarchy. The bourgeois capitalists favoured the operation, with the intention, among other things, of converting the land into a merely commercial commodity, extending the area of large-scale agricultural production, and increasing the supply of free and rightless proletarians driven from their land. Apart from this, the new landed aristocracy was the natural ally of the new bankocracy, of newly hatched high finance, and of the large manufacturers, at that time dependent on protective duties. The English bourgeoisie acted quite as wisely in its own interest as the Swedish burghers, who did the opposite: hand in hand with the bulwark of their economic strength, the peasantry, they helped the kings in their forcible resumption of crown lands from the oligarchy, in the years after 1604 and later on under Charles X and Charles XI (Marx, 1990a, 884-85).

Marx seems to use the term "bourgeois capitalists" to differentiate the old lords who have become capitalists from the owners of capital, i.e. "bourgeois capitalists", who had never been "feudal" before. But, the latter becomes "the new landed aristocracy". In the transformation of the state and Crown lands, and feudal and Church estates into private property, which is commercial commodity, the new landed aristocracy, the new bankocracy and the large manufacturers establishes an alliance. The "glorious revolution" was the revolution of the new **class** interests of "the landed and capitalist profit-grubbers". The "forcible usurpation" of the communal property is realised between the fifteenth and sixteenth century. The novelty of the eighteenth century, says Marx, is the usage of the legal means for the thefts of people's land. The acts of Parliament provide the legal framework for the

transformation of communal lands into private property of the great landlords who have replaced the feudal lords. After the thefts of state domains, large farms began to be called “capital farms”, or “merchant farms”. In this process, the yeomanry became tenants and the great masses of the agricultural population were set free in the service of industry. Marx states that the eighteenth century, unlike the next century, did not recognise “the identity between the wealth of nation and the poverty of the people” (Marx, 1990a, 885-86). And in the nineteenth century, the relation of the agricultural labourer to communal property had blurred (Marx, 1990a, 889).

Meanwhile, Marx points to the attitudes of the bourgeois parties towards the rights of the proletariat. The liberal party seized the power with the support of the proletariat two years before the removal of the laws against the trade unions. However, it “allowed the English judges, ever ready to wag their tails for the ruling **classes**, exhume the earlier laws against ‘conspiracy’ and apply them to combinations of workers”. The similar betrayal of the bourgeoisie is also seen even in the first waves of the French revolution when the French bourgeoisie wanted to abolish the workers’ right for association that had been just acquired (Marx, 1990a, 903). In 14 June 1791, it was proclaimed that the combination of workers was “an assault on liberty and the declaration of the rights of man’ ” and subject to money fine and to the deprivation of the citizen rights for one year (Marx, 1990a, 903-04). This was the “state compulsion” in order to “confine the struggle between capital and labour within limits convenient for capital” and lived longer than the revolution itself. Marx states that “Nothing is more characteristic than the pretext for this bourgeois *coup d’état*”. We can deduce Marx’s usage of the term *coup d’état* that bourgeoisie applies the method of *coup d’état* against the revolutionary attempts of another **class** towards its own revolution.

The Production of Relative Surplus Value: the Concept of Relative Surplus-Value: We have seen that with the absolute surplus-value, capital tries to raise the absolute quantity of surplus product from the production

process. The means of this is to extend the working day as much as possible. However, the capitalist **class** meets the resistance of the working **class** that develops as the capital begins to dominate the social production. On the other hand, the search for an increase in the absolute surplus-value is based on the stable, relatively fixed level of labour productivity. The only solution for an increment in the surplus labour is to increase the surplus-labour, hence to increase the working day. However, once this sort of solution is seen at large to be limited to a historical stage of the development of the means of production, the search for “relative surplus-value begins to come into the agenda of capital. The only means of increasing surplus-value is nothing but to revolutionise the conditions of production in general, and the means of production (unity of the labour process and the valorisation process) in particular. Such a revolution in the general conditions of production in fact tries to reduce the necessary labour time in favour of a far more surplus-labour time. As a result, it directly reduced the variable capital by increasing the constant component of capital. Hence, such a search inevitably decrease the value of labour-power, hence value of the commodities. Consequently, capitalist needs higher capacity of production, and the ever-extending market.

Marx suggests that even when the method of labour is not modified, simultaneous labour of a large number of the workers revolutionise the objective labour process (Marx, 1990a, 441). The observation about the fact that the “simultaneous employment of a large number of workers” creates an extra labour power is one of the main arguments of Marx in order to demonstrate the contribution of workers themselves to the increasing productivity of labour. “When numerous workers work together side by side in accordance with a plan, whether in the same process, or in different but connected processes, this form of labour is called co-operation” (Marx, 1990a, 443). Co-operation not only increases the productivity of individual worker, but also creates a “new productive power, which is intrinsically a collective one” (Marx, 1990a, 443). An increase in productivity is caused by

the collectivity per se. As is seen here, Marx always follows a strategy in favour of the workers, and tries to show the workers' exclusive contribution to the creation of wealth.

I can suggest that the production of relative surplus value is a sign for the fact that capitalist development has just elevated itself to a higher level. This is because the possibility of acquiring absolute surplus-value is limited because of the existing time constraints of production and the limits put by the balance of power between the ruling and ruled classes.

Marx says that

While it is not our intention here to consider the way in which the immanent laws of capitalist production manifest themselves in the external movement of the individual capitals, asserts themselves as the coercive laws of competition, and therefore enter into the consciousness of the individual capitalist as the motives which drive him forward, this much is clear: a scientific analysis of competition is possible only if we can grasp the inner nature of capital, just as the apparent motions of the heavenly bodies are intelligible only to someone who is acquainted with their real motions, which are not perceptible to the senses (Marx, 1990a, 433).

The laws of capitalist production asserts themselves as the coercive laws of competition, and by this, enter into the consciousness of the individual capitalist as the driving motive. A scientific analysis of competition can be understood only we are informed about the internal logic of capital. Real motions are not open to the senses. But apparent motions can be intelligible only when the real motions can be revealed. It is seen that Marx says that a theoretical inquiry of the subject, being acquainted with the real motions, should be followed by the analysis of the apparent motions. It is sure that the former inquiry is a culmination of the past, which is now being put into the test of the present moment.

Now let us go to Marx's analysis of relative surplus-value, by looking at the individual capitalist. An individual capitalist who use an improved method of

production extracts not only an amount of surplus-value from the production, but also an extra surplus-value according to the other capitalist in the same business. By increasing the productivity of labour, he can sell his products above their individual values, and below their social values, since the value of commodities are determined by the value of the socially necessary labour time, as stated before. What the capitalist does is to have cheapened the values of commodities produced and the (yet relative) value of the labour-power he uses. But such an advantage will vanish as soon as his method of production begins to be generalised into the branch he is operating (Marx, 1990a, 436-37). It is already not the absolute value of a commodity that interests the capitalist, but the surplus-value presented in the commodity (Marx, 1990a, 437). We see that “there is a motive for each individual capitalist to cheapen his commodities by increasing the productivity of labour” (Marx, 1990a, 435).

As Marx states above, his intention is not the analyses of “the external movement of the individual capitals”, of manifestation of “the coercive laws of competition in “the consciousness of the individual capitalist”, but of the real motions (production) behind the apparent motions (competition). In other words, the interest is the objective development of the labour’s productivity under the capitalist mode of production. But “How far this result can also be attained without cheapening commodities” will be handled with through the examination of “the particular methods of producing surplus-value” (Marx, 1990a, 438): the methods are *co-operation*, the *division of labour*, *mechanisation* and *increasing the scale* of industry.

Co-operation: The difference between the handicraft trades of the guilds and the early stage of the manufacture, says Marx, can be hardly distinguished with the exception of quantitative difference. The latter enlarges the workshop and uses comparatively large number of workers simultaneously under the control of one individual capitalist. The scale is extended in order to increase the quantity of the products. Nonetheless, capitalist production

begins in this way, says Marx (Marx, 1990a, 439). However, a modification occurs in the way that a “collective working day” emerges and creates the day of the average social labour by eliminating the individual differences among labourers. In addition, during the modification that the manufacture creates, minimum efficiency of the labour and the hence the average rate of surplus-value is established (Marx, 1990a, 439-41). For the different rates of surplus-value and the different levels of the labour’s efficiency, “inequalities” are eliminated for “the society as a whole, but not for the individual masters”. In individual differences may be only either a source of loss or extra surplus-value. The law emerges as an external possibility, which is open to the aims of the individual capitalist. “The law of valorisation therefore comes fully into its own for the individual producer only when he produces as a capitalist and employs a number of workers simultaneously, i.e. when from the outset he sets in motion labour of a socially average character” (Marx, 1990a, 441).

Collective productive power that is caused by co-operation is exemplified by Marx, for instance, collective work of the twelve masons: they, “in their collective working day of 144 hours, make much more progress with the building than one mason could make working for 12 days, or 144 hours”. The reason behind this magical increase in the productivity of labour is, in fact, ensured by eliminating the temporal-spatial (physical constraints of the body) constraints of the isolated workers Marx says that “a body of men working together have hands and eyes both in front and behind, and can be said to be to a certain extent omnipresent. The various parts of the product come to fruition simultaneously” (Marx, 1990a, 445). What is done is a production of time and space for the production of far more commodity. Marx is rather aware of the idea of the production of time. He says, “A single person cannot carve a working day of more than say, 12 hours, out of the natural day, but 100 men co-operating can extend the working day to 1,200 hours” (Marx, 1990a, 445).

In comparison to the numbers of the isolated workers, co-operation needs the smaller number of workers. For this reason, when the numbers and time are decisive, co-operation is much more useful. Marx observes that because of the absence of the co-operation, for example, agricultural products are wasted in some areas of the United States and of India where “the old communities” were “destroyed” by “English rule” (Marx, 1990a, 446).

In order to put the workers as such into the production process, the capitalist must have the required money in advance for wages of the workers and the means of production, in other words, a variable and constant capital (Marx, 1990a, 447). This means that the manufacture, that is to use combined worker, can be started by the money accumulated in advance. Therefore, co-operation presupposes a concentration of the constant and variable capital in the hands of individual capitalist in advance. Likewise, the scale of production and the level of co-operation will depend on the same concentration. As for the personal situation of the capitalist, a minimum of money will be sufficient for him to be able to emancipate from the manual labour, and hence to transform himself “from a small master into a capitalist” and thus “formally to establish the capital-relation”. The mediation for the materialisation of this relation is “a certain minimum amount” through which “numerous isolated and independent processes” that is converted into “one combined social process” (Marx, 1990a, 448).

With and through the establishment of this capital-relation, the worker begins to work for, and later on, under the control of the capitalist. But more important result is this: “Through the co-operation of numerous wage-labourers, the command of capital develops into a requirement for carrying on the labour process itself, into a real condition of production” (Marx, 1990a, 448). The contingent position of the capitalist in the labour process becomes the sine quo none of the labour process.

Capital, or the capitalist, who it belongs to, fulfils the general functions of directing, supervising, etc. Marx resembles this general functions to the function performed by a general in the field of battle (Marx, 1990a, 448). “A single violin player is his own conductor: an orchestra requires a separate one. The work of directing, superintending and adjusting becomes one of the functions of capital, from the moment that the labour under capital’s control becomes co-operative”. The directing is “a specific function of capital” with special characteristics (Marx, 1990a, 448-49). When the number of co-operating workers increase, says Marx, so does the workers’ resistance to the capital’s domination and hence its pressure to eliminate this resistance. Therefore, the control function of capitalist is not only a result of the social labour process, but also of his exploitation of this social process. Thus, the control is “conditioned by the unavoidable antagonism between the exploiter and the raw material of his exploitation”. In addition, with the extension of the means of production, “the necessity increases for some effective control over the proper application of them, because they confront the wage-labourer as the property of another (*fremdes Eigentum*)”. Moreover, it is already capital that brings together the workers, and their unification and connection of their individual workings are the problems that must be resolved “outside their competence” (Marx, 1990a, 449).

These things are the act of capitalist, and confront the workers as “a plan” of capitalist “in the realm of ideas”, and the authority of capitalist “in practice”, “as the powerful will of a being outside them, who subjects their activity to his purpose” (Marx, 1990a, 450). Marx says that capitalist direction is “purely despotic”. This is result of the content and nature of the production process. It is the capital’s valorisation process based on the social labour. “An industrial army of workers under the command of a capitalist requires, like a real army, officers (managers) and N. C. O. s (foremen, overseers), who command during the labour process in the name of capital. The work of supervision becomes their established and exclusive function” (Marx, 1990a, 450). Marx again develops a political argument by putting the apparently reason and

result into their right places, about the executive position of the capitalist in the process of production. He says that “It is not because he is a leader of industry that a man is a capitalist; on the contrary, he is a leader of industry because he is a capitalist” (Marx, 1990a, 450). The leadership function of capital resembles “the functions of general and judge” which “were attributes of landed property” in feudal times (Marx, 1990a, 451, also see note 18, *in which Marx makes fun of Auguste Comte and his school about the “eternal necessity of this sorts of attributes”*).

The productive power of social labour, says Marx, costs nothing to the capitalist. Nonetheless, it is not utilised till the labour is “incorporated into capital” when co-operation begins with the production process. For this reason, this “free gift” looks like a natural possession of capital, as if it is inherent in it (Marx, 1990a, 451).

Marx mentions the power of the kings of the ancient Asia, Egypt in a similar way with the powers of modern capitalist, “whether he appears as an isolated individual or, as in the case of joint-stock companies, in combination of others”. The surplus labour of the non-agricultural labourers of the ancient monarchies was directed in order to build such gigantic buildings. Nonetheless, in these ancient societies, the principle of co-operation had been mobilised, sporadically, and on the base of common ownership over the conditions of production as it occurred in middle ages and modern colonies. In addition, the labourer was not the free wage-labourer, but a member of a tribe or community. The co-operation was based on “the direct relations of domination and servitude, in most cases on slavery”. On the other hand, capitalist co-operation presupposes free worker who sell his labour-power to capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 451-52). In addition, only with the development of the capitalist mode of production could the labour process be transformed into “a social process” (Marx, 1990a, 453).

The Division of Labour and Manufacture: Manufacture is the characteristic form of the capitalist production process between the mid sixteenth century and the last third of the eighteenth century. It is the form of –co-operation based on division of labour”. Its origination can occur in the way either by “the assembling together in one workshop, under the control of a single capitalist, of workers belonging to various independent handicrafts” (Marx, 1990a, 455), or by employing a number of craftsmen all doing the same sort of work in one workshop by one capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 456). At the beginning, each independent handicraft makes his work in the old fashion. But, with the pressure of external conditions, for example, with the mergence of the necessity to increase production, the work was obliged to be parted, or divided up into isolated and disconnected ones. “This accidental division is repeated, develops advantages of its own and gradually ossifies into a systematic division of labour” (Marx, 1990a, 456). Hence, the product, that is commodity, is no longer “the individual product of an independent craftsman”, but “the social product of a union of craftsmen, each of whom performs one, and only one, of the constituent partial operations” (Marx, 1990a, 457).

The division of labour in manufacture carrier the character of handicraft, and hence depends on the individual skill and strength of the workers. Every partial process is done by hand. Its advantages come directly from the division of labour that is a kind of co-operation (Marx, 1990a, 457-58).

“The collective worker, who constitutes the living mechanism of manufacture, is made up of solely of such one-sidedly specialised workers”. This is the cause behind the raising productivity of labour. The time saving is directly related with the transformation of the worker’s labour into one-sided, automatic implementation of a particular operation. The worker takes less time in doing his job than “the craftsman who performs whole series of operations in succession”. One-sidedness leads to time saving, and hence to an increment in the production capacity. The method of work also changes because the repetition of the same work and the concentration of attention to

the same job refine the methods (Marx, 1990a, 458). As for the single craftsman, “the transition from one operation to another interrupts the flow of his labour and creates gaps in his working day”. On the other hand, ever repeating and partial labour “disturbs the intensity and flow of a man’s vital forces, which find recreation and delight in the change of activity itself” (Marx, 1990a, 460).

The one-sidedness of the worker in manufacture is also seen in the one-sidedness of the tools that are used for partial purposes. In manufacture, not only labour, but also the tools, or the instruments of labour are differentiated and specialised (Marx, 1990a, 460). For this reason, manufacture creates the material conditions of machinery, “which consists of a combination of simple instruments” (Marx, 1990a, 460-61).

The Two Fundamental Forms of Manufacture-Heterogeneous and Organic: The relation between the finished articles and its various parts are contingent. The subdivided operations can be realised either by independent handcrafts, or by the co-operation of the specialised workers under the single capitalist, and his factories. In the latter case, it is not necessary that every part of the product can be materialised within the factory. Concentration of workers is not always profitable because the split of the workers into their homes increases the competition among workers. Consequently, this implies that the split of the work prevents the common use of the labouring instruments. Moreover, such a split offers a saving to the capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 462). However, the specialised worker work for the capitalist while the independent craftsman fort his customers (Marx, 1990a, 462-63). It is seen that Marx is rather aware of the flexible production processes in terms of the possible organisations within manufacturing.

One of the disadvantages of the work force composed of the specialised workers is that the whole body cannot operate perfectly when a certain part is absent (Marx, 1990a, 466).

When the manufacture is based on the divides works, it also creates different sorts of workers who needs different degree of training and skill. Some workers are used for simple operation while others for more complex processes. Hence, in manufacture there emerges a hierarchy of workers and a hierarchy of wages. It needs simple operations while it does this for complex ones. “Hence in ever craft it seizes, manufacture creates a **class** of so-called unskilled labourers, a **class** of strictly excluded by the nature of handicraft industry. Division of labourers into skilled and unskilled and the simplification of the functions eliminate the costs of apprenticeship and training. Hence, in general, the value of labour-power falls. These all valorises the capital by reducing the reproduction costs of labour-power, hence increasing the surplus labour-time in relation to the necessary time for production (Marx, 1990a, 470).

Division of Labour in Manufacture and in Society: “Just as a certain number of simultaneously employed workers is the material pre-condition for the division of labour within manufacture, so the number and density of the population, which here corresponds to the collection of workers together in one workshop, is a pre-condition for the division of labour within society”. Nevertheless, density is related with the communication. In this sense, Marx observes that the northern parts of the United States of America are denser than India (Marx, 1990a, 472-73).

Since the commodity production and circulation is required by the capitalist mode of production, the division of labour within manufacture presupposes a certain degree of social division of labour. But, the former increases the latter (Marx, 1990a, 473). Marx distinguishes the social division of labour, which arises within the family and then within a tribe, that is based on the physiological foundation such as ages and sexes and the one that arises from the exchange relations between the different families, tribes, communities, which confront each other. The first sort of origination of the division of labour within society implies the disintegration of the whole and

the rising independency of the parts, while the second sort, integration, interdependence and the rising dependency of the parts. If the starting point of the social division of labour is the physiological, disintegration begins to occur with the exchange relations with other communities. As the process of disintegration operates, “the sole bond still connecting the various kinds of work is the exchange of products of commodities” (Marx, 1990a, 471-72).

A comparison between the division of labour in manufacture and the division of labour in society reveals how the connection among individuals is established. In manufacture, different operations of work are realised on one spot while in society the work is spread-out over wider area and great number of people under the different branches of labour. In the former, the connection is “only the common product” that is produced as commodity by the combination of the specialised workers. In the latter, the connection is “the fact that their respective products are commodities” (Marx, 1990a, 475). If so, comparison demonstrates that the difference between the manufacture and society is rather “subjective, exists merely for the observer” (Marx, 1990a, 475). However, such a subjective difference is offered as an objective difference. The social division of labour is mediated through the exchange of the products of different sector of industry, while the division of labour within manufacture is mediated through an exchange between the workers and one capitalist. In society, the means of production is dispersed among the independent producers. But in manufacture, they are concentrated in the hands of one capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 476).

In the workshop, workers are subjected into definite functions, while in the society, distribution of workers and the means of production occurs by “the play of chance and caprice”. The law governing the commodity production, that commodity have to be a use-value and must be produced according to the disposable labour-time of society for its production, creates a constant tendency towards equilibrium. But, this occurs “only as a reaction against the constant upsetting of this equilibrium”. Here, Marx uncovers the paradoxical

division between the two sorts of division of labour: “The planned and regulated *a priori* system on which the division of labour is implemented within the workshop becomes, in the division of labour within society, an *a posteriori* necessity imposed by nature, controlling the unregulated caprice of the producers, and perceptible in the fluctuations of the barometer of market prices” (Marx, 1990a, 476).

The workshop ensures “the undisputed authority of the capitalist over men, who are merely the members of a total mechanism which belongs to him”. On the other hand, social division of labour provides the contact of the independent commodity producers with the authority of competition, which is “the coercion exerted by the pressure of their reciprocal interests, just as in the animal kingdom the ‘war of all against all’ more or less preserves the condition of existence of every species” (Marx, 1990a, 477). It is nothing but the market competition through whose mediation and authority the social division of labour brings individual producers together. Authority of competition, the coercion exerted by the pressure of reciprocal interest, forms the species-life of individual. Marx observes that bourgeois consciousness celebrates the capitalist’s individual control and regulation with the workshop while it rejects any conscious attempt to social control and regulation of the production process by denouncing any collective control “as an inroad upon such sacred things as the rights of property, freedom and the self-determining ‘genius’ of the individual capitalist”. For the “apologists of the factory system”, says Marx, social control and regulation of production implies only the turning “the whole of society into a factory” (Marx, 1990a, 477).

Smith proposes state education to prevent the deteriorating effects of the division of labour. His French translator, Garnier, opposes him by saying that this education violets the law of social division of labour. Marx says that the latter is consistent with capital. He said that there must be proportion decided by society between “hand labour and head labour”. The existing division is

the product of past and the base for future progress. In addition, public money should not be spent in order to “confound and blend together two **classes** of labour which are striving after division and separation” (Marx, 1990a, 484).

The transition from manufacture to the large-scale industry is conditioned by the inner limitations of the former. First of all, although manufacturing created a division between skilled and unskilled labour and then formed a hierarchy among labourers; skilled workers continued their influence and kept their numeric superiority. Secondly, as the operations were simplified and hence adapted to the women and child labour, male workers resisted against this development. In addition, the workers wanted to keep their skills in hand (489). In this transitory phase of capitalist form of labour, Marx observes that “capital is constantly compelled to wrestle with the insubordination of the workers. Marx quotes in *Ure*: “By infirmity of human nature, it happens that the more skilful the workman, the more self-willed and intractable he is apt to become, and of course the less fit a component of a mechanical system in which ... he may do great damage to the whole”. Marx states that “the complaint that the workers lack discipline runs through the whole of the period of manufacture”. During the period between the sixteenth century and the formation period of large scale industry, firstly, “capital failed in its attempt to seize control of the whole disposable labour-time of the manufacturing workers, and secondly, the manufactures are short-lived, changing their locality from one country to another with the emigration or immigration of workers”. Manufacture lacked order. This need must have been met. It seemed to be an artificial construct in comparison to the town handicrafts and the domestic economy of the countryside. “At a certain stage of its development, the narrow technical base on which manufacture rested came into contradiction with requirements of production which it had itself created” (Marx, 1990a, 490). Manufacture created the workshops and mechanical apparatus and developed a high degree of the division of labour in the workshops. Marx states that this workshop created “machines”, which would

eliminate the function of the handicraftsman. Hence, by machinery, worker's lifelong specialisation over certain functions is removed, and limit to capital's domination is eliminated (Marx, 1990a, 490-91).

In the organised system of machinery, we see an "collective working machine" that is "an articulated system composed of various kinds of single machine, and of groups of single machines, becomes all the more perfect the more the process as a whole becomes a continuous one". Interruption is made by the machines, not by the hands of workers. In the developed factory, continuity between the different parts of the production process is "the regulating principle". In terms of the number, size and speed of the machines, there is "a fixed relation" (Marx, 1990a, 502). It is seen that machinery establishes continuity, speed, and discipline in the labour process. It eliminates any subjectivity on the part of workers, and overcome resistance that can be levelled by the workers, especially by the skilled labourers.

Machinery system is based on automation when it is "driven by a self-acting prime mover". Before invention of these sorts of self-acting machines, some machines needed the aid of the workers. However, this aid implies that the automation is still in the developing stage (Marx, 1990a, 502-03).

The Value Transferred by the machinery to the Product: "Machinery, like every other component of constant capital, creates no value, but yields up its own value to the product it serves to beget". Machinery enters as a whole into the labour process, but piece by piece into the valorisation process. "It never adds more value than it loses, on an average, by depreciation" (Marx, 1990a, 509). It resembles the natural forces that are meaningless without human intervention. Here the past labour, objectified in the form of machines, fulfils its function (Marx, 1990a, 510). The transferable value of the machine is dependent on its value. "The less value it contains, the less value it contributes to the product. The less value it gives up, the more productive it is" (Marx, 1990a, 512). But, if the machine's contribution is equal to the

displaced labour, productivity of labour is not increased. "The productivity of the machine is therefore measured by the human labour-power it replaces" (Marx, 1990a, 513). It is sure that when the machinery use is less dear than the use of labour-power, the capitalist will prefer the former. Marx says that "the limit to his using a machine is therefore fixed by the difference between the value of the machine and the value of the labour-power replaced by it". The fall of wages makes the machinery superfluous. If the measures are not taken against the falling wages, machinery is put forward. Marx observes that the factory acts in England and moral codes against the use of women and girls with men, together with the parent's' rejection of their children's cheap half-time labour, limited the child and women labour and hence leads into the mechanisation in order to replace the women and child labour (Marx, 1990a, 516). Nonetheless, English industry did not always apply to machinery when the prices of the labourer are rather low in comparison to the values of the machines. For this reason, Marx states that "In England women are still occasionally used instead of horses for hauling barges, because the labour required to produce horses and machines is an accurately known quantity, while that required to maintain the women of the surplus population is beneath all calculation" (Marx, 1990a, 517).

Moral degradation of women and children that is caused by the exploitation of their labour, Says Marx, is perfectly portrayed by F. Engels in his *Condition of the Working Class in England* (Marx, 1990a, 522-23). But, intellectual degeneration of children that is artificially produced by the industry compelled the Parliament to introduce compulsory elementary education for children less than 14 years in workplaces that are subject to the factory acts. Marx distinguishes artificial ignorance and the natural ignorance. But, short term education of the children within the factories was given by the teachers who were even unable to write especially before 1844 factory act (Marx, 1990a, 523). In some places, as in Scotland, employers dismissed the children who were subjected to compulsory education (Marx, 1990a, 524).

Machinery, by extending his working force into the children and women, broke the resistance of the male workers that were levelled to the despotism of capital in the manufacturing period (Marx, 1990a, 526).

Because it is capital, the automatic mechanism is endowed, in the person of the capitalist, with consciousness and a will. As capital, therefore, it is animated by the drive to reduce to a minimum the resistance offered by man, that obstinate yet elastic natural barrier. This resistance is moreover lessened by the apparently undemanding nature of work at a machine, and the more pliant and docile character of the women and children employed by preference (Marx, 1990a, 526-27).

The value of machine is determined by necessary labour-time for its reproduction or the value of a better machine that is to replace it. Existing machined confronts the competition of the new, better and cheap machines. Hence, the machines also undergo “a moral depreciation”, says Marx. They are devalued. For this reason, first the machine put into motion, prolongation of the working day is necessarily wanted by the capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 528). They do not make sense for the production of surplus-value unless they confront the living-labour. Otherwise, they lose their use and exchange value (Marx, 1990a, 529).

Machinery does not create a new value, but “relative surplus-value”. It does this not only by reducing the value of labour-power and cheapening indirectly the commodities that is needed by the worker, but also in its sporadic implementation, by elevating the labour into a higher level, “by raising the social value of the article produced above its individual value, and thus enabling the capitalist to replace the value of a day’s labour-power by a smaller portion of the value of a day’s product” (Marx, 1990a, 530). In other words, machines enable the capitalists to make production with less cost than the average of an industry.

But, relative-surplus-value as such is obtained only within a transitional period when the use of machinery is under the monopoly of the capitalist.

Since the profit as such exceptional and short-term, the prolongation of the working day is acutely required. When the use of machinery is generalised into the industry under which our capitalist works, exceptional profits vanish and then the only source of the surplus-value becomes the variable part of capital again. The social value of the product is reduced to its individual value (Marx, 1990a, 530). Here, the capitalist must increase the productivity of labour and hence increase the *rate* of the surplus-value. But, in order to increase the *rate* of the surplus-value, i.e. the ratio of the surplus-labour time to the necessary labour time required for the production of commodity, capitalist converts a part of his variable capital, hence the number of workers, into constant capital, which is not the source of new value. Marx observes that

there is an immanent contradiction in the application of machinery to the production of surplus-value, since... the rate of the surplus-value, cannot be increased except by diminishing... the number of workers. This contradiction comes to light as soon as machinery has come into general use in a given industry, for then the value of the machine-produced commodity regulates the social value of all commodities of the same kind; and it is this contradiction which in turn drives the capitalist, without his being aware of the fact, to the most ruthless and excessive prolongation of the working day, in order that he may secure compensation for the decrease in the relative number of workers exploited by increasing not only relative but also absolute surplus labour (Marx, 1990a, 531).

What the results of the continuation of this contradiction are these: the more machinery, and the higher rates of the surplus-value, hence the higher rate of exploitation we have, the less workers work for the longer working days, and the more relative and absolute surplus-labour is produced. Attempt to increase surplus-value directed against the source of the surplus-value, the living labour. The continuation of this contradiction leads into new inventions, and *structural* unemployment. Machines are ironically put into motion not in order to decrease the working day, but only to decrease the necessary labour-time for the production of commodities in favour of the capitalist.

Machinery breaks the resistance against the prolongation of working day. In addition, by the application of machinery, the capitalist can penetrate into the new sources of labourer, women and children, and emancipate the workers he previously occupied, by producing “a surplus working population, which is compelled to submit to the dictates of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 530-31). Machinery eliminates the moral and natural limits to the prolongation of the working day. It is an “economic paradox”, says Marx, which the machinery that is used for reducing the labour-time turns the whole time of the worker and his family into a time for the valorisation of capital. There could be no such paradox, observes Marx, for the thinkers of the classical antiquity. For example, poet Antipater (first century B. C. in Greece) “hailed the water-wheel for grinding corn, that most basic form of all productive machinery, as the liberator of female slaves and the restorer of the golden age” (Marx, 1990a, 532).

Intensification of Labour: The prolongation of working day is reacted by the society and then the normal working day is legally established. But the solution of capital is intensification of the factory labour (Marx, 1990a, 533). Struggle over the normal working makes the capitalist direct into the production of relative-surplus-value and the machinery. When the working day is constant, this can be provided with the intensification of labour (Marx, 1990a, 534). Here, the worker uses more labour-power in a given time by using the means of production economically since “the legal limitation of the working day compels the capitalist to exercise the strictest economy in the cost of production” Improvements in the technology of production also support the capitalist in this economy (Marx, 1990a, 536-37). The result is the increased production capacity and the increased wealth of the manufacturers thanks to “the more intensive exploitation of labour-power” (Marx, 1990a, 540). On the other hand, the total number of the workers in the industries subjected to the fixed working day significantly decreased while the number of children increased in England from 1850s to 1860s (roughly, after the ten hours’ day regulation begins, Marx, 1990a, 541). In fact, what the capitals do

is to compress the time within the workplaces: “12 hours’ work... is now compressed into less than 10 hours”, stated a factory inspector in 1872 (Marx, 1990a, quoted in Marx, 541-42).

Striking fact is the shortening of the working day just leads into the intensification of labour, and hence creates the similar health problems that were seen in the longer working days. Marx points to a general attitude of the capitalist in the face of any retreat: “capital’s tendency, as soon as a prolongation of the hours of labour is once for all forbidden, is to compensate for this by systematically raising the intensity of labour, and converting every improvement in machinery into a more perfect means for soaking up labour-power” (Marx, 1990a, 542). But if capital compensates for its loss in this way, Marx says, there would be a new demand for shorter working days.

The Factory: Marx observes that “in place of the hierarchy of specialised workers that characterises manufacture, there appears, in the automatic factory, a tendency to equalise and reduce to an identical level every kind of work that has to be done by the minders of the machines; in place of the artificially produced distinctions between the specialised workers, it is natural differences of age and sex that predominate” (Marx, 1990a, 545). The division of labour demonstrates itself in the distribution of the workers among the specialised machines and among the different departments within factory. “The essential division is that between the workers who are actually employed on the machines... and those who merely attend them (almost exclusively children)”. Apart from “these two principle **classes**, there is a numerically unimportant group whose occupation it is to look after the whole of the machinery and repair it from time to time, composed of engineers, mechanics, joiners etc. This is a superior **class** of workers, in part scientifically educated, in part trained in a handicraft; they stand outside the realm of the factory workers, and are added to them only to make up an aggregate. This division of labour is purely technical” (Marx, 1990a, 545-46). Marx states that the English factory legislation does not accept this superior

class of workers as being factory workers. But, Parliament includes everybody into the category of factory workers except the owner of the factory (Marx, 1990a, 546, note 99). Within factory, workers can be easily replaced without any interruption in the production process. Likewise, the machines can replace the workers like children, who are merely attendants. The simplicity of the labour also provides the rapid turnover of the individual workers (Marx, 1990a, 546-47). Compared with the manufacturing period, “The lifelong speciality of handling the same tool now becomes the lifelong speciality of serving the same machine”. The workers’ dependence on the factory and hence on the capitalist is completed (Marx, 1990a, 547).

The relation of man to the tools is completely inverted. In manufacture and before, the worker would use the tool. Now the tool, the machine uses him. Machinery acquires independence over the subjectivity of the workers, by rendering them a part of it, “living appendages” incorporated into itself. Routine of the work, repetition of the same mechanical process, that is the factory work, “exhausts the nervous system”, “does away with the many-sided play of the muscles, and confiscates every atom of freedom, both in bodily and in intellectual activity”. Nothing can be an advantage for the worker. “Even the lightening of the labour becomes an instrument of torture” because the machine does not emancipate the worker from the labour. Rather, it fallows out the content of the work. The conditions of the work become the employer of the worker. “Owing to its conversion into an automation, the instruments of labour confronts the worker during the labour process in the shape of capital, dead labour, which dominates and soaks up living labour-power” (Marx, 1990a, 548). The dead labour, which is the past labour of the living labour, comes up as alien and automatic force against the individual worker. But not only dead labour as such seems in the shape of capital, but also intellectual aspects of the production too looks like this: “The separation of the intellectual faculties of the production process from manual labour, and the transformation of those faculties into powers exercised by capital over labour, is,... finally completed by large scale industry erected on

the foundation of machinery” (Marx, 1990a, 548-49). Individual skills loses their significance in the face of the science, of “the gigantic natural forces”, and of “the mass of social labour”, three of which “constitutes the power of the master”. Factory subordinates the worker to “the uniform motion of the instrument of labour” and composes working groups. It “gives rise to a barrack-like discipline” and “brings...labour of superintendence to its fullest development, thereby dividing the workers into manual labourers and overseers, into the private soldiers and the N. C. O. s of an industrial army” (Marx, 1990a, 549).

Marx states that factory **requires such a discipline and training for the workers**, that within itself, a private legislation is needed for the regulation of the labour process. “The overseer’s book of penalties replaces the slave-driver’s lash. All punishments naturally resolve themselves into fines and deductions from wages, and the law-giving talent of the factory Lycurgus so arranges matters that a violation of his laws is, if possible, more profitable to him than the keeping of them” (Marx, 1990a, 549-50). Marx resembles the factory working to the slavery: “The slavery in which the bourgeoisie holds the proletariat chained is nowhere more conspicuous than in the factory system. Here ends all freedom in law and in fact,...He must eat, drink and sleep at command... The despotic bell calls him from his bed... here the employer is absolute law-giver; he makes regulations at will” (quoted in Engels, Marx, 1990a, 550, note 9).

The Struggle between Worker and Machine: “The struggle between the capitalist and the wage-labourer starts with the existence of the capital-relation itself. It rages throughout the period of manufacture” (Marx, 1990a, 553). Machinery is the “capital’s material mode of existence. Marx observes that the labourer’s revolt against this material mode of capital goes back to seventeenth century in textile manufacturing. The most striking example would emerge by “the Luddite movement”, which developed in the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century because of the introduction of the power-

loom into the manufacturing districts of England. The movement only revealed that the workers needed time to learn the difference between the machinery and its use by capital and they had to attack against “the form of society” rather than the “material instruments of production” (Marx, 1990a, 554-55). Machinery displaces the workers and enters into the competition with the labours and hence large number of workers becomes unsaleable and superfluous at the labour market. “The price of labour-power falls below its value“. “When machinery seizes on an industry by degrees, it produces chronic misery among the workers who compete with it. Where the transition is rapid, the effect is acute and is felt by great masses of people” (Marx, 1990a, 557). The former example had been lived in England by the gradual development of textile industry, while the latter one was lived in India where English industry led to acute results (Marx, 1990a, 557-58). Newly introduced machinery also eliminates the higher position of the skilled labour by creating self-regulating labour processes to which even children could adapt themselves (Marx, 1990a, 559). It can not only decrease the required quantity of the skilled workers, but also can substitute “the less skilled for the more skilled, juvenile for adult, female for male”. Such a system of substitutions leads into “a fresh disturbance in the rate of wages” (Marx, 1990a, 560). The machinery reduces all sort of costs, including wastes, wages, and numbers of the workers while it increases the productivity, and speed of labour and hence the produce (Marx, 1990a, 560). Here Marx gives the first clues to his theory of over-production crises. In the years 1866-67, rapid development of machinery after the end of the American civil war, there emerged a worldwide glut of the commodities. The workers called for, theoretically right, says Marx, the reduction of working day into four day a week. This demand too was accepted with some variations (Marx, 1990a, 561, and note 28). Marx also observed that the large number of factories disappeared between 1861 and 1868, in other words, changed into the hands of a smaller segment of capitalists. Apart from this war among the capitalists, the machinery is also used in the war between the workers and the capitalist. It “does not just act as a superior competitor to the worker”. “It

is the most powerful weapon for suppressing strikes, those periodic revolts of the working class against the autocracy of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 562). Marx suggests that “It would be possible to write a whole history of the inventions made since 1830 for the sole purpose of providing capital with weapons against working class revolt” (Marx, 1990a, 563). Marx’s explanation of the power that capital obtains with the machinery seems at large degree to be related with the reduction in the number of the worker in general and of the skilled workers in particular. The declining wages and the extension of the labour market into the children and women increases the competition among the workers. The exchange power of the working class before capital is reduced in every aspects. The general result is the increasing power of capital. The significant one is that Marx tackles one dimension of the machinery question and the scale of the industry in the context of the struggle between capital and worker.

*The Compensation Theory, With Regard to **the Workers Displaced by Machinery***: Marx states that many bourgeois political economists argued that there emerges an additional free capital to employ the workers that are displaced by the machinery (Marx, 1990a, 565; Ricardo later on rejected this idea “with the scientific impartiality and love of truth characteristic of him”, note 34). But, he says that what they claim is related with “the means of subsistence of the workers who have been ‘set free’”, and placed at the possible use of the other capitalists. What is done is the transformation of an amount of the means of subsistence into capital. The compensation only means first the “forced holiday” of the workers, and secondly a possible future employment of them by capital (Marx, 1990a, 566). The following effect is the declining demand for the means of the purchases and hence is falling prices in those commodities. The latter result is declining wages of the workers who are employed in the production of the means of the purchases. The introduction of machinery not only displaces the workers in the related branches of industry, but also in the other branches, it has not entered (Marx, 1990a, 567). The possibility of employment for the workers can only be

ensured by a *new* capital wishing investment, rather than the capital that had displaced the workers (Marx, 1990a, 567-68). The lucky displaced workers are placed at the disposal of the other possible capitalists.

For Marx, the problems are caused by the capitalist application of the machinery rather than the machinery itself. The decisive factor is the **class** relation that underlies the introduction and development of the machinery. “Therefore, since machinery in itself shortens the hours of labour, but when employed by capital it lengthens them; since in itself it lightens labour, but when employed by capital it heightens its density; since in itself it is victory of man over the forces of nature but in the hands of capital it makes man the slave of those forces; since in itself it increases the wealth of the producers, but in the hands of capital it makes them into paupers”, says Marx, the bourgeois economist implies that “his opponent is guilty of the stupidity of contending, not against the capitalist application of machinery, but against machinery itself”. He observes that the bourgeois economist thinks that the problems capitalist application of machinery creates are only *temporary*. But, are the only temporary things the problems themselves, asks Marx. “Any other utilisation of machinery than the capitalist one is to him impossible”, he answers. Whether the exploiter is the machine or the worker does not matter to him. The capitalist use of machinery is necessary for the use of machinery, for the bourgeois economist. Whoever rejects this reality is “an enemy of social progress”. It is sure that Marx’s emphasis is upon the capitalist use of machinery. The fact that same machinery could be used in other way does not imply that the machinery is to be used only in other way. This is because that, according to Marx’s statements, the development and logic of use of the machinery is completely contingent on the **class** relation behind it. Is it based on the capital-relation, or let us say, or on the labour-relation?

The displacement of the workers in a branch of industry, and hence unemployment does not imply that there emerges an unemployment in other industries. For instance, employment in the industries that produce raw

materials and the means of production may rise. But this compensation that is not related with the theory of compensation stated above, can be analysed by the change in “the composition of the capital employed” (Marx, 1990a, 571). But the rise in the new employment area must be lower than the unemployment that had been created by machinery. Otherwise, the product of the machine would be dearer than the product of the hand labour (Marx, 1990a, 570).

With the development of machinery, “a new type of worker springs to life: the machine-maker” (Marx, 1990a, 571). But even into this industry, machinery is introduced in a large scale. The number of workers and the redundant working population rises with the development of machinery. Industrial development leads into a corresponding transformation in the agricultural lands and population structure as seen in the impact of the woollen industry of England over the arable lands and agricultural labourers. Machinery increases all sorts of demand for the raw materials, instruments of labour, half-finished products, and different sorts of labour in the “handicrafts and manufactures supplied by the machines”. Marx states that, apart from the development of the machinery that results into a corresponding development in the number of the branches of “social production”, “Machine production drives the social division of labour immeasurably further than manufacture does, because it increases the productive power of the industries it seizes upon to a much greater degree” (Marx, 1990a, 572). So, mechanisation of the production is accompanied with the social differentiation of labour and of the production. The general result of the machinery is in fact its “immediate result”,

to augment surplus-value and the mass of products in which surplus-value is embodied. It also increases the quantity of substances for the capitalists and their dependents to consume, and therefore the size of these social strata themselves. Their growing wealth, and the relatively diminished number of workers required to produce the means of subsistence, begets both new luxury requirements and the means of satisfying them. A larger portion of the social product is converted into surplus product, and a larger portion of the surplus product is

reproduced and consumed in a multitude of refined shapes. In other words, the production of luxuries increases. The products are also made more refined and more varied by the new world market relations created by large-scale industry. Not only are greater quantities of foreign luxury articles exchanged for home products, but a greater mass of foreign raw materials, ingredients and half-finished articles are used as means of production in the home industries. Owing to these relations with the world market, the demand for labour increases in the transport industry, and splits the latter into numerous extra subdivisions (Marx, 1990a, 572-73).

The significant definitions made by Marx are these: Firstly, there is a social stratum which is dependent on or very below the **class** of the capitalists as regards with the increasing consumption found of this **class**. The growing wealth of the capitalists and their dependents requires the production of new luxury goods and new means of consumption. There emerges far more refined way of consumption, and hence new luxuries. The relations with the world market provoke this tendency and produce far more developed transport industry and services. But Marx says in relation to his time, that these new branch of work is far from significant even in the developed nations of his time (Marx, 1990a, 573). But the significant result of the increasing productivity of the large-scale industry “permits a larger and larger part of the working class to be employed unproductively” (Marx, 1990a, 574). The development of machinery permits the development of the unproductive labouring **class**. What Marx predicts here is of course, the development of the service sector in the contemporary period. For example He says that “Hence it is possible to reproduce the ancient domestic slaves, on a constantly extending scale, under the name of a servant **class**, including men-servants, women-servants, lackeys, etc.” (Marx, 1990a, 574). In terms of the significant share of the servant **class** in England and Wales in 1861, Marx gives this statistical data for the total approximately 8 million working population within the total 20 million:

Agriculture:	1.098.261
Textile industry:	642.607
Mining:	565.835
Metal industry:	396.998

The servant **class**: 1.208.648
“capitalist who is in any way engaged in industry, commerce or finance” forms the rest of the 8 million.

The labourers and the capitalists are all the 8 million population within the 20 million of the society.

The rest of the population includes dependents, and unproductive women, young persons and children and the “ideological” groups such as the members of the government, soldiers, lawyers, priests, and the appropriators of the ground-rent and interest, and lastly the outlaws and paupers (Marx, 1990a, 574).

The contemporary sociology and urbanism would see in this statistical distribution of the population of 1861 England and Wales a “distorted” employment structure, “marginal sector”, etc. On the other hand, Marx sees in it the results of the capitalist development of the machinery and labour productivity in the large-scale industry. It should be also noted that the labour and the capitalist all are distinguished from the “ideological” groups such as the state personal and the clerical occupations and from the parasitical strata, which lives with the labour of others. Productivity creates on the one hand, the possibility of living without labouring for the large parts of the population, on the other hand, new social categories as regards with the productivity. In addition to these, Marx could easily mention the social stratum that is composed of the capitalists’ dependents. Ever-increasing transformation of the social product into surplus product directs the social production into the private spheres of consumption of this social stratum below the capitalists. New goods, habits and tastes, which are based on the refinement of the life, would form the cultural sphere of the industrial productivity. Machinery produces new categories of labour, new ways of life, and hence new consumption patterns by increasing and re-distributing the surplus-value into different spheres of society. Nonetheless, it also increases the population share of the servant **class**, of the “modern domestic slaves”

(Marx, 1990a, 575). The central idea that Marx has in mind is the possibility created by machinery and its increasing productivity of labour that can be utilised in favour of a free time for all men rather than the new forms of slavery.

Repulsion and Attraction of Workers through the Development of Machine Production. Crises in Textile Industry: Although the factory based machinery increases the constant component of capital, the factory system is also rather subject to the variation in the composition of the capital. For example, during its extension period, existing technical structure is used and the number of the workers increases (Marx, 1990a, 578). In addition, when the large-scale industry is properly established, it also obtains elasticity, “a capacity for sudden extension...which comes up against no barriers but those presented by the availability of raw materials and the extent of sales outlets”. Moreover, the immediate effect of the machinery acquires new supply of raw materials. The cheaper goods and the new transport and communication technology permit the conquest of the foreign markets by destroying the domestic handicraft and rendering old producers of the finished articles the suppliers of raw materials. Large-scale industry turns the foreign workers into “supernumeraries” and then leads into emigration and the colonisation (Marx, 1990a, 579). “A new and international division of labour springs up, one suited to the requirements of the main industrial countries, and it converts one part of the globe into a chiefly agricultural field of production for supplying the other part, which remains a pre-eminently industrial field” (Marx, 1990a, 579-80). It is clearly seen that factory system is at the beginning organising the different parts of the world as the different sectors of the national economy. The increasing productivity of the large-scale production permits the local capital of penetrating into the other parts of world and of transforming the production system and the employment structure of the foreign countries according to its requirements. But, the international character of the factory system also carries the contradictions of capital of the mother country transfers to the globe. Marx states that the factory system’s

immense capacity of production and its dependence on the world market leads into a cyclical phenomena: “feverish production”, creates “glut on the market” and then the “contraction of the market” cripples the production. “The life of industry becomes a series of periods of moderate activity, prosperity, over-production, crisis and stagnation” (Marx, 1990a, 580). As it is known, this business cycle is also formulated by bourgeois economist, but without referring to the contradictory character of the commodity production under capitalist mode of production. The machinery makes the employment and the living conditions of the workers uncertain and unstable as its direct results in the form of periodic crisis of industrial production (Marx, 1990a, 580-82).

The periodic turns of the production cycle determines the area of **class** struggle and the power of the working class. “Except in the periods of prosperity, a most furious combat rages between the capitalists for their individual share in the market”. The shares are determined by the cheapness of the products that can be provided by the improved machinery and the new methods of labour in order to decrease the variable part of capital. Nevertheless, “there also comes a time in every industrial cycle when a forcible reduction of wages beneath the value of labour-power is attempted so as to cheapen commodities” (Marx, 1990a, 582). It is seen that intra-struggle of the capitalists in the next turn would result into a tension between the workers and the capitalists.

The increase in the number of the workers requires rapid growth in the capital invested. But this growth occurs only within the backward and forward movements of the industrial cycle. However, technical process either does not employ additional workers, or displaces existing workers. While the qualitative change in the machinery displaces the existing workers and does not create employment for fresh workers, “the purely quantitative extension of the factories absorbs not only the men thrown out of work but also fresh contingents of workers” Thus the workers are “continually repelled and attracted, slung backwards and forwards, while, at the same time, constant

changes take place in the sex, age and skill of the industrial conscripts” (Marx, 1990a, 583).

English industrial cycle: Marx’s survey of English industrial cycle applies the statements above to the real economic history together with the significant manifestations of the each period (Marx, 1990a, 583-84):

1770-1815: monopoly over the machinery and the world market, only five year’s depression or stagnation

1815-1825

1815-1821: depression

1822, 1823: prosperity

1824: abolishing the Combination Laws for the workers, extension of factories

1825: *crisis*

1826-1837

1826: misery and riots of the workers

1827: slight improvement

1828: power-looms and exportation increased

1829: increasing exportation, especially to India

1830: glutted markets

1831-1833: depression, the monopoly of the East India Company repealed

1834: increase in the factories and machinery, shortage of workers, new poor laws furthers the flow of the agricultural workers into the factory towns. Children disappear in the country districts. White slave trade begins.

1835: prosperity, hand-loom weavers’ starvation

1836: prosperity

1837, 1838: depression and *crisis*

1839-1847

1839: recovery

1840: depression, riots, military intervention

1841, 1842: unbearable sufferings of the workers

1842: factory owners displace the workers in order to enforce the abolishment of the Corn Laws. Stream of the thousands of workers into Lancashire and Yorkshire is prevented by the military, the workers’ leaders put into trial. Great misery

1844: recovery

1845: prosperity

1846: improvement and reaction. Repeal of the Corn Laws

1847: *crisis*, general reduction of wages by 10 percent

1847-1857

1848: depression. Manchester is protected by the military
1849: recovery
1850: prosperity
1851: prices fall, low wages, frequent strikes
1852: improvement, continuation of the strikes, the manufacturers threaten for the importation of workers
1853: exportation increases. Three months strikes. Misery at Preston
1854: prosperity and glutted markets
1855: news of bankruptcies in the world
1856: prosperity
1857: *crisis*

1858-1863

1858: improvement
1859: prosperity and new factories established
1860: summit of the cotton trade in England, glutted markets in Far East. The French Treaty of Commerce, growths of factories and machinery
1861: temporal prosperity, reaction, the American Civil War, shortage of cotton
1862-1863: “complete collapse”

We can observe firstly that the “complete collapse” occurred when one of the significant spheres of the world market, the United States, entered into a multi-dimensional civil crisis. Secondly, the capitalist-worker alliance could be maintained only till the 1840s period when the industrial capitalism succeeded in eliminating the resistance of the landed property and of repealing of the *Corn Laws*. The military could be used against the workers in the country that is frequently recalled as the cradle of the liberal democracy. Thirdly, as related with the theoretical meaning of Marx’s *Capital*, capital accumulation is the accumulation of power for the capitalists that is used against the working class. In order to succeed in his struggle against the workers, the capitalists must constantly accumulate his power.

In the times of crisis, and depression, “a most furious combat rages between the capitalists for their individual share in the market”. Their internal combat soon turns into their combat with the workers that are manifested itself in the reduction of wages and in turn in the workers’ resistance against this devaluation of the labour-power through riots and strikes. Nonetheless, the capitalists cannot fight in all fronts at the same time. Its short and the long

term **class** interests and the immediate and the distant threats that can be levelled towards it are clearly conceived in its search for the **class** alliances. The significant thing is that Marx's analysis in *Capital* demonstrates that the workers are the victims of the accumulation dynamics and cannot take the advantages of the capital accumulation except for the possibility of more employment and relatively good wages of the recovery periods. The workers can only be a temporal ally of the temporarily democratic fraction of the capitalist **class** which is trying to elevate itself to a more productive capital that needs far more productive labourer.

The analytical results of machinery are manifold. It creates unemployment. But this is only the problem of the present society under the capitalist mode of machine production. Unemployment also implies, for Marx, the possibility of free time for all men when it is transformed into a full employment with less working hours for everybody. Apart from this future prospect, it is important definition made by Marx that machinery and the factory production eliminates all differences among men except for their natural differences such sex, ages, etc. Along with the ever-changing labour market, this means that highly productive capitalist economy puts into the political, ideological and cultural agenda of men the only existential questions, body differences, gender relations, spatial aspects of life, alienation of men from nature, ethnicity, etc. In addition to these, the increasing possibility of living without labouring for the capitalist **class** and their dependent stratum, and the appropriators of the ground-rent and interest point to a consumption society and ever-changing tastes, habits and ways of life. These are the cultural dynamics of the capitalist application of machinery, and are the Marxian base of the recent post-modern and post-Marxist theorising. If Marx makes a reduction, this is a reduction of the modes of living to the modes of labouring, of creating wealth, and of appropriating wealth. And, so far as we know, the mode of production of social surplus is the condition for the different modes of the production of life. This is the reduction of life to the life itself.

The Revolutionary Impact of Large-Scale Industry on Manufacture, Handicrafts and on the Division of Labour. The development of the factory system affects all other branches of industry. The principle of the factory production becomes the standard for the other spheres of production. It changes the composition of the collective labourer of the other production areas. The division of labour is extended to involve “cheap labour” of women, children of all ages and of all unskilled labourers. The affect as such is so penetrating that even the domestic industries follows the similar pattern that fits the factory production. So we have now a “modern domestic industry” which is completely different with the old domestic industry which involves the independent handicrafts and peasants and “above all, a dwelling-house for the worker and his family” (Marx, 1990a, 590-91). The outmoded domestic industry, says Marx, is now only “an external department of the factory, the manufacturing workshop, or the warehouse”. The factory concentrates not only concentrates the workers in the manufactures and the handicrafts and command them, but also dominates “the outworkers in the domestic industries, who live in the large towns as well as being scattered over the countryside”. Marx gives striking definitions to the theorists of the so-called new production paradigms under the label of the post-Fordist, or to say, flexible production that has emerged in the recent period of capitalism: “An example: the shirt factory of Messrs Tillie at Londonderry, which employs 1000 workers in the factory itself, and 9000 outworkers spread over the country districts”. It is sure that in manufacture that is controlled by the factory system shows “more shameless” exploitation of the cheap labour. This is more valid for the modern domestic industries as the direct results of the declining power of the dispersed workers and hence their declining power of resistance, and of the competition of these industries with both the factories and the manufactures. In addition, “poverty robs the worker of the conditions most essential to his labour, of space, light and ventilation” together with the irregular employment (Marx, 1990a, 591).

In addition to these, it should be noted that the old forms of thought, consciousness and ideology cannot always change in the compatible forms with the dynamics of the production of capital in all kinds. When the old forms of living are insisted, they are either followed out of their historical and social contents, or become isolated from the new forms of the social life. For one of these two solutions to be emerged, there emerges a process of struggle between the Judaist and archaic interpretations of the existing Moslem religion. This is valid also for the old state ideology that is, *Kemalism*. Just as the *theoretical-historical Islam* must be turned into a far more practical one, that is, Judaist Islam, *theoretical-historical Kemalism* too must be changed into a practical one, which is either liberal democratic one or the social democratic one. However, the thoughts live only in thoughts.

Modern Domestic Industry: Working at home can be imagined as a good condition of the future society. But this was provided in the new forms of labouring in the nineteenth century. For example, in the modern domestic industries, some branches of industry such as the making of the lace, workers were not completely employed in the workshops and warehouses, but also, at homes. Manufacturers give their orders, for instance, to the mistress houses. The owner of these houses employs many women, girls and children either in his own workshops, or the workers works in theirs (Marx, 1990a, 596). This system is extended event o the countryside. “Pillow lace-making”, for example, is carried on some agricultural district where some manufacturers employ more than 3000 lace makers, who are mainly children and female (Marx, 1990a, 597).

The child-parent relations in the regions where straw-plaiting and straw-hat making are developed again suffer from the mode of labouring and exploitation of the workers of all ages and sexes. For the children of the ages of 4, even of 3, “straw-plait schools” are established. The children are instructed in these “blood-sucking institutions” in the supervision of their mothers. They are also made work at home after the school by their “half-

starved mothers” (Marx, 1990a, 598). For the working places of the children, specialists suggest minimum spaces. “Thus do the children enjoy life till the age of 12 or 14”. The system also changes the parents’ attitude towards their children: Marx states that “The wretched half-starved parents think of nothing but getting as much as possible out of their children. The latter, as soon as they are grown up, do not care a farthing, and naturally so, for their parents, and leave them”. Again in an official report it is said about this population:

It is no wonder that ignorance and vice abound in a population so brought up ... Their morality is at the lowest ebb ... a great number of the women have illegitimate children, and that at such an immature age that even those most conversant with criminal statistics are astounded (Marx, 1990a, 599).

Marx observes that the respect and love among the family members cannot be maintained under this system. On the other hand, as exemplified by the official reports, while ignorance, vice, immorality, illegitimacy, crime are all produced under the society of capital, the solution would put forward in the form of bourgeois education, family, morality, legitimacy, and punishment. The forms of solution are nothing but the mere forms of consciousness, law and ideology.

The factory system had a certainty in the time and the results of the production. The pauses in the working day no longer did harm to the produce under the process (Marx, 1990a, 605). Nonetheless, “irregular habits of the workers themselves obstruct the regulation of the hours of labour”. For example, in the factories where piece-wage predominates, the loss of time is complemented by the over-work or night-work. Marx says that this “brutalises the adult worker and ruins his wife and children” (Marx, 1990a, 607). Marx observes that although this sort of irregularity in the use of labour-power is a reaction against the monotonous labour process, it is also created by the anarchy in the production that may be result of the seasonal works or the sudden orders that must be met within a short time. Such sudden orders increase with the development of the transport and communication

technology. Sudden orders and the unpredicted market demand encourage over-working of the workers. The anarchy in production itself also produces an uncertainty and irregularity in the employment of the workers. The capitalist thus keeps “an industrial reserve force that shall be ready at a moment’s notice”. For the workers, there is a season of over-working days and the period of unemployment (Marx, 1990a, 608). The capitalists claims that these sort of usages of the workers are cause by the “‘natural barriers’ inherent in production”. But, says Marx, this is a lie when it is seen that the regulation of the working hours did spread the mass of labour evenly over the year (Marx, 1990a, 609). In addition, the new navigation technology and the development of the communication rendered meaningless the seasonal labour along with the new means of production and the simultaneous employment of the greater number of workers, and the impact of these changes over the wholesale trade created the conditions for the regular hours of working (Marx, 1990a, 609-10).

Health, Education and The Factory Acts in England: “Factory legislation, that first conscious and methodical reaction of society against the spontaneously developed form of its production process, is ... just as much the necessary product of large-scale industry as cotton yarn, self-actors and the electric telegraph” (Marx, 1990a, 610). The sentence demonstrates well that what Marx understands from the notoriously mentioned manifestation of the production in the conscious forms of society. It is sure not the factory legislation that created large-scale industry. But as the latter develops, the society begins to think of, to concern and to debate about it. Even, more, the large-scale industry required a sort of legislation for itself. Its participants, immediately, indirectly, the workers, and their advocates on the one side, the capitalists and their adherents on the other side, are involved in “first conscious and methodical reaction of society against the spontaneously developed form of its production process”. Some participates actively in this process of reaction while the others do passively.

As for the clauses relating to health, the fact that manufacturers fanatically opposed to the legal clauses that implied slight additional costs for themselves demonstrated the meaninglessness of “the free-trade dogma that, in a society of mutually antagonistic interests, each individual furthers the common welfare by seeking his own personal advantage!” (Marx, 1990a, 611). Marx generalises the logic of the Factory Act of 1864: “the capitalist mode of production, by its very nature, excludes all rational improvement beyond a certain point”. When certain limited improvements become compulsory such as minimum space for each labourer, the Acts as such only result into the factory development at the expense of small employers (Marx, 1990a, 612). The same act also proclaims the compulsory elementary education for the child labourers. Marx observes that the merit of these clauses demonstrates for the first time the possibility of “combining manual labour with education and gymnastics”. The factory inspectors found that this combination made both education and work “a rest and a relief to the other” (Marx, 1990a, 613). Here Marx refers to Robert Owen who saw the factory system as “the germ of the education of the future”. This sort of education “will, in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labour with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing full developed human beings” (Marx, 1990a, 614). Senior also demonstrates the division between education and productive labour in the case of upper **class** children. Marx says that Senior observed that “the monotonous, unproductive and long school day undergone by the children of the upper and middle **classes** uselessly adds to the labour of the teacher, ‘while he not only fruitlessly but absolutely injuriously, wastes the time, health, and energy of the children’” (Marx, 1990a, 613-14).

The contradiction was previously defined as the one between the increasing development of the technical basis of production and the reproduction of “the old division of labour with its ossified particularities” under capitalist mode of production (Marx, 1990a, 617). In other words, the technical development is

accompanied by the human sacrifice under the capitalist form of large-scale industry. Marx implies that the contradiction as such will dissolve in its path of development.

When the factory acts intervenes the factories, it confronts the “capital right’s of exploitation”. But when it does this for domestic labour, it meets the “parental authority” (Marx, 1990a, 619-20). Marx observes that large-scale industry overturns the economic base of the old family system and family labour. Hence it dissolves the family relations of the past. The children are put against their parents. But who misuses and exploits the labour of the children and the young persons is not in fact the parents, but “the capitalist mode of exploitation, by sweeping away the economic foundation which corresponded to parental power, made the use of parental power into its misuse”. Nonetheless, Marx sees a positive potential in this exploitation in favour of “a new economic foundation for a higher form of the family and of relations between the sexes” (Marx, 1990a, 621). The potential underlies the fact that large-scale industry, assigns “an important part in socially organised processes of production, outside the sphere of the domestic economy, to women, young persons and children of both sexes” (Marx, 1990a, 620). However, the integration of the women and young persons into “the collective working group” cannot be “a source of humane development” where “the worker exists for the process of production, and not the process of production for the worker”. Rather, the system here operates in the opposite direction (Marx, 1990a, 621).

The factory acts are generalised into the other spheres of production when factory development occurs. Manufactures are turned into factories, handicrafts into manufactures. Marx observes that turning point is twofold in this transition of the spheres of production towards the direction of factory system. First, when capital is subjected to state control, it calls for compensation at all other points; and second, the capitalists cry for “equality in the conditions of competition”, hence for “equality of restraint on the

exploitation of labour” (Marx, 1990a, 621). For example, the large employers under state regulation points to the small workplaces that are not under regulation. It is sure that under these conditions, the smaller places that are the least suitable for labourers will multiply (Marx, 1990a, 622).

In the face of the conditions of labour, the Factory Act Extension Act is issued in 15 August 1867 and the Workshops Regulation Act in 21 August 1867. The former would regulate the large industries, the latter the small ones (Marx, 1990a, 624). These 1867 legislation, which extends the factory legislation into manufacture, handicrafts, and domestic economy, says Marx, is “on the one hand, the necessity imposed on the Parliament of the ruling **classes** of adopting, in principle, such extraordinary and extensive measures against the excess of capitalist exploitation; and, on the other hand, the hesitation, the unwillingness and the bad faith with which it actually put these measures into practice”. The extension act implies the regress from the Factory Act because of many exceptions and compromises with masters. And the workshops regulation act is not effective because of the undermanned staff for its execution (Marx, 1990a, 625).

Marx says that when the factory legislation begins to include all other trades in order to protect “working class both in mind and body” has become “inevitable”, this extension increases the general transformation of the small and independent industries into a large scale one, and implies the capital concentration and hence the domination of the factory system. It also destroys the old transitional forms of capital that are not yet clearly dominating power. But the extension of factory legislation also “generalises the direct struggle against its rule”. “While in each individual workshop it enforces uniformity, regularity, order and economy, the result of the immense impetus given to technical improvement by the limitation and regulation of the working day is to increase the anarchy and the proneness to catastrophe of capitalist production as a whole, the intensity of labour, and the competition of machinery with the worker. By the destruction of small-scale and domestic

industries it destroys the last resorts of the 'redundant population', thereby removing what was previously a safety-valve for the whole social combination of the process of production, it matures the contradictions and antagonisms of the capitalist form of that process, and thereby ripens both the elements for forming a new society and the forces tending towards the overthrow of the old one" (Marx, 1990a, 635).

The above quotation from Marx demonstrates that the factory legislation as a legal form is a product of the development in the capitalist mode of production, including the forces and the relations of production, and exactly for this reason, has a capability for the transformation of the all other production systems into the domination of the factory system. It has power for transformation since it carries the results of the capital's struggle for domination and the balance of the **class** relations. Had not it been the product of the past accumulation and struggle it as a legal form would not be attributed such a transformative capability. This transformation destroys the fixity and security of the worker's life situation (Marx, 1990a, 618), concentrates the labour force, increases the anarchy of production. But by doing these, it matures the social combination of production in return of the problems it creates, and hence it matures the contradictions and antagonisms of its form of production by ripening the elements and the forces operating towards a new society. Here we should note that *contradiction* is an ontological definition that is scientifically established whereas *antagonism* is more or less a conscious conflict between the opposites whose positions are contradictory out of personal consciousness. Immediately we can say that the proof of the existence of any contradiction is provided by the antagonisms that are seen in the conflicting situations. What Marx does in his works is to help the working class aware of the antagonisms of the capitalist form of production process. This help can be accepted as the consciousness given from without if consciousness from without is not understood as an alien consciousness that is produced in favour of the working class and then

tries to be injected upon its existing situation. Marx helps the working class aware of its own antagonistic interest against capitalist **class**.

In addition, Marx's realist ontology follows the origination and the development paths of the contradictions while his epistemology (logic) defines the antagonisms that require the consciousness of conflicting subjects. The latter also demonstrates that conflict and struggle come into agenda when the bearers (*tragers*) of the capitalist mode of production begin to reject or change their bearing roles in the existing situation of the social production. Subjects are bearers, but not always! This is simply because of the ever-existence of the conflicting interests, or antagonisms.

it annihilates the bulwark of the old society, the 'peasant', and substitutes for him the wage-labourer. Thus the need for social transformation, and the antagonism of the **classes**, reaches the same level in the countryside as it has attained in the towns.

Technological application of science replaces the old traditional ways of working.

The capitalist mode of production completes the disintegration of the primitive familial union which bound agriculture and manufacture together when they were both at an undeveloped and childlike stage. But at the same time it creates the material conditions for a new and a higher synthesis, a union of agriculture and industry on the basis of the forms that have developed during the period of their antagonistic isolation. Capitalist production collects the population together in great centres, and causes the urban population to achieve an ever-growing preponderance (Marx, 1990a, 637).

The urbanisation as such has two results for Marx:

On the one hand it concentrates the historical motive power of society; on the other hand it disturbs the metabolic interaction between man and the earth, i.e. it prevents the return to the soil of its constituent elements consumed by man in the form of food and clothing; hence it hinders the operation of the eternal natural condition for the lasting

fertility of the soil. Thus it destroys at the same time the physical health of the urban worker and the intellectual life of the rural worker (Marx, 1990a, 637).

The last definitions are made clearer with Marx's quotation from David Urquhart, who knows and criticises the condition of the time but without comprehending it: "You divide the people into two hostile camps of clownish boors and emasculated dwarfs. Good heavens! A nation divided into agricultural and commercial interests, calling itself sane; nay, styling itself enlightened and civilised, not only in spite of, but in consequence of this monstrous and unnatural division" (Marx, 1990a, 637-38, note 48).

The Production of Absolute and Relative Surplus Value: Here Marx deals with the concept of productive labour, and the bearer of the productive labour, the productive worker. In the simple labour process, the labour is already accepted as productive labour. When the labour process is "purely individual", the worker carries on both the physical and mental functions in the labour process. But, these united functions become separated later on. We have no longer an individual product, but "a social product, the joint product of a collective labourer, i.e. a combination of workers, each of whom stands at a different distance from the actual manipulation of the object of labour". If so, when the co-operative character of the labour process is extended, the concept of the productive labour must also be extended (Marx, 1990a, 643). In the more developed form of labour process, in order "to work productively, it is no longer necessary for the individual himself to put his hand to the object; it is sufficient for him to be an organ of the collective labourer, and to perform any one of its subordinate functions". Marx states that the definition derived from the analysis of the material production itself is also valid for the collective labourer. But the similarity between the individual and collective cases cannot be applied to the persons, or "members taken individually" (Marx, 1990a, 644). To be an organ of the collective labourer by fulfilling one of the functions of the collective labourer may be valid to be able to be a part of the productive labour in collective character. On the other

hand, the extension of the concept as such also narrows the area to which the concept is applied.

Capitalist production is not merely the production of commodities, it is, by its very essence, the production of surplus-value. The worker produces not for himself, but for capital. It is no longer sufficient, therefore, for him simply to produce. He must produce surplus-value. The only worker who is productive is one who produces surplus-value for the capitalist, or in other words contributes towards the self-valorisation of capital (Marx, 1990a, 644).

Marx directly connects the concept of the capitalist mode of production to the production of surplus-value rather than to the production of commodities only. In addition, the production of surplus-value, which is the self-valorisation of capital, requires the capital-relation. This relation must not need necessarily to be occurring in the sphere of material production. Moreover, in the definition of capitalist mode of production, the concept of the surplus-value is far more determining one than the concept of commodity. According to this definition, a columnist in a newspaper or a novelist of a publishing company may be located into the position of productive worker within the capital-relation of the capitalist production.

Under the regime of capital, that the working day is composed only of the necessary labour time, says Marx, is impossible because of capital's dependence on the surplus labour. "Only the abolition of the capitalist form of production would permit the reduction of the working day to the necessary labour-time". Nonetheless, even after this abolition, the latter would expand to include more of the day. This would occur for two reasons: first, living conditions of the workers would improve and "his aspirations become greater", and second, what the surplus labour is now would then be counted as necessary labour required for "the formation of a social fund for reserve and accumulation". But the analysis of capital demonstrates that "The more the productivity of labour increases, the more the working day can be shortened, and the more the working day is shortened, the more the intensity of labour can increase". The productivity in terms of society is also increased

because of the economic use of the labour by economising the means of production and the avoiding the useless labour. Marx observes that while the capitalist mode of production enforces economy in the context of individual business, it “also begets, by its anarchic system of competition, the most outrageous squandering of labour-power and of the social means of production, not to mention the creation of a vast number of functions at present indispensable, but in themselves superfluous” (Marx, 1990a, 667). Marx compares the economies obtained by the individual capitalists with the social costs of the capitalist form of production. This comparison is rather powerful when capitalists’ claim about the productivity of the private capital and the merits of competition.

If “work is more and more evenly divided among all the able-bodied members of society, and a particular social stratum is more and more deprived of the ability to shift the burden of labour (which is necessity imposed by nature) from its own shoulders to those of another social stratum”, socially necessary labour time for material production is shorter, and the socially disposable time for “the free intellectual and social activity of the individual” is greater. From this transformation of time economy, Marx concludes that: “The absolute minimum limit to the shortening of the working day is... the universality (*Allgemeinheit*) of labour. In capitalist society, free time is produced for one **class** by the conversion of the whole lifetime of the masses into labour-time” (Marx, 1990a, 667).

The rate of Surplus-Value: The capital-relation, “namely the fact that variable capital is exchanged for living labour-power, and that the worker is accordingly excluded from the product” is concealed fact by the political economists (Marx, 1990a, 670). Instead of this phenomenon, they demonstrate that “worker and capitalist divide the product in proportion to the different elements which they respectively contribute towards its formation” (Marx, 1990a, 671). Marx says that not only a contribution made by the worker to the value-product, but also an unpaid labour must be taken for

granted. Surplus-labour is nothing but the unpaid labour, and the necessary labour is the paid labour only (Marx, 1990a, 671-72). Hence, Marx says that capital is both the command over labour and unpaid labour. All surplus value is “in substance the materialisation of unpaid labour-time. The secret of the self-valorisation of capital resolves itself into the fact that it has at its disposal a definite quantity of the unpaid labour of other people (*fremder Arbeit*)” (Marx, 1990a, 672).

Wages: The value of labour-power is imagined in “its converted form as wages” (Marx, 1990a, 679). The wage-form conceals “every trace of the division of the working day into necessary labour and surplus-labour, into paid labour and unpaid labour. All labour appears as paid labour” (Marx, 1990a, 680). In wage-labour, unpaid labour appears as paid because “the money-relation conceals the uncompensated labour of the wage-labourer”. But in the “*corvée* system”, the necessary and the surplus labour (compulsory labour) of the serf is clearly distinguished. For this reason, the transformation of the value of labour-power into the form of wages hides the actual relation and “presents to the eye the precise opposite of that relation” (Marx, 1990a, 680). As for the capitalist, Marx states that “he never comes to see that if such a thing as the value of labour really existed, and he really paid this value, no capital would exist, and his money would never be transformed into capital” (Marx, 1990a, 682). In the context of *Time-Wages*, Marx states that the capitalist “does not know that the normal price of labour also includes a definite quantity of unpaid labour, and that this very unpaid labour is the normal source of his profits. The category of surplus labour-time does not exist at all for him, since it is included in the normal working day, which he thinks he has paid for in the day’s wages. But overtime, namely the prolongation of the working day beyond the limits corresponding to the usual price of labour, certainly exist for him. When faced with his underselling competitor, he even insists upon extra pay for his overtime. Again, he does not know that this extra pay also includes unpaid labour” (Marx, 1990a, 690-91).

The form of wages is conditional on the industrial sectors. Time-wages brings the equality between workers. On the other hand, in the case of piece-wages, the capitalist in order to lower the average wage and to prolong the working day in general uses the differences between the labours of workers. The lengthening and the intensifying of the working period becomes the personal interest of the worker (Marx, 1990a, 695-96). In addition, the form of the piece-wage gives to the worker the sense of liberty, individuality, self-control and independence and the competition among workers (Marx, 1990a, 697). In this sense, Marx says that this form is the most suitable form to the capitalist mode of production. From 1797 to 1815, piece-wage was used for the longer working days with lower wages (Marx, 1990a, 968). Another aspect of the piece-wage is the fact that “the quality and intensity of the work are here controlled by the very form of the wage, superintendence of labour becomes to a great extent superfluous” Hence, Marx observes that the modern domestic labour and “a hierarchically organised system of exploitation and oppression” are based on this form. In the latter case, the middlemen interpose between the worker and the capitalist. In England of Marx’s time, this system was called the “sweating system”. In addition, thanks to the piece-wages, capitalist can recruit some workers with a special contract. “Here the exploitation of the worker by capital takes place through the medium of the exploitation of one worker by another” (Marx, 1990a, 965).

When the piece-wages are valid form for an industry, capital increases the quantity of the products within a working day due to the intensification of labour. But this rising productivity of labour only means the lower piece-wages as the quantity of the products rise (Marx, 1990a, 699).

This change in the piece-wage, so far purely nominal, leads to constant struggles between the capitalist and the worker, either because the capitalist uses it as a pretext for actually lowering the price of labour, or because an increase in the productivity of labour is accompanied by an increase in its intensity, or because the worker takes the outward appearance of piece-wages seriously, i.e. he thinks his product is being paid for and not his labour-power, and he therefore resists any reduction in the selling price of the commodity.

'The operatives... carefully watch the price of the raw material and the price of manufactured goods, and are thus enabled to form an accurate estimate of their master's profits' (Marx, 1990a, 699-700).

However, Marx adds that the capitalist "cries out against this presumptuous attempt to lay taxes on the progress of industry, and declares roundly that the productivity of labour does not concern the worker in the least" (Marx, 1990a, 700).

Any claims that can be put forward from the side of the worker for the increased productivity and profits appropriated by the capitalist is rejected by the latter and seen as a tax on the industrial development. The worst thing is that the latter also attempts to decrease even the nominal wages because of the increased productivity.

National Differences in Wages: An analysis of the national differences in wage-levels, the various factors that determine the value of labour-power must be concerned. These factors, says Marx, are "the price and the extent of the prime necessities of life in their natural and historical development, the cost of training the workers, the part played by the labour of women and children, the productivity of labour, and its extensive and intensive magnitude". For any comparison, there is a need for "the prior reduction of the average daily wage for the same trades, in different countries, to a uniform working day" (Marx, 1990a, 701).

The Process of Accumulation of Capital: "The capitalist who produces surplus-value", says Marx, is "admittedly the first appropriator of this surplus-value, but he is by no means its ultimate proprietor". The first appropriator "has to share it afterwards with capitalists who fulfil other functions in social production taken as a whole, with the owner of the land, and with yet other people". If so, surplus-value is divided into various parts. "Its fragments fall to various categories of person, and take on various mutually independent forms, such as profit, interest, gains made through trade, ground rent, etc."

Marx says that the detailed analysis of the circulation of capital would be found in Volume 2 of *Capital* while the “modified forms of surplus-value only in Volume 3” (Marx, 1990a, 709). Marx makes a statement that is valid for the *Volume 1 of Capital*:

we assume here that the capitalist sells the commodities he has produced at their value, and we shall not concern ourselves with their later return to the market, or the new forms that capital assumes while in the sphere of circulation, or the concrete conditions of reproduction hidden within these forms... we treat the capitalist producer as the owner of the entire surplus-value, or perhaps better, as the representative of all those who will share the booty with him.

And for the process of accumulation of capital, he says: “We shall therefore begin by considering accumulation from an abstract point of view, i.e. simply as one aspect of the immediate process of production”. The more important thing is that Marx does not go away the “actual process” although his analysis demands the exclusion of the “phenomena that conceal the workings of its inner mechanism”:

In so far as accumulation actually takes place, the capitalist must have succeeded in selling his commodities, and in reconverting the money shaken loose from them into capital. Moreover, the break-up of surplus-value into various fragments does not affect either its nature or the conditions under which it becomes an element in accumulation. Whatever the proportion of surplus-value which the capitalist producer retains for himself, or yields up to others, he is the one who in the first instance appropriates it. In our presentation of accumulation, then, we assume no more than is assumed by the actual process of accumulation itself. On the other hand, the simple, fundamental form of the process of accumulation is obscured both by the splitting-up of surplus-value and by the mediating movement of circulation. An exact analysis of the process, therefore, demands that we should, for a time, disregard all phenomena that conceal the workings of its inner mechanism (Marx, 1990a, 710).

“In so far as accumulation actually takes place, the capitalist must have succeeded in selling his commodities, and in reconverting the money shaken loose from them into capital”. Here Marx disregards the crisis-prone character of capitalist production.

“the break-up of surplus-value into various fragments does not affect either its nature or the conditions under which it becomes an element in accumulation”. Essential aspect of capitalist production is the production of surplus-value.

“Whatever the proportion of surplus-value which the capitalist producer retains for himself, or yields up to others, he is the one who in the first instance appropriates it”. There must be always capitalist producers so far as accumulation continues.

we assume no more than is assumed by the actual process of accumulation itself”. Marx’s model is the model of the actual process.

Marx’s assumptions also demonstrate the fundamental aspects of his theory of **classes**, which is based on the capitalist producer, to say, productive capital, and productive labourer that is the bearer of productive labour. When capital-relation is established, the **class** relation between the capitalist and the worker is also established in its initial form. The capital-relation, and the **class**-relation corresponding to this, is constructed within the sphere of simple reproduction of capital. Now, let us follow Marx’s analysis of simple reproduction in the *Volume 1 of Capital*. This subject is also concerned also in *Volume 2 of Capital* and in *Volume 3* in an *expanded* scale.

Simple Reproduction: “If production has a capitalist form, so too will reproduction” (Marx, 1990a, 711). For this reason, as regards with our statements above, we must *not* divide the **class** relations into “primary” and “secondary” relations. Rather, we must follow Marx’s division between production and reproduction, which is conceived as “simple” and “expanded”. None of them excludes the other. We must say that **class** relations are produced and reproduced. Moreover, since “The conditions of production are at the same time the conditions of reproduction” (Marx, 1990a, 711), the conditions of **class**-relation is at the same time the condition of the

reproduction of **class**-relation, which is nothing but the formation of **class** relation in the society as a whole.

Simple reproduction assumes that the fruit of the capital-in-process, i.e. surplus-value are consumed by the capitalist, and that “surplus-value acquires the form of a revenue arising out of capital”. Here, reproduction simply means that the process of production is repeated on the same scale. In this process, the worker produces both surplus-value and the variable capital that is paid for to himself since he “is not paid until after he has expended his labour-power” (Marx, 1990a, 712). What is given to the worker in the shape of wage is “a portion of the product he himself continuously reproduces”. His wage, money, is “merely the transmuted form of the product of his labour” (Marx, 1990a, 712). The transaction between the worker, the owner of the labour-power and the capitalist, the owner of the money (here capital), is “veiled by the commodity-form of the product and the money-form of the commodity”. The transformation of the product into commodity and money means that the product of labourer “constantly moves away from him in the form of capital”. In order to explain this transition, Marx refers to the relation between the lord and the peasant who is liable to compulsory work for his lord. The peasant works for himself with his own means of production for a part of the week. For the rest of the week, he is devoted to his compulsory labour for his lord’s domain. His labour-found is not in the money-form. If the lord appropriates the means of production of the peasant to himself, the latter will be “obliged to sell his labour-power to the former”. Hence, the lord “becomes a wage-paying capitalist” (Marx, 1990a, 713). Marx uses the same schema of relation in the *corvée* system for the capitalist production. The transition occurs with the appropriation of the means of production of the producer, the peasant. The difference is in the formation of money-wage. The fact that labourer produces both surplus-value (here consumption fund of the capitalist) and labour-found (variable capital) for himself simply means that the commodities he has previously produced are being converted into money and then are used to pay for his past labour-

power (Marx, 1990a, 712). What Marx means here is that the worker cannot distinguish his necessary and surplus-labour, and his past and present labour. In the *corvée* system, difference between the necessary and surplus-labour is clearly observed because of the temporal succession of the forced labour that is divided from the peasant labour for him. But, even in the capitalist production, “The illusion created by the money-form vanished immediately if, instead of taking a single capitalist and a single worker, we take the whole capitalist **class** and the whole working class”. Marx sees the vanishing point of the illusion in the conception of the **classes** as a whole. He says that: “The capitalist **class** is constantly giving to the working class drafts, in the form of money, on a portion of the product produced by the latter and appropriated by the former. The workers give these drafts back just as constantly to the capitalists, and thereby withdraw from the latter their allotted share of their own product. The transaction is veiled by the commodity-form of the product and the money-form of the commodity” (Marx, 1990a, 713). Wage of the worker operates as a draft between the capitalists. The worker as a commodity producer for one capitalist is also a commodity buyer for another capitalist. In the former case, a portion of the commodity-form of the product is seen as money-wage while in the latter case, as the money-form of another commodity. Hence we can also conclude that a capitalist cannot accumulate capital without the existence of other capitalists. Otherwise, all products must have been bought by the workers. This would simply imply the ignorance of the surplus-value which is not appropriated by the workers themselves. For this very reason, Marx says that the market transaction between the worker and the capitalist is veiled by the commodity-form of the product and the money-form of the commodity. A single capitalist veils his transaction thanks to other capitalist. There must be **class** solidarity among the capitalists simply because they do the same transactions with the workers.

In the case of the transformed relation between the peasant and lord, “the labour found...takes the form of a quantity of capital advanced in the form of

wages by the lord of the land”, and “forced labour is changed into wage-labour”. But at the beginning of this process, says Marx, the capitalist must have possessed of some money in the form of “primitive accumulation” that was provided independently of “the unpaid labour of other people”. This previous, original accumulation can not be counted as variable capital, which is not advanced out of “the capitalist’s found” (Marx, 1990a, 714). The capitalist needs a sum of money before he is able to “frequent the market as a buyer of labour-power”. Marx says that “However this may be, the mere continuity of the process of capitalist production, or simple production, brings about other remarkable transformations which seize hold of not only the variable, but the total capital” (Marx, 1990a, 714).

The mere continuity of the production necessarily at the end “converts all capital into accumulated capital, or capitalised surplus-value”. This occurs simply because in the absence of the surplus-value, originally advanced capital becomes the total consumption of capitalist after a certain period. “After the lapse of a certain number of years, the value of the capital he possesses is equal to the sum total of the surplus-value he has appropriated during those years” (Marx, 1990a, 715). If so, for the transformation of a wealth, a sum of money, into capital, we need more than “the production and circulation of commodities” (Marx, 1990a, 715).

For Marx, “A division between the product of labour and labour itself, between the objective conditions of labour and subjective labour-power, was therefore the real foundation and the starting-point of the process of capitalist production”. What was the starting-point at the beginning becomes the distinctive result of the process of capitalist production by the simple reproduction, which is ever-repeating process for the transformation of wealth into capital. In this process of the formation of capital, while the initial wealth of the capitalist is transformed into capital, the position of the worker does not change according to his entrance to the process when “his own labour has already been alienated (*entfremdet*) from him, appropriated by the capitalist,

and incorporated with capital". On this ground, the labour of the worker "constantly objectifies itself so that it becomes a product alien to him (*fremder Product*)" (Marx, 1990a, 716). The worker himself produces "objective wealth, in the form of capital, an alien power that dominates and exploits him; and the capitalist just as constantly produces labour-power, in the form of a subjective source of wealth which is abstract, exists merely in the physical body of the worker, and is separated from its own means of objectification and realization; in short, the capitalist produces the worker as a wage-labourer". This ever-continuing process of reproduction, "this perpetuation of the worker, is the absolutely necessary condition for capitalist production" (Marx, 1990a, 716).

For the simple reproduction process to start, the labourer is to have been alienated from his objective conditions of labour before the process begins. So, we need a mass of non-propertied population, which is to become wage-labourers. The worker's initial alienation from his means of labour then results in the formation of capital that is the alien product to him. Capital as an alien power is the product of the wage-labourer who is under the control of the capitalist. Capital as the objective wealth is produced by the *worker*, and the *capitalist* constantly produces *labour-power*. Alienation follows alienation. Marx sees the alienation process in a dialectical way. As we have seen in our survey of the thoughts of young Marx, like Hegel, Marx sees the dialectical process as the alienation process. In the criticism of religious ideas and too of the state philosophy of Hegel, he tries to reveal the origin and the development of the alienation according to the subject under consideration. Alienation in every sort is always the alienation of the power from its creator. As seen in the imagination of God, man attributes his generic power to the personality of God. The latter as an imagined creation of the former becomes the real creator of man. The Hegelian left had already revealed this religious alienation before early formation of Marx's thoughts. In *Capital*, while Marx applies the Hegelian dialectic to the critique of the bourgeois political economy, he also demonstrates that dialectical process is also the

development of alienation process. This means that without alienation, dialectic change and development do not take place. Dialectics as the logic of the continuous movement of a contradictory unity is also a search for the solution of the dialectical relation. The latter is the area of conflicts that assume the perception of and the fight against the antagonistic situation that is founded on the contradictory relation. The worker produces and reproduces a power alien to him. This is the contradictory situation. His power changes into his own powerlessness. The situation is the inverse for the capitalist. The *mediation* is the capital-relation established between the worker and the capitalist.

The other characteristic of the dialectical relation is the unequal positions of the elements that establish the dialectical relation among themselves. The base and the result of such a relation is the inequality. In the formation of capital-relation, the sides, the worker as the owner of the labour-power and the capitalist as the owner of money as capital, occupy the unequal positions in terms of contracting power. Thus, we can conclude that the development of dialectical relation is always unequal in terms of its constituting elements. In our case, the worker reproduces his inferiority while the capitalist reproduces his superiority. The abolition of this dialectic relation is possible only when its dialectical mediation is abolished.

And the last thing to mention is the totality, which is ensured by the capital itself. As Marx has demonstrated so far, capital is the transmuted form of labour, alienated form of the labour itself. The unity of the capitalist and the worker is represented by capital and the capitalist and the worker form the opposite poles of capital. On the other hand, since the superior and advantaged pole of capital, which completely favours the situation, is occupied by the capitalist, it is a reality that *capital as a unity* is represented by the capitalist. From the standpoint of social totality, capital is represented by the capitalist **class**.

The worker in his individual consumption “uses the money paid to him for his labour power to buy the means of subsistence” and in his “productive consumption” he works for the capitalist and hence “belongs to the capitalist”. In the former case, “he belongs to himself, and performs his necessary vital functions outside the production process”. In the former, says Marx, “the worker himself continues to live” while in the latter “the capitalist continues to live” (Marx, 1990a, 717). Here Marx seems to say that in order to live the capitalist depends on the worker, while the worker can live by himself. Capital as an objective wealth can be produced without having capitalists. But this cannot be realised without labourers. For this reason, he says that “the capitalist’s most indispensable means of production” is the worker. He must produce and reproduce him. “The maintenance and reproduction of the working class remains a necessary condition for the reproduction of capital. But the capitalist may safely leave this to the worker’s drives for self-preservation and propagation. All the capitalist cares for is to reduce the worker’s individual consumption to the necessary minimum” (Marx, 1990a, 718). This statement is sure valid for the individual consumption of the worker, not for his productive consumption in the labour process by the capitalist because what the individual consumption of the worker increases above the minimum is counted as “unproductive consumption” by “the capitalist and his ideologist, the political economist” (Marx, 1990a, 718). Raising wages and hence increasing consumption as a result of accumulation of capital can be accepted only if they are to be accompanied by an increase in the productive consumption of the labour-power. Otherwise, “additional capital would be consumed unproductively” (Marx, 1990a, 718-19). When it is seen that the worker is the needy individual, he also sees his own individual consumption as unproductive (Marx, 1990a, 719).

“From the standpoint of society”, says Marx, “the working class, even when it stands outside the direct labour process, is just as much an appendage of capital as the lifeless instruments of labour are”. Its individual consumption

within a minimum is an aspect of the capital's reproduction process. That process wants to "prevent the workers, those instruments of production who are possessed of consciousness, from running away, by constantly removing their product from one pole to the other, to the opposite pole of capital". By individual consumption, the workers maintain and reproduce their labour-power and continuously re-appear at the labour market. "The Roman slave was held by chains; the wage-labourer is bound to his owner by invisible threads. The appearance of independence is maintained by a constant change in the person of the individual employer, and by the legal fiction of a contract" (Marx, 1990a, 719). These "invisible threads" are at the very beginning the unequal position of the worker before the capitalist who obtains his power from his capital. But, the threads are not always "invisible". Capital has property right over his consumption of labour-power. Marx says that law enforced this right in former times. For example, mechanics were not permitted to emigrate before 1815 in England. Otherwise, they were subjected to severe punishment (Marx, 1990a, 719).

Reproduction of the working class also requires the accumulation and transmission of the skills through generations (Marx, 1990a, 719). When there emerges a lack of adequate skill, or the working force in some place, capital clearly asserts his property rights over labour-power as seen in demands of capital for the state's intervention in order to transform the "redundant" population to the other places. Such a demand is also made by the working class and by the social other strata as exemplified in England during the time of American Civil War (Marx, 1990a, 720-23).

The capitalist production reproduces the separation between the conditions of labour and labour-power and continuously forces the worker "to sell his labour-power in order to live". Hence, it is the normal state of affairs that the worker confronts the capitalist as the seller of his own labour-power as a commodity. If the worker enters the labour-market as the owner of labour-power, Marx furthers the analysis by saying that "In reality, the worker

belongs to capital before he has sold himself to the capitalist” (Marx, 1990a, 723). If “in reality” the selling act of the worker is realised before, the contract in the market transaction only means that the act is completed in legality. “His economic bondage is at once mediated through, and concealed by, the periodic renewal of the act by which he sells himself, his change of masters, and the oscillations in the market-price of his labour” (Marx, 1990a, 723-24). Periodic renewal of the job acts, the possibility of the different masters at the labour market are the middle terms between the free worker and his bondage. But the latter is also concealed by this mediation since the worker thinks of himself as free owner of his own commodity. And if I interpret Marx’s statement, the market fluctuations in the price of the labour-power seem to be a possibility of free choice for different masters and different jobs; in other words, the wage-differentiation is one of the signals for the labour to move from one sphere to another.

In sum, the capitalist process of production says Marx, “produces not only commodities, not only surplus-value, but it also produces and reproduces the capital-relation itself; on the one hand the capitalist, on the other hand the wage-labourer” (Marx, 1990a, 724). He also refers to his own 1847 lecture in *Deutscher Arbeiterverein* (1849 articles called *Wage Labour and Capital* published in *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*): “capital presupposes wage-labourer; wage-labourer presupposes capital. They reciprocally condition each other’s existence; they reciprocally bring forth each other” (Marx, 1990a, note 21 in 724).

Accumulation of Capital: “Accumulation of capital” is defined by Malthus as “conversion of revenue into capital”, and alternatively as “the employment of apportion of revenue as capital”. For Marx, “The employment of surplus-value as capital, or its reconversion into capital, is called accumulation of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 725). Surplus-value is not the revenue of the capitalist, but the unpaid labour appropriated by the capitalist. The portion of surplus-value that is consumed by the capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 728), “the consumption fund of

the capitalist **class**" (Marx, 1990a, 726), is not concerned by Marx at this stage of the analysis. In addition, he states that he also does not concern at this point with whether the additional capital is joined to the original capital and whether it is used by the same capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 728).

In the process of accumulation of capital, "The cycle of simple reproduction alters its form and, to use Sismondi's expression, changes into a spiral" (Marx, 1990a, 727).

The question of where the original capital came from is answered by the spokesmen of the political economy as "From his own labour and that of his forefathers". But the analysis demonstrates that its source is the unpaid labour. All requirements of the production are the "component parts of the surplus product, parts of the tribute annually exacted from the working class by the capitalist **class**" (Marx, 1990a, 728). "The ownership of past unpaid labour is thenceforth the sole condition for the appropriation of living unpaid labour on a constantly increasing scale. The more the capitalist has accumulated, the more is he able to accumulate" (Marx, 1990a, 729).

If at the beginning of the process, labour-power is purchased with a part of the original capital and at the end of the production process, there emerges a surplus-value as an additional capital; new additional capital too can be the product of the previous additional capital. The purchasing act of the labour-power by the original capital was based on "the laws of appropriation or of private property". But, these laws "become changed into their direct opposite through their own internal and inexorable dialectic". The exchange of the equivalents is turned into "only an apparent exchange" because the portion of capital that purchases the labour-power is merely a portion of the labour of others that has been "appropriated without an equivalent" (Marx, 1990a, 729). The exchange relation between worker and capitalist, says Marx, becomes "a mere form" that is "alien to the content of the transaction itself, and merely mystifies it" (Marx, 1990a, 729-30). "The constant sale and

purchase of labour-power is the form; the content is the constant appropriation by the capitalist, without equivalent, of a portion of the labour of others which has already been objectified” (Marx, 1990a, 730). Formal equality of the market transaction between labour and capital conceals and mystifies the result. At the beginning, as “the rights of property” dictates, the commodity-owners with equal rights come together; at the end, the property becomes a right for the capitalist to appropriate the unpaid labour of others and “impossibility” for the worker to appropriate the product of his own labour. It is evident from here that “The separation of property from labour” is the “necessary consequence of the law of private property that “apparently originated in their identity” (Marx, 1990a, 730). Marx states that the situation the worker confronts here is in complete accordance with the law of exchange. This law “requires equality only between the exchange-values of the commodities given in exchange for one another” and “presupposes a difference between their use-values and it has nothing whatever to do with their consumption, which begins only after the contract has been concluded and executed”. The fact that labour-power is a “particular commodity” possessing “the peculiar use-value of supplying labour, and therefore of creating value”, does not contradict with “the general law of commodity production”. For this reason, the transformation of money into capital is in accordance “with the economic laws of commodity production and with the rights of property derived from them” (Marx, 1990a, 731).

In the market transaction between worker and capitalist, we meet concrete persons who sell and buy the labour-power as commodity that is to be consumed in the process of capitalist production. Here what Marx does is to portray the process from its beginning to its end. But the essential participants of the capitalist accumulation, the worker and the capitalist, lives their life differently in their isolation and in their totality. These different forms of living demands different standards or different analytical tools for the **class** theory:

To be sure, the matter looks quite different if we consider capitalist production in the uninterrupted flow of its renewal, and if, in place of the individual capitalist and the individual worker, we view them in their totality, as the capitalist **class** and the working class confronting each other. But in so doing we should be applying standards entirely foreign to commodity production (Marx, 1990a, 732).

It is sure that the individual capitalist and the worker confront each other in the commodity production is different from the confrontation of the **classes** in society. Marx urges, “since sales and purchases are negotiated solely between particular individuals, it is not admissible to look here for relations between whole social **classes**” (Marx, 1990a, 733). “Only the mutually independent buyer and seller face each other in commodity production” (Marx, 1990a, 733).

The relations between individuals are established by every single act of exchange, but the relations between social **classes** require more than the commodity production. Nonetheless, the latter carries both the characteristics of the commodity relations which can be dealt with in the concrete individual relations and requires the generalisation of the individual cases of the commodity production based on wage-labour in society: “Only where wage-labour is its basis does commodity production impose itself upon society as a whole; but it is also true that only there does it unfold all its hidden potentialities” (Marx, 1990a, 733).

Marx says that “in the period of capitalism ... social wealth becomes to an ever-increasing degree the property of those who are in a position to appropriate the unpaid labour of others over and over again” (Marx, 1990a, 733). The totality of the similarly same positions is also a question of measure, the level of development of the capital’s domination over society. That the elevation of the individual capitalists into a **class** is merely a question of dialectical development from quantity to quality through measure of the domination of the individual capitalist over the production process of social wealth.

The last thing to mention is the significance of the division between simple reproduction and the accumulation of capital. “Looked at concretely, accumulation can be resolved into the production of capital on a progressively increasing scale. The cycle of simple reproduction alters its form and, to use Sismondi’s expression, changes into a spiral” (Marx, 1990a, 727). In addition, as regards with the former case, Marx said that: if the surplus product entered into “the consumption fund of the capitalists”, “nothing but simple reproduction would ever take place” (Marx, 1990a, 726). In other words, in simple reproduction, accumulation of capital does not take place. The later also requires “additional labour” (Marx, 1990a, 727). For this reason, in order to investigate the relations between social **classes**, we must also further the investigation of the process of capital accumulation.

Division of Surplus-Value into Capital and Revenue; the Abstinence Theory: Surplus-value or the surplus-product is composed of both the consumption fund of the capitalist individual and “fund for accumulation”. The former fund is the revenue of the capitalist. The latter is “employed as capital, i.e. it is accumulated”. The capitalist decides the division between them (Marx, 1990a, 738). “Except as capital personified, the capitalist has no historical value, and no right to that historical existence”. “It is only to this extent that the necessity of the capitalist’s own transitory existence is implied in the transitory necessity of the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 1990a, 739). The motivating force of the capitalist as capital personified is not the acquisition of use-values, but the acquisition of exchange-values. His necessity is based on the historical necessity of the capitalist mode of production. He is obliged to accumulate. Otherwise, he loses his capital. Competition externally and coercively subjects the individual capitalist to the laws of capitalist production and enforces him to preserve and extend the wealth in his hand. Nonetheless, he develops the productive forces of society and prepares the foundation of a higher form of society.

He is fanatically intent on the valorisation of value; consequently he ruthlessly forces the human race to produce for production’s sake. In

this way he spurs on the development of society's productive forces, and the creation of those material conditions of production which alone can form the real basis of a higher form of society, a society in which the full and free development of every individual forms the ruling principle. Only as a personification of capital is the capitalist respectable. As such, he shares with the miser an absolute drive towards self-enrichment. But what appears in the miser as the mania of an individual is in the capitalist the effect of a social mechanism in which he is merely a cog. Moreover, the development of capitalist production makes it necessary constantly increase the amount of capital laid out in a given industrial undertaking, and competition subordinates every individual capitalist to the immanent laws of capitalist production, as external and coercive laws. It compels him to keep extending his capital, so as to preserve it, and he can only extend it by means of progressive accumulation (Marx, 1990a, 739).

Capital here is portrayed as *spirit* or *mind* (or that is to say *God*) that embodies itself in the capitalist. It is sure that such an embodiment of the spirit implies that the capitalist is also out of his own control. It is paradoxical that while the spirit provides the subjectivity for the capitalist, it is nothing but the product of labour that has been alienated from the producers. Capital as the product of labour manifests itself in the laws of capitalist production. If so, these laws operate with and through the acts of the capitalists. While Marx reformulates the dialectical development of idea in the form of the dialectical development of the immanent laws of capitalist production, he explains his statements in the post face to the second edition of *Capital 1* in 1873: therein he said:

The spirit, the mind of Hegelian philosophy corresponds to the laws of society and history for Marx. The individuals either favour or suffer from the laws of society. The laws in question are out of control of man. However, while the **class** of capitalists has the immediate interest in the continuation of these laws, the **class** of workers suffers from their operation. The capitalist "ruthlessly forces the human race to produce for production's sake". Here, as we have seen in the analysis of young Marx' thoughts, the workers, the producers represent the human race. The "immanent laws of capitalist production" subordinate the capitalist. Both the capitalist and the

subordination of the capitalists that is inserted by the law of capitalist production subordinate the workers.

As the actions of capitalist are “a mere function of capital - endowed as capital is, in his person, with consciousness and a will - his own private consumption counts as a robbery committed against the accumulation of his capital” (Marx, 1990a, 739). The capitalist is sort of conqueror. “Accumulation is the conquest of the world of social wealth” (Marx, 1990a, 739).

The accumulated wealth of the capitalist is not the non-consumed part of the surplus-value appropriated by him. Marx says that when Owenism in Britain and the Saint-Simonism and Fourierism in the Continent began to spread after the July Revolution (Marx, 1990a, 743-44), “The hour of vulgar economics had arrived” and the abstinence theory was proclaimed by Nassau W. Senior. He argued that the capital was the abstinence on the part of the capitalist and later on claimed that the profit of capital was “the unpaid ‘last hour of the twelve hours of labour’” (Marx, 1990a, 744). Moreover, “the conditions necessary for the labour process are ... converted into acts of abstinence on the part of the capitalist” (Marx, 1990a, 744). But, Marx replies that “In economic formations of society of the most diverse kinds”, there occurs “reproduction on an increasing scale” (Marx, 1990a, 745). Furthermore, this does not occur necessarily like the process of capital accumulation and not necessarily appear as the function of a capitalist (Marx, 1990a, 745-46).

“Labour transmits to the product the value of the means of production consumed by it” (Marx, 1990a, 754). The instruments of labour “lose their value piecemeal, and transfer that value to the product only bit by bit”. This is the “free service of past labour” that is “filled with vitality by living labour, accumulates progressively as accumulation takes place on a larger and larger scale” (Marx, 1990a, 757). But, “the powers of labour project themselves as powers of capital, just as all the value-forms of the commodity

do as forms of money” (Marx, 1990a, 756). In the circles of bourgeois citizens and political economists, the service of past labour is seen as “the assets of the non-worker X”, says Marx: “The ever-growing weight of the assistance given by past labour to the living labour process in the form of means of production is ... attributed to that form of past labour in which it is alienated (*entfremdet*), as unpaid labour, from the worker himself, i.e. it is attributed to its form as capital” (Marx, 1990a, 757).

The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation: A Growing Demand for Labour-Power Accompanies Accumulation If the Composition of Capital Remains the Same: “The growth of capital, says Marx, implies growth of its variable constituent”. This then implies the rising demand for labour-power. In such a case where the composition of capital remains the same since the demand for labour increase in the “same proportion as the capital, and with the same rapidity”, the wages may rise. This phenomenon was the problem of the English capitalists during the whole of fifteenth century, and the first half of the eighteenth century. Nonetheless, the workers cannot be seen in an advantageous position since the fundamental character of capitalist production remains the same. “As simple reproduction constantly reproduces the capital-relation itself, i.e. the presence of capitalists on the one side, and wage-labourers on the other side, so reproduction on an expanded scale, with more capitalists, or bigger capitalist, at one pole, and more wage-labourers at the other pole” (Marx, 1990a, 763). The reproduction of labour-power is only a factor for the capital to reproduce itself. Its “enslavement to capital is only concealed by the variety of individual capitalists to whom it sells itself” (Marx, 1990a, 763-64).

“Accumulation of capital is therefore multiplication of the proletariat”. Marx says that **Classical** political economy was so aware of this fact that Smith, Ricardo, etc. even identified accumulation with “the transformation of the surplus product into additional wage-labourers”. John Bellers saw the “labour of the poor” as “the mines of the rich” in 1696 (Marx, 1990a, 764). At the

beginning of the eighteenth century, Bernard de Mandeville, in his *The Fable of the Bees* in 1728, also approached the fact in terms of property and wage levels. He said that “The only thing then that can render the labouring man industrious, is a moderate quantity of money, for as too little will ... either dispirit or make him desperate, so too much will make him insolent and lazy”, and also stated that “in a free nation, where slaves are not allowed of, the surest wealth consists in a multitude of laborious poor”. This “honest man with a clear mind”, says Marx, also described the happy society: “To make the society, (which of course consists of non-workers, Marx adds), happy and people easier under the meanest circumstances, it is requisite that great numbers of them should be ignorant as well as poor; knowledge both enlarges and multiplies our desires, and the fewer things a man wishes for, the more easily his necessities may be supplied”. Marx states that what Mandeville had not understood is the fact that accumulation not only increases the mass of capital but also the mass of the “labouring poor” (Marx, 1990a, 765). Marx in his footnote 3 also quotes from the same writer who said that “Temperate living and constant employment is the direct road, for the poor, to rational happiness (by which the author means the longest possible working days and the smallest possible amount of the means of subsistence, Marx adds), and to riches and strength for the state (namely for the landowners, capitalist, and their political dignitaries and agents, Marx adds) (Marx, 1990a, 765, quoted from the writer’s *An Essay on Trade and Commerce*, 1770).

Marx says that the analysis up this point demonstrates “most favourable” conditions for the workers, “their relation of independence on capital takes on forms which are endurable”, “easy and liberal” as Eden says. What occurs is the extension of capital’s exploitation and domination and hence the extension of the mass of people subordinated by it (Marx, 1990a, 768-69). Nonetheless, “at the best of the times”, rising wages “means only a quantitative reduction in the amount of unpaid labour the worker has to

supply". However, a reduction as such cannot be furthered to a point where the system is threatened (Marx, 1990a, 769-70).

If the price of labour rises because of capital accumulation, the rise is allowed since either it does not thread the accumulation, or the rate of accumulation lessens. In the former case, stock increases and exploitable labour-power is rendered insufficient by capital. In the second case, "the relative reduction in the amount of capital" causes "the exploitable labour-power, or rather its price, to be in excess". Marx says that "The mechanism of capitalist production process removes the very obstacle it temporally creates. The price of labour falls again to a level corresponding with capital's requirements for self-valorisation" (Marx, 1990a, 770). What Marx demonstrates in both alternatives is that the diminished or increased rate of the increase in labour-power or working population is the result of the increase in capital or of the relative reduction for capital. The converse is not true. "To put it mathematically: the rate of accumulation is the independent, not the dependent variable; the rate of wages is the dependent, not the independent variable". The question is whether the workable or exploitable population is insufficient or existed in excess for capital. The "movements of the accumulation of capital" are "reflected as relative movements of the mass of exploitable labour-power" (Marx, 1990a, 770).

The transition from handicrafts to capitalist industry, which is called "primitive accumulation", is the "historical basis, instead of the historical result, of specifically capitalist production". The primitive accumulation is the "starting-point" and contains the methods for the increased production of surplus-value that is the latter element of accumulation. Thanks to its methods, capital is produced by capital and there emerges a ground for the extended scale of production (Marx, 1990a, 775). A certain degree of accumulation is presupposed for "the specifically capitalist mode of production". The accumulation of capital develops the latter, and the latter develops the former (Marx, 1990a, 776).

Marx divides capital into individual and social capital. "Every individual capital is a larger or smaller concentration of means of production, with a corresponding command over a larger or smaller army of workers". The social capital grows with the growth of many individual capitals. In this process, "offshoots split off from the original capitals and start to function as new and independent capitals". Marx says that "the division of property within capitalist families plays a great part in this". The accumulation of capital implies the growing numbers of the capitalists. The "part of the social capital domiciled in each particular sphere of production is divided among many capitalists who confront each other as mutually independent and competitive commodity-producers". Therefore, accumulation and concentration is "scattered over many points" and the increase of the individually functioning capitals lead into the formation of new capitals and the inner-divisions of old (Marx, 1990a, 776). Accumulation creates both concentration of the means of production and "repulsion of many individual capitals from one another". But, such a fragmentation of the total social capital is counteracted by the transformation of the small capitals into few large capitals, in other words, by "expropriation of capitalist by capitalist". The concentration of capitals that has already formed means only a new distribution among the capitalists and differs from the concentration of the means of production in the process of accumulation. It is not constrained by the limits of accumulation. What occurs here, says Marx: "Capital grows to a huge mass in a single hand in one place, because it has been lost by many in another place. This is centralisation proper, as distinct from accumulation and concentration" (Marx, 1990a, 777). The centralisation process is set into motion against the fragmentation of the total social capital. It is "concentration of capitals already formed, destruction of their individual independence" (Marx, 1990a, 777).

How a capital is attracted by another capital, or how the centralisation of capital occurs is seen in "The battle of competition" that is "fought by the cheapening of commodities", "on the productivity of labour", and hence "on the scale of production". Victor is determined by the fact that "the larger

capitals beat the smaller”. Marx also recalls that “with the development of the capitalist mode of production, there is an increase in the minimum amount of individual capital necessary to carry on a business under its normal conditions”. For this reason, the smaller capitals enter the production spheres which are not under the complete control of the large-scale-industry. Competition rises with the increasing number of the capitals and decreases with the growing magnitude of the rival capitals. “It always ends in the ruin of many small capitalists, whose capitals partly pass into the hands of their conquerors, and partly vanish completely” (Marx, 1990a, 777).

Another “new force” comes into agenda with the development of capitalist production, “the credit system”. At the beginning of its development, the credit system is “the humble assistant of accumulation”. The money resources is scattered over “the surface of society”. But, in time it “becomes a new and terrible weapon in the battle of competition and is finally transformed into an enormous social mechanism for the centralisation of capitals” (Marx, 1990a, 777-78). Competition and credit become “the two most powerful levers of centralisation”. The accumulation progress and the expansion of capitalist production also create “the social need” and the “technical means” for new industrial businesses which presupposes the previously centralised capital. “Today, therefore, the force of attraction which draws together individual capitals, and the tendency to centralisation, are both stronger than ever before”. The limit of the centralisation is the united social capital under the control of a single capitalist or a single capitalist company (Marx, 1990a, 779).

The Progressive Production of a Relative Surplus Population or Industrial Reserve Army: The accumulation of capital is at the beginning a quantitative change. However, such change becomes a qualitative one in a certain point of its development through the change in the composition of capital. The latter means an increase in the constant part of capital in comparison to its variable part. From this observation, Marx concludes that

“Since the demand for labour is determined not by the extent of the total capital but by its variable constituent alone, that demand falls progressively with the growth of the total capital” (Marx, 1990a, 781). The demand for labour increases absolutely, but “in a constantly diminishing proportion” (Marx, 1990a, 782). The “accelerated relative diminution” of the variable capital, which accompanies the accelerated increase of the total capital and moves more rapidly than this increase, takes the inverse form, at the other pole, of an apparently absolute increase in the working population, an increase which always moves more rapidly than that of the variable capital or the means of employment”. As capital accumulates more and more capital, it begins to demand less and less labour-power. “But in fact it is capitalist accumulation itself that constantly produces, and produces indeed in direct relation with its own energy and extent, a relatively redundant working population, i.e. a population which is superfluous to capital’s average requirements for its own valorisation, and is therefore a surplus population” (Marx, 1990a, 782). The working population produces “the means by which it is itself made relatively superfluous” (Marx, 1990a, 783). Marx deduces from this relation between the accumulation of capital and the necessary amount of the working population “a law of population peculiar to the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 1990a, 783-84). He adds that “every particular historical mode of production has its own special laws of population”. Only the plants and animals that are not subject to the human intervention can have an abstract law of population (Marx, 1990a, 784).

The redundant, surplus working population is not only a product of the capitalist accumulation, but also a “lever” of it and “a condition for the existence of capitalist mode of production”. It is “a disposable industrial reserve army, which belongs to capital”. Capital “creates a mass of human material always ready for exploitation” (Marx, 1990a, 784).

With accumulation, capital gains more flexibility for its own transformation in terms of technical composition and in terms of the new branches of industry.

For this elasticity of capital, “there must be the possibility of suddenly throwing great masses of men into the decisive areas without doing any damage to the scale of production of other spheres. The surplus population supplies these masses”. The development of the modern industry demonstrates “a decennial cycle (interrupted by smaller oscillations) of periods of average activity, production at high pressure, crisis and stagnation” and “depends on the constant formation, the greater or less absorption, and the re-formation of the industrial reserve army or surplus population”. Some phases of the business (industrial) cycle energetically produce the surplus population. Meanwhile, Marx says that “cyclical path of modern industry” is seen with the advance of capitalist production (Marx, 1990a, 785).

The natural increase of the disposable labour-power is not enough for the capitalist production. It needs industrial reserve army that is not conditional on the natural limits (Marx, 1990a, 788).

With the advance of accumulation and hence with the development of capitalist production, capitalists also can set in motion more labour by great exploitation with the same amount of variable capital. In order to do this, skilled workers are replaced with less skilled, mature labour-power with immature, male with female (Marx, 1990a, 788).

The relative surplus population is produced more rapidly than the technical transformation of production and than the corresponding diminution of the variable capital in comparison to the constant capital. As the labour productivity increases, supply of labour increases more quickly than the demand for labourers. The result is on the one side, the over-work of the employed workers, and the production of industrial reserve army, on the other side. “The condemnation of one part of the working class to enforced idleness by the over-work of the other part, and vice versa, becomes a means of enriching the individual capitalists, and accelerates at the same

time the production of the industrial reserve army on a scale corresponding with the progress of social accumulation” (Marx, 1990a, 789-790). The reserve also competes with the employed workers, “forces them to submit to over-work, and subjects them to the dictates of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 789).

The general wage levels are “exclusively regulated” by the amount of the industrial reserve army, which “in turn corresponds to the periodic alternations of the industrial cycle”. The wage levels are not determined by the numbers of the working population, but by the changing proportions between “an active army” and “a reserve army” of the working class. Marx observes that “It would be utterly absurd” to say that “the movement of capital depended simply on the movement of population”. The labour-market becomes relatively under-supplied since capital is expanding. While the former becomes relatively over-supplied since the latter is contracting. “The appropriate law for modern industry”, says Marx, “is the law of the regulation of the demand and supply of labour by the alternate expansion and contraction of capital, i.e. by the level of capital’s valorisation requirements at the relevant point” (Marx, 1990a, 790).

As for the raising wages, Marx states that, according to “the dogma of the economists”, wages rise with accumulation. Rising wages increase the working population. This condition goes on till the labour-market becomes over-supplied. When capital becomes insufficient, wages begin to fall till capital becomes in excess again in relation to workers. The process turns back and wages rise again. Against this, Marx states that “Before the rise in wages would produce any positive increase of the population really fit for work, the deadline would long since have passed within which the industrial campaign would have to have been carried through, and the battle fought to a conclusive finish” (Marx, 1990a, 790-91). As an example, Marx refers to the rising wages in the English agricultural districts between 1849 and 1859. He says that with the wage increases, which were the result of “the unusual exodus” of the working population in the war times, and of the infrastructural

development and of the expansion of factories, etc., the farmers did not wait for the multiplication of the agricultural workers, but they applied to machinery and increased the productivity of labour. Hence, the demand for labour fell (Marx, 1990a, 791). Marx says that “economic fiction” confuses the movement of wages with the distribution of the working population into different production areas (Marx, 1990a, 791-92). For example, in a favourable condition, accumulation may be attracting additional capital in a sphere of production in which profits are greater than the average profits. There, the demand for labour rises and hence the wages rises. The higher wages begin to attract additional working population until labour-power becomes over-supplied and hence till the wage levels begin to fall to their average level or below it. Then new workers do not come to this production area, but begin to go to other areas. What occurs here is nothing but the “local oscillations of the labour-market in a particular sphere of production”, or “the distribution of the working population into the different spheres of outlay of capital, according to its varying needs” (Marx, 1990a, 792).

The industrial reserve army is a pressure over “the active army of the workers” during “the periods of stagnation and average prosperity”; it limits their demands during “the periods of over-production and feverish activity”. “The relative surplus population is therefore the background against which the law of the demand and supply of labour does its work. It confines the field of actions of this law to the limits absolutely convenient to capital’s drive to exploit and dominate the workers” (Marx, 1990a, 792).

The development of capitalist production and hence accumulation of capital does not create the same amount of employment for labour in the proportion of its increase. It employs less labour and the redundant workers increase. When capital employs a greater number of workers, “the general demand for labour increases only to the extent of the excess of the employed over those ‘set free’ ”. Marx refers to a mechanism of capitalist production that “takes care that the absolute increase of capital is not accompanied by a

corresponding rise in the general demand for labour". Just as the demand for labour is not accompanied with the increase of capital, labour supply is not accompanied with the increase of the working class. When capital accumulation increases the demand for labour on the one side, it sets free the workers on the other side. In addition, the unemployed workers force the employed ones to the over-work. This means that reserve army makes "the supply of labour" independent of "the supply of workers". The law of supply and demand, says Marx, "completes the despotism of capital" (Marx, 1990a, 793).

The workers can recognise the logic of these laws that operates against their interests: "as soon as the workers learn the secret of why it happens that the more they work, the more alien wealth they produce, and that the more the productivity of their labour increases, the more does their very function as a means for the valorisation of capital become precarious; as soon as they discover that the degree of intensity of the competition amongst themselves depends wholly on the pressure of the relative surplus population; as soon as, by setting up trade unions, etc., they try to organise planned co-operation between the employed and the unemployed in order to obviate or to weaken the ruinous effects of this natural law of capitalist production on their **class**, so soon does capital and its sycophant, political economy, cry out at the infringement of the 'eternal' and so to speak 'sacred' law of supply and demand" (Marx, 1990a, 793). When the employed and unemployed is combined, "the 'pure' action of this law" is disturbed (Marx, 1990a, 793-94). If a circumstance that prevents the emergence of the reserve army come into existence and "the absolute dependence of the working class upon the capitalist **class**", "capital ... rebels against the 'sacred' law of supply and demand, and tries to make up for its inadequacies by forcible means" (Marx, 1990a, 794).

Different forms of the relative surplus population: The relative surplus population refers to the workers who are either partially employed or wholly

unemployed. It possesses three forms such as “floating”, “the latent” and “the stagnant”. The first form is the constant decrease of the employment of the workers with the increasing scale of production. This is the situation in the centres of modern industry. The majority of workers are dismissed with the expansion of industry. Some workers immigrate to the place where capital has emigrated. As a result, female population becomes greater than that of the males (Marx, 1990a, 794). It is a contradiction that in some places a shortage of workers is seen, while in other places many workers are dismissed from their jobs. In addition, since labour-power is rapidly consumed by capital, workers’ life expectancy falls and they fall into the lower positions of the surplus population. “Under these circumstances, the absolute increase of this section of the proletariat must take a form which swells their numbers, despite the rapid wastage of their individual elements. Hence the rapid replacement of one generation of workers by another (this law does not hold for the other **classes** of the population). This social requirement is met by early marriages, which are a necessary consequence of the conditions in which workers in large scale-industry live, and by the premium that the exploitation of the workers’ children sets on their production” (Marx, 1990a, 795). We are introduced here by Marx that the laws of society is not only historically determined but also **class** determined. Low life expectancy leads the workers to marry in the early ages and make them have more children for the rapid replacement of the workers’ generation and for the exploitation of child labour.

When capitalist production penetrates into the agriculture, the demand for rural labour absolutely falls. The new workers attracted with the accumulation of capital do not compensate the repulsion of the workers. This is the similar situation with the non-agricultural industries (Marx, 1990a, 795-96). Consequently, some part of the agricultural population constantly is turned to “an urban or manufacturing proletariat”. But the movement of this relative surplus population to the towns presupposes “a constant latent surplus population” in the countryside. “The wages of the agricultural labourer are

therefore reduced to a minimum, and he always stands with one foot already in the swamp of pauperism” (796).

The stagnant form of the relative surplus population is the part of the active labour army that is at a large degree irregularly employed. For capital, it is “an inexhaustible reservoir of disposable labour-power”. Its living conditions are below the average conditions of the working class. For this reason, Marx says that it forms a foundation for “the special branches of capitalist exploitation”. Low wage levels and over-work characterise the stagnant surplus population. Its perfect example is seen in “the rubric of ‘domestic industry’”. Its source is the redundant population that is produced in large-scale industry and agriculture and at a larger degree than this, in the transitional areas where handicraft is turned into manufacture and manufacture to machinery. This part of the working class reproduces itself and forms a greater part in proportion with the general increase of the **class** (Marx, 1990a, 796). “In fact, not only the number of births and deaths, but the absolute size of families, stand in inverse proportion to the level of wages, and therefore to the amount of the means of subsistence at the disposal of different categories of worker”. Marx quotes from Adam Smith, who says that “Poverty seems favourable to generation”; and from S. Laing who states that “If the people were all in easy circumstances, the world would soon be depopulated” (Marx, 1990a, 797, note 22). For “This law of capitalist society”, Marx says that “It calls to mind the boundless reproduction of animals individually weak and constantly hunted down” (Marx, 1990a, 797). Since it is weak and short-lived, it must rapidly and abundantly generate and reproduce itself.

The last category Marx portrays is “the lumpenproletariat”. It is “the lowest sediment of the relative surplus population” that “dwells in the sphere of pauperism”. The “actual” part of this category is “vagabonds, criminals, prostitutes”. Marx divides this “social stratum”, i.e. the lumpenproletariat, into three sub categories. First sub-category refers to “those able to work”.

Paupers that are the products of the trade crisis and that diminish with the revival of trade. Second sub-category is composed of the, “orphans and pauper children”, who are “candidates for the industrial reserve army”. In the prosperous times, they rapidly participate in “the army of active workers”. Third sub-category consists of “the demoralised, the ragged, and those unable to work, chiefly people who succumb to their incapacity for adaptation, an incapacity which results from the division of labour; people who have lived beyond the worker’s average life-span; and the victims of industry, whose number increases with the growth of dangerous machinery, of mines, chemical works, etc., the mutilated, the sickly, the widows, etc.”. This extreme misery, “pauperism”, is “the hospital of the active labour-army and the dead weight of the industrial reserve army”. Marx observes that the pauperism is necessarily produced with the production of the relative surplus population. Hence it is “a condition of capitalist production, and of the capitalist development of wealth”. It is sure that pauperism is also an unwanted expense, “the *faux frais*” of capitalist production. But, “capital usually knows how to transfer these from its own shoulders to those of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie” (Marx, 1990a, 797).

The industrial reserve army increases with the growth of the social wealth and with the productivity of labour and with the growth of the absolute numbers of the proletariat. The greater the reserve army in proportion to the total numbers of the active labour-army, the more consolidated is the surplus population. Thus the more extensive the miserable parts of the working class and the industrial reserve army; the more the “official pauperism” is recognised. “*This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation*”. However, Marx says that since it is a law, it is “modified in its working by many circumstances”. The numerical adaptation of the workers to the requirements of capital is a foolish demand of “the economic wisdom”. The adaptation is “the misery of constantly expanding strata of the active army of labour, and the dead weight of pauperism” (Marx, 1990a, 798). It is “the law by which a constantly increasing quantity of means of production may be set

in motion by a progressively diminishing expenditure of human power". The rising productivity of labour presses upon the means of employment of the workers and makes their existential conditions more precarious. Under capitalism, "the working population always increases more rapidly than the valorisation requirements of capital" (Marx, 1990a, 798). Social productivity increases at the cost of the individual worker. This paradox is a result of "a dialectical inversion" under which "all means for the development of production" become "means of domination and exploitation of the producers". The methods for productivity and development "distort the worker into a fragment of a man, they degrade him to a level of an appendage of a machine, they destroy the actual content of his labour by turning it into a torment; they alienate (*entfremden*) from him the intellectual potentialities of the labour process in the same proportion as science is incorporated in it as an independent power; they deform the conditions under which he works, subject him during the labour process to a despotism the more hateful for its meanness; they transform his life-time into working-time, and drag his wife and child beneath the wheels of the juggernaut of capital". These methods are developed with the methods for the production of surplus-value and hence with the methods of accumulation. For this very reason, "in proportion as capital accumulates, the situation of the worker, be his payment high or low, must grow worse" (Marx, 1990a, 799).

As Marx has presented, such a contradictory development of capitalist production is clearly seen in the simultaneous accumulation of wealth and misery at the opposite poles. At the pole of "the **class** that produces its own product as capital", necessary condition of accumulation manifests itself as "the torment of labour, slavery, ignorance, brutalisation and moral degradation", whereas at the other pole, wealth is accumulated. Ever worsening situation of the worker is the product, and the reason of "the law which always holds the relative surplus population or industrial reserve army in equilibrium with the extent and energy of accumulation" and that "rivets the worker to capital more firmly than the wedges of Hephaestus held

Prometheus to the rock” (Marx, 1990a, 799). The contradictory results of this law, accumulation of wealth and misery at the same time, are the “antagonistic character of capitalist accumulation” (Marx, 1990a, 799), which had been regarded by the political economists such as Ortes as “a universal law of social wealth”, Townsend as the system of God and Nature (Marx, 1990a, 800-802).

Instead of using architectural metaphors, which seem to lead inevitably to non-dialectical approach, Marx’s *Capital* offers us the centres and of the axis of capitalist society in a similar way a Marxist (urban) *planner* does for the capitalist (urban) system. Marx makes a *revolutionary plan* and for this purpose, he analyses and evaluates the existing situation in order to understand the conditions of the revolution. *Capital* seems to be the *synthetic map of Marx’s revolutionary plans*.

The Reasons behind Crises: the Nature of Capital: The Volume 2 of Capital (Marx, 1992a) deals with the process of reproduction of capital, which includes the circulation process of capital. The problem here is not only the production of capital but also how its reproduction takes place. The analysis of reproduction as such aims at demonstrating the crisis prone character of capitalist production, which is a necessary product of the movement of capital in its nature. Capitalist production necessarily leads into crises, which are inevitable as long as material production are realised under the capitalist mode of production. Crises are the necessary products of the contradictory dynamics of capital itself.

Production assumes and conditions the consumption. The production is also the productive consumption of the material elements of production. Besides this “industrial consumption” (Marx, 1999b, 453), the individuals consumes in order to live. But this is the unproductive consumption in terms of the capitalist production. The question for the accumulation of capital is not only the individual consumption, but also, the “industrial consumption”, the

consumption of labour (Marx, 1999b, 453-4). Marx divides the total social product into two great departments: means of production and means of consumption. The former covers the commodities that enter productive consumption and the latter consists of commodities that enter individual consumption (Marx, 1992a, 471). The relation between production and consumption in general is always unequal and disproportional. This is first of all the result of the reproduction of constant capital and hence productive consumption of capital. "The more the proportion of constant capital used in a country is, the more the part of the constant capital that is consumed in the production of constant capital and express itself not only in the greater amount of products but also increases the value of these products is" The such an increase in value and amount of the products occurs even if the annual labour remains the same and is important for an understanding of "*capital accumulation*" (Marx, 1999b, 456).

If capital not only reproduces itself, but also accumulates, a part of surplus-value must be turned into capital rather than consumed as revenue. This part is turned into partially constant capital and partially variable capital according to the given organic composition of capital. The highly developed production entails that amount of surplus-value that is turned into constant capital must be more than its part that is to be transformed into variable capital (Marx, 1999b, 460). For this transformation, capital needs labour reserve. This need is met with the transformation of previously unproductive workers into productive ones, or of previously unemployed part of population such as women, children, or vagabond poor. This transformation increases the working population. The other source of labour power is the general rise of population which may raise the absolute number of working population. Marx says that a certain and continuous accumulation of capital requires the absolute increase in population. "*Raising population*" is the foundation of continuous capital accumulation. However, for such an increase assumes average wages (Marx, 1999b, 460).

For the transformation of surplus-value into constant capital, similarly, requires constant capital reserve with both its fixed and circulating components, at hand, i.e. at the market. All capitalist producers, depending on the input-output connection among the different parts of production, are at the same position. Each of them makes additional supply for additional demand for the other capitalist. This is the condition for continuous accumulation of particular capitals and capital in general (Marx, 1999b, 460-62).

For some capitalists such as machine producers to reproduce their capital even at the same scale, there must be an expanding reproduction at the other spheres of production such as those who use these machines. Even more, if these machine producers make capital accumulation, the other spheres must make far more capital accumulation (Marx, 1999b, 463).

In the chain of input-output among the capitalist producers, any over-supply of one capitalist that is accompanied with the lack of demand on the part of another capitalist at the later phase of production means unnecessary production or stock formation for himself (Marx, 1999b, 464). Marx asks that if we have capital accumulation in general, what the general condition of accumulation is. The answer is that "*the conditions of accumulation are the same with the initial conditions of its production and reproduction*". A part of money must be transformed into variable capital and constant capital that are at the market as commodities (Marx, 1999b, 465). The development of capitalist production provides these commodities at the market. This is provided with the fact that each capital tries to produce commodity as much as possible, and each capital tries to capture market as much as possible. Competition to exclude the others is the nature of capitalist production (Marx, 1999b, 466). Here Marx says that he does not yet concerns with the over-accumulation of money capital, over-accumulation of commodity capital and assumes that commodities are sold at their values (Marx, 1999b, 466). But what takes place is the reverse that additional accumulation of capital in one

sphere assumes the *simultaneous* and *parallel* additional production in its other spheres of production. For this reason, “for accumulation to take place, all other spheres must make *over-production*” (Marx, 1999b, 467).

The process of accumulation depends on the expanding of production scale. The criteria of such an expansion are “not any way *consumption*” but “*capital* itself” and “the limitless aspirations of capitalists for their wealth and their capital’s expansion”. In addition, consumption is constrained at the beginning since large part of population and the working people can expand their consumption within narrow limits and since demand for labour decreases relatively with the development of capitalism. Moreover, disproportions of capital between different spheres of production are accidentally eliminated and corrected continuously and frequently by force (Marx, 1999b, 473).

Marx says that he here concerns with the different forms of capital in its development, not real conditions of actual production. He also states that he does not analyse actual pattern of society that does **not consist of only two classes** composed of workers and industrial capitalists and in which **consumers and producers are not the same category**. In his analysis, it is also assumed that there is neither competition among capitalists and nor credit system. The number of consumers is more than that of producers and their form of spending and the amount of their income are very decisive in the circulation and reproduction of capital. Nonetheless, as in the case of money, analysis of capital in general demonstrates the possibilities of crises within itself (Marx, 1999b, 474).

The aim of capitalist production is not the production of use-values, but exchange value and hence the expansion of surplus-value. In order to conceal the contradictory nature of capitalist production, Marx says, it is argued that production is made for the satisfaction of consumption of producers. But capitalist production has not such a driving force (Marx, 1999b, 476).

The de-valorisation of commodities and destruction of capital is caused by the fall in the commodity prices. However, this does not mean that any use-value is destroyed. The only thing that occurs is the transfer of capital from one hand to another. The old capitalist becomes bankrupted. It is sure, new capitalist who obtains his capital cheaply from the bankrupted will make more money when market recovers. Nonetheless, a part of old capital's exchange value has been destroyed. In such situation, the **class** of money proprietor capitalists becomes rich at the expense of industrial capitalists (Marx, 1999b, 476-7).

Possibility for Crises existing in the Nature of the Internal Contradiction between Commodity and Money: Ricardo rejects the idea of over-production by saying that the use of capital depends on the individual preferences of capitalist. When he sees over-production, prices fall below the natural prices and then transfer his capital into area that is more profitable. Ricardo also accepts that money is only the means of exchange (Marx, 1999b, 480).

Here Marx gives his **dialectical** answers to these sorts of definitions that depend on the unity of selling and buying, or of demand and supply, which rejects contradiction in favour of unity. For Marx, as we have seen in the *Volume I of Capital*, capital has different phases in its metamorphoses such as money capital, productive or functioning capital and commodity capital. On the other hand, product under capitalist production is commodity, which divides itself into commodity and money. Commodity has both use-value and exchange value, and money is both a means of payment, a means of circulation and capital. It is also general commodity, or general social labour which represents all other commodities according to its price. These different forms or phases of capital, money and commodity are not perfectly elaborated in a dialectical way, if not confused, by classical political economy. Marx states that if selling and buying represents the unity of two processes, or the movement of single process, the movement is also the division of these two phases or independence from each other. It is indeed

true to say that any unity assumes an initial division, and any division, similarly assumes an initial unity. As in the case of selling and buying, their unity only appears through crises. The latter proclaims the unity of the parts that have become independent from each other and assumes an internal unity of these parts. But, economist thinks that, says Marx, crises never happen since there is a unity (Marx, 1999b, 481). To accept that products are exchanged with other products or bought with services is to ignore the contradiction between exchange-value and use-value within the commodity. It is to see the commodity merely as a product, a use-value, and the circulation of commodities merely as barter between products, or use-values (Marx, 1999b, 481-2). These arguments go back even to the time before simple commodity production, put aside pre-capitalist production. They do not see commodity production as the first condition of the capitalist production and commodity to be transformed into money. In addition, the peculiar use and characteristic of wage-labourer, that it creates surplus-value, is concealed and peculiar relation in which commodities and money are transformed into capital is ignored. Marx thinks that **service** is only the labour that is seen as the use-value and secondarily important problematic under capitalist production. The money, on the other hand, is not only a means for the exchange of products, but also must express itself as exchange-value, general social labour, and is fundamental and necessary existential form of commodity. Here, since the commodity is transformed into a mere use-value, or product, essence of the exchange-value is concealed and the fact that money is an appearance of commodity and is independent from the original shape of the commodity through its metamorphoses is easily rejected. But the first elements of capitalist production, which is the existence of products as commodities and the division of the later into commodity and money, and lastly the relationship between the wage-labourer and the commodity or money, are forgotten and by doing so, existential logic of crises are ruled out (Marx, 1999b, 482).

Marx states that none of the capitalists produce for their consumption, and there is no crisis in a place where men produce for themselves, but in this case, there is also no capitalist production. “Producer has no chance for selling or not selling. He *must sell*”. “The crisis emerges whenever he cannot sell, can sell below the cost price or with a positive loss” (Marx, 1999b, 483). In addition, Marx states that Ricardo forgets that a man can also sell for his payments and this situation is significant during the crisis. The first aim of capitalist selling is to transform the commodity capital into money capital and hence to realise the profit. The driving force is not consumption or revenue. The latter is only valid for the ones who try to transform commodities into the means of consumption, or subsistence. Income is not the reason but a result for capitalist production. “Every one, first of all, *sells* for the sake of selling, that is, in order to transform commodity into money” (Marx, 1999b, 483-4).

It is sure; Marx accepts that no body continuously produces in the absence of demand. But the question is not this since the aim of capitalist production is to appropriate “the value, money, abstract wealth” rather than the appropriation of another goods. In the “metaphysical equality between selling and buying”, as assumed by James Mill and repeated by Ricardo, only the unity is seen, but not division. However, money is not only a means of exchange, but at the same time, ensures independent exchanges between products in time and space, since “individual labour must express itself, only in a way of alienation, as *abstract, general social labour*” (Marx, 1999b, 484).

There is nothing to prevent the over-supplying of the commodities at the market and price falls (Marx, 1999b, 484-5). The nature of the metamorphoses of commodities involves the possibility of general abundance. Demand and supply can be disconnected and can become independent. In addition, the demand for money, general commodity, in other words, demand for exchange-value can be more that the demand for other commodities. This is the instinct for the transformation of commodity into money, and hence for the realisation of its exchange value. The relation ship

between demand and supply is also the relationship between production and consumption. But these two phases obtains their unity with the force of crisis. This unity must be seen as the opposite of the division and contradiction, which is the typical aspect of bourgeois production (Marx, 1999b, 485).

Worldwide trade crises are the concentration and putting in an order of the bourgeois economic contradictions by force. Within these crises, there emerges a plenty of **individual factors**, which emerge in every sphere of bourgeois economy, and must be identified and then the other aspects of this conflict must be traced back , and also more abstract forms of crisis that follow each other must be demonstrated (Marx, 1999b, 490).

Marx says that if commodity metamorphoses demonstrates the abstract general possibility for crisis, separation of buying from selling, the same possibility is valid for capital as long as it is nothing but commodity. Here, also, separation above demonstrates that, while a capital as commodity must be transformed into capital as money, another capital as money must be correspondingly transformed into capital as commodity. Such a correspondence, that is the totality and interpenetration of different capitals' reproduction and circulation processes, is a condition of division of labour and is contingent (accidental) (Marx, 1999b, 490). In the possibility for crisis that is based on the difficulty of making payments, Marx observes that capital renders the possibility a reality. In the chain of payments between producers, merchants and bankers, a serious difficulty against the mutual charges and rights prevents the realisation of commodity values and individual reproduction processes of each capital. This is the possibility for crisis that is caused by the money as a means of payment (Marx, 1999b, 491). Nonetheless, these contradictions are only abstract and potentially existed and do not explain the transformation of potential contradictions into real contradictions (Marx, 1999b, 492). However, contradictions that are exited within the circulation of commodities develops much more with the circulation of money, i.e. the development of possibility for crisis, reproduce them in

capital because mature commodity and money circulation emerges under capital. Nevertheless, the development of potential crisis can be seen only in the peculiar aspects of capital, **actual movement of capitalist production, competition** and **credit** rather than in its commodity and money existence. *(here let me note in passing that if the development of crises potential can be followed from the actual production, competition and credit, it can be argued that competition, which originates from actual production, raises the demand for credit, and this explains the foreign debt or credit problem in the countries where there is a lack of credit capital in the face of fierce internal and external competition. Hence Turkey's debt problem can be reduced to the capital's demand and need for credit capital or money. This demand in turn leads into high interest rates and currency problem. It is sure, the state is indebted in the name of all capital in the internal and external money markets)* However, Marx observes, an analysis of capitalist immediate production process does not add any element to the crisis although it involves the element of crisis since it is related neither with the value reproduced, nor the realisation of surplus-value. This express itself only in the circulation process that is itself a reproduction process (Marx, 1999b, 492). Here the question is not only how capital produces but how it is produced. The reproduction process of capital as a whole or circulation process as a whole is the unity of production and circulation phases of capital. Only there the abstract form or possibility of crisis develops in a higher level. Crisis is to render the separated parts a unity by force, and is the division of the unity into separated parts by force (Marx, 1999b, 492-3).

Marx states that the general possibility of crisis does not explain the causes of crisis since it demonstrates the general form of crisis. It cannot be said that abstract form of crisis is the reason of crisis. The explanation must show that how abstract form changes into from possibility into actuality. For this reason the general condition of crisis must be explained from the angle of the form of general conditions of capitalist production (Marx, 1999b, 494). The search for causes must show how possibility changes into reality.

Contradiction between Production and Consumption under Capitalist Conditions: Over-production of certain consumption Goods: Workers produce not only consumption goods, but they can buy only the individual consumption items, and hence can represent only the demand related with consumption goods since they do not use their labour for their account. This fact demonstrates that a place where capitalist production is dominant excludes many workers or producers as consumers. Workers do not buy means of production or raw materials. This means that producers are not identical with consumers. Even in the production spheres where consumption goods are not produced, direct producers are excluded from their purchasing power for their products. They are not direct users or consumers for such products. Machines and raw materials are not use-values or commodity, but an objective condition of which they are subjective condition (Marx, 1999b, 497).

Entrepreneurs, on the other hand, represent all surplus-value and must sell the commodities which are produced by workers in order to reproduce capital. But, workers must only sell their commodity, labour-power. For this reason, capitalists needs more market in comparison to workers (Marx, 1999b, 497-8).

Under capitalist production, consumers or buyers are not identical with producers or sellers. Such an argument is put forward in order to ignore crises. For instance, landowner (rent), or money holder capitalists consume without producing. On the other hand, workers can consume only if they continue to produce surplus-value. Otherwise, either their labour stops or is shortened, or their wages are decreased. However, their insufficient consumption is not related with the fact that they do not produce sufficiently, but with the fact that the large part of their products belongs to themselves (Marx, 1999b, 498). "Workers must always be over-producers". They must produce beyond their needs. Hence, for the producers, there is no unity between production and consumption. This also implies that production is

realised without any consideration about consumption limits in existence (Marx, 1999b, 499). In addition, since the driving force of the capitalist production is to appropriate the most possible share from surplus-value, the large-scale production, mass production tries to use the most possible amount of direct labour. This also means that capitalist production naturally produces without considering market limits (Marx, 1999b, 500). But market stagnation, with over-supply, prevents the reproduction process of capital. This firstly influences the workers. The workers also become under-consumers or non-consumers (Marx, 1999b, 501). Such a situation influences other production areas and all producers become relatively over-producers, and there emerges general relative over-production. Glut, abundance of means of production, bankrupted capitalists and poor and starve workers are seen at the same time. Concerned the mutual independence and interconnection between different spheres of production, Marx asks why over-production begins firstly in one place of production? (Marx, 1999b, 502). In fact, this is the absolute over-production in one sphere, which leads into relative over-production in other spheres where there is no over-production (Marx, 1999b, 510).

Contradiction between the limitation of consumption and fast development of the productive Forces leads into Over-production: The term overproduction creates some wrong ideas. For example, when we consider that large part of the masses can not satisfy their needs, or they can satisfy their only minimum needs, it is to wrong to think of that products are abundantly produced. Rather, we can say that there is under-production in such a situation. But, the limits of production are determined by the profits of the capitalists, not by the needs of the producers. But the over-production of products is not in any way the same with the over-production of commodities (Marx, 1999b, 506). Marx says that over-production is a capitalist phenomenon. In the antiquity, over-consumption might have been existed, but not over-production. In the modern phenomena of over-production, it is seen that there is on the one hand, a limited consumption on the part of

producer masses, and on the other hand, an unrestrained development of the productive forces and hence mass production, with the limit defined by the profit of the capitalists (Marx, 1999b, 507).

Marx says that if capitalist production develops in every sphere simultaneously and equally, there would be no capitalist production (Marx, 1999b, 510). Those who ignore over-production because they believe that there is no separation between selling and buying and that social production seems to say that this social production is regulated according to a plan which would distribute productive forces in terms of various social needs (Marx, 1999b, 507).

Ignorance of over-production is based on the idea that commodities correspond to commodities as if capitalist trading is barter. In the latter, the seller of commodity need not be a buyer of another commodity (Marx, 1999b, 510), and even in the simple circulation of commodities, money must be transformed into commodity, and vice versa. This transformation is discrete and suffers from the changing values and magnitudes of the commodities in terms of both final products that are to be transformed into new capital and of components of capital which change their amounts and values. Under capitalist production, we see not only over-production of commodities, but necessarily over-production of capital, which is nothing but the same with the over-production of commodities that is advanced for the production of surplus-value (Marx, 1999b, 512).

Accumulation of capital, i.e. reproduction on an expanded scale, creates competition among producer capitalists. But this does not lead into an increased demand for labour and hence wages. This depends on the changed proportions of capital after accumulation. With capital accumulation, demand for labour may fall absolutely or relatively (Marx, 1999b, 518).

The question of the tendential fall in the rate of profit originally belongs to Adam Smith and David Ricardo, economists of manufacturing and industrial periods of capitalist production. But, all ideas about the collapse theory of capitalism are incorrectly attributed to Marx. To clarify Marx's position, let us now go to *Volume 3 of Capital* (The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole) and begins with its Part III: *The Law of the Tendential Fall in the Rate of Profit* within the context of The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole of *Volume 3 of Capital*.

The Law of the Tendential Fall in the Rate of Profit: The law is based on the fact that, once the wages and working day are given, the same rate of surplus-value (s/v) is expressed in different rates of profit (different s/c) and also, "in a falling rate of profit", "according to the different scale of the constant capital c and hence the total capital C " (Marx, 1991b, 317). When the same rate of exploitation, the same level of wages and the same working day are assumed, successively raising organic compositions of capital leads into different and falling rates of profit. If the changes in the organic composition of capital occurs "in more or less all spheres, or at least the decisive ones and that it therefore involves changes in the average organic composition of the total capital belonging to a given society, then this gradual growth in the constant capital, in relation to the variable, must necessarily result in a gradual fall in the general rate of profit", given the same rate of exploitation of labour (Marx, 1991b, 318). This law that is direct result of the development of the social productivity of labour, however, "does not present itself in ...an absolute form, but rather more in the tendency to a progressive fall". As for the previous writers, Marx states that none of them discovered this law, but only perceived the phenomenon. The failure of the Classical political economists in the discovery of the law related with the phenomenon of the falling rate of profit in general was caused by their ignorance about the distinction between constant and variable parts of capital, about the profit that is separate from surplus-value, about the differences in the organic

composition of capital, and the conception of the general rate of profit (Marx, 1991b, 319-20).

Marx assumes that profit is another name of surplus-value. For this reason, the fall in the profit rate means the falling ratio between surplus-value and total capital advanced. For this reason, the fall is independent of the distribution of surplus-value, and the law independent of the categories of profit (Marx, 1991b, 320). (Surplus-value can be extorted from producers in different forms as in the case of countries in which money-lender extorts from independent peasant his all surplus-value in the form of interest. But this does not mean that rate of interest is the rate of profit; Marx, 1991b, 321).

Here, it should be noted that the fall in the rate of profit is relative rather than absolute, in other words, not related with the absolute number of labour and surplus-value. Thus, it is not caused by an absolute decline of the variable part of total capital, but by the relative decline of variable capital to the constant component (Marx, 1991b, 322-3). The number of the workers can progressively grow although the rate of profit progressively fall (Marx, 1991b, 324).

The development of capitalist production and accumulation entails the development of individual capital advances. Concentration of capitals, and growing number of capitalists in a lesser degree, is both a condition and result of this development. In addition, it hands in hand with the progressive expropriation of immediate producers (Marx, 1991b, 325). Moreover, the working army under the control of each capitalist grows (Marx, 1991b, 325-6). The development of social productivity of labour, the relative fall in the variable capital as a part of the total capital and the accumulation also brings itself to the progressive increase in the mass of workers applied, in the absolute mass of profit and surplus-value (Marx, 1991b, 326).

The question of how the falling rate of profit and increasing mass of profit correspond to each other and results from the same development is (Marx, 1991b, 326), is answered by Marx as such: the development of social productivity of labour and the development of capitalist production develops “the possibility of a relative surplus-population” (Marx, 1991b, 328) because the social productivity of labour increases from “a disproportion arising from the capitalist exploitation of labour, the disproportion between the progressive growth of capital and the relative decline in its need for a growing population” (Marx, 1991b, 329). With the development of capitalist production, (and hence the raising productivity of social labour), “the more an ever greater amount of capital is needed to employ the same amount of labour-power”. This means that the total capital must be increased more than the labour-power employed. “In order to apply an absolutely greater variable capital at a higher composition... the total capital must grow not only in the same proportion as this higher composition, but still faster than it” (Marx, 1991b, 330). We can conclude from these explanations that with the development of capitalist production, **initial capital advances** increases and hence possibility for becoming a big capitalist decreases and the second one is that capitalist production in its higher level of development needs relatively less labour-power according to the total capital. This means that countries that have entered capitalist production later begins with a higher level of productivity of labour in industry and can support more unproductive labour. So, it is foolish to compare the **distribution of employment** of the developed and underdeveloped countries into the different sectors of production and services without seeing the starting point in the productivity of social labour.

The relation between profit rates, growing number of commodities produced with falling prices seem to the capitalist in the competitive market as if he “voluntarily made less profit on the individual commodity, but compensated himself by the greater number of commodities which he now produces”. Marx observes that this conception stems from the standing point of “commercial capital” (Marx, 1991b, 337). For the individual capitalist at the market, Marx

states that “everything presents a false appearance in competition, in fact an upside-down one”. He, the capitalist, is possibly to imagine that he reduces profit on the individual commodity by cutting price, but obtains a higher profit because of the greater number of commodities he sells, and that he first fix the price and then induce to the total price of the total product, without dividing the price components of commodity as he made in his original calculation. Marx says that “**the vulgar economist** does nothing more than **translate** the peculiar **notions of the competition-enslaved capitalist** into an ostensibly more theoretical and generalised language, and **attempt to demonstrate the validity** of these notions” (Marx, 1991b, 338). **The vulgar economist** is *theoretical translator* of the capitalists’ everyday experience derived from the competitive environment of the market where “everything presents a false appearance”. It is sure that Marx differentiates these economist from Ricardo (and Smith), who made some scientific discoveries and went beyond mere *translations*.

The foreign trade as such advances the capitalist mode of production at home and raises organic composition of capital, but also leads into over-production as regards with the foreign country. Marx states that “the same causes that bring about a fall in the general rate of profit provoke counter-effects that inhibit this fall, delay it and in part even paralyse it”. However, “These do not annul the law, but they weaken its effect”. If they do not weaken its effect, this fall relatively slows. “**The law operates therefore simply as a tendency, whose effect is decisive only under certain particular circumstances and over long periods**” (Marx, 1991b, 346).

The increase in share capital: As the capitalist production develops along with the accelerated accumulation, a portion of capital turns into “interest-bearing capital”, and invested for this purpose. This is not the loan capital given by any capitalist to industrial capitalist obtaining the entrepreneurial profit and paying interest. This interest-bearing capital also does not affect the general rate of profit in which profit is composed of interest+ all sorts of

profit + ground-rent. But the investment of these capitals as interest-bearing capital “although **invested in large productive enterprises, simply yield an interest, great or small, after all costs are deducted-so called ‘dividends’**” (Marx, 1991b, 347). Dividends “do not therefore enter into the equalisation of the general rate of profit, since they yield a profit rate less than the average” (Marx, 1991b, 348). Why this occurs and what creates an advantage as a counteracting factor against the fall in the rate of profit *seems to be* that amount of dividends are not determined at the beginning of investment as the rate of interest, but determined at the end of the time period when it is to be paid by the enterprise, as if the enterprise determines the rate of interest according to the surplus-value or profit to be appropriated, rather than the given rate of interest, which influences the general rate of profit. The other interesting phenomenon is that large enterprises here can eliminate many money-owners from competition.

Development of the Law's Internal Contradictions: Related with other results stated above, the fall in the profit rate “accelerates the concentration of capital, and its centralisation, by dispossessing the smaller capitalists and expropriating the final residue of direct producers who still have something left to expropriate” (Marx, 1991b, 349). It also “slows down the formation of new, independent capitals and thus appears as a threat to the development of the capitalist production process”. In addition, “it promotes overproduction, speculation and crises, and leads to the existence of excess capital alongside a surplus population”. Marx states that economists like Ricardo see this **barrier** created by the capitalist mode of production, but they attribute it to nature (in the theory of rent) rather than to production. They feel that “the capitalist mode of production comes up against a barrier to the development of the productive forces”. For Marx, “this characteristic barrier in fact testifies to the restrictiveness and the solely historical and transitory character of the capitalist mode of production; it bears witness that this is not an absolute mode of production for the production of wealth but actually comes into

conflict at a certain stage with the latter's further development" (Marx, 1991b, 350).

Besides the fall in the profit rates, which was observed by Ricardo and his school only in terms of industrial profits, Marx states that "**the rate of ground-rent** also has a tendency to fall, even though its absolute mass grows and it may even grow in relation to industrial profit" (Marx, 1991b, 350). As the capitalist production advances, "the entire profit" is appropriated by "the industrial and commercial capitalists, in the first instance", and "for later redistribution", **rent** becomes a "**surplus** over and above profit" (Marx, 1991b, 351). This means that rent depends on surplus profits over the average level of profit. "On this capitalist basis, rent then grows once more, as a portion of profit (i.e. of the surplus-value considered as product of the total capital), but not the specific portion of the product pocketed by the capitalist" (Marx, 1991b, 351). *(Here, since Marx defines rent as surplus profit, **the lease-price** of land is not rent proper since it enters production as a component of fixed capital. But, land owner can realise rent later on with new lease-price that is above the average or previous level).*

The unproductive labour and a high rate of profit may coexist if there is a high rate of surplus-value and the long working day. Marx states that this is possible only where the average wage are very low and "the workers' needs are very slight" despite its low level of productivity. The low level of wages implies "a lack of energy on the workers' part", and hence, capital's accumulation is slow, the "population is stagnant". The other situation is the coexistence of the falling rate of profit and the growing mass of profit. Here a large part of the new value goes to the capitalist as "capital" in order to replace the capital consumed, and a relative smaller is appropriated as "profit". The capital advances increase and the conditions of production requires more capital in a larger scale. This situation implies "a simultaneous **concentration** of capital", and "leads to the **centralisation** of this capital, i.e. the **swallowing-up of small capitalists by big, and their decapitalization**".

Marx sees in this process “the divorce of the conditions of labour from the producers raised to a higher power”. This *divorce* “forms the concept of capital, as this arises with primitive accumulation” (Marx, 1991b, 354) and “subsequently appearing as a constant process in the accumulation and concentration of capital, before it is finally expressed here as the centralisation of capital already existing in a few hands, and the decapitalization of many”. This process is not a good development for the capitalist production as a mode and it “**would** entail the rapid **breakdown of capitalist production, if counteracting tendencies were not** constantly at work alongside this **centripetal force**, in the direction of **decentralisation**” (Marx, 1991b, 355).

The conflict between the extension of production and Valorisation: The development of the social productivity of labour reduces the total quantity of labour applied by capital, while it increases the rate of exploitation. But, this situation “reduces the number by which the rate of surplus-value has to be multiplied in order to arrive at its mass”. This was because so, for example, “Two workers working for 12 hours a day could not supply the same surplus-value as 24 workers each working 2 hours”. For this reason, there is a limit to the reduction of workers: “the compensation for the reduced number of workers provided by a rise in the level of exploitation of labour has certain limits that cannot be overstepped; this can certainly check the fall in the profit rate, but it cannot cancel it out”. The number of workers decreases and the level of exploitation rises in order to increase the surplus-value (Marx, 1991b, 356). Marx states that the fall in the rate of profit can be checked, but cannot be cancelled out. As the capitalist mode of production advances, this rate falls, although the mass of profit rises due to the increases in the capital investments (Marx, 1991b, 356). But the rate of profit, which is nothing but the proportion of surplus-value to the total capital advanced (s/c), falls (Marx, 1991b, 356).

The development of the capitalist mode of production, and hence accumulation of capital, we see always contradictory tendencies. “The contending agencies function simultaneously in opposition to one another”. But, they “cannot just be considered as existing quietly side by side”; “they contain a contradiction”, which is reflected in the “contradictory tendencies and phenomena”. Marx gives us three **simultaneously** contending tendencies operating in opposition to each other: 1) “Simultaneously” with the dynamics that leads into “a genuine increase in the working population”, “we have those agencies that create a relative surplus population”; 2) “Simultaneously” with the fall in the rate of profit, the mass of capital grows, and existing capital devaluates, which check the fall in the profit rate and creates an impulse for capital’s value accumulation; 3) “Simultaneously” with the rising productivity, the organic composition of capital rises, and the variable component of capital declines as against constant component (Marx, 1991b, 357). Here, we see that the *totality of the process* is provided by the contradictory tendencies. This totality is a **dialectical process** through which contradictory tendencies **simultaneously** stem from a certain development (such as the dynamics that leads into “a genuine increase in the working population, the fall in the rate of profit, the rising productivity). The word simultaneity is very important in Marx’s dialectical analysis because announcement of the contradictory tendencies is contingent on both space and time. They manifest themselves sometimes side by side, sometimes sequentially. For this reason, Marx states that

These various influences sometimes tend to exhibit themselves side by side, spatially; at other times one after the other, temporally; and at certain points the conflict of contending agencies breaks through in crises. **Crises** are never more than momentary, violent solutions for the existing contradictions, violent eruptions that re-establish the disturbed balance for the time being (Marx, 1991b, 357).

Marx states that this **contradiction is expressed “in the most general terms”** in the fact that

the capitalist mode of production tends towards an absolute development of the productive forces irrespective of value and the surplus-value this contains, and even irrespective of the social relations within which capitalist production takes place (Marx, 1991b, 357).

The former is the devaluation of the surplus value produced because of partial or incomplete realisation at the circulation process of capital (valorisation *versus* de-valorisation of capital). The latter is the development of the productive forces against the background of the relations of production, or consumption structure of capitalist society, which deprives the working masses from consuming (private appropriation of surplus value *versus* socialisation of labour).

We can observe firstly that the “complete collapse” occurred when one of the significant spheres of the world market, the United States, entered into a multi-dimensional civil crisis. Secondly, the capitalist-worker alliance could be maintained only till the 1840s period when the industrial capitalism succeeded of eliminating the resistance of the landed property and of repealing of the Corn Laws. The military could be used against the workers in the country that is frequently recalled as the cradle of the liberal democracy. Thirdly, as related with the theoretical meaning of Marx’s Capital, capital accumulation is the accumulation of power for the capitalists that is used against the working class. In order to succeed in his struggle against the workers, the capitalists must constantly accumulate his power.

In the times of crisis, and depression, “a most furious combat rages between the capitalists for their individual share in the market”. Their internal combat soon turns into their combat with the workers that are manifested itself in the reduction of wages and in turn in the workers’ resistance against this de-valorisation of the labour-power through riots and strikes. Nonetheless, the capitalists cannot fight in all fronts at the same time. Its short, the long-term class interests, the immediate, and the distant threats that can be levelled towards it are clearly conceived in its search for the **class** alliances. The

significant thing is that Marx's analysis in Capital demonstrates that the workers are the victims of the accumulation dynamics and cannot take the advantages of the capital accumulation except for the possibility of more employment and relatively good wages of the recovery periods. The workers can only be a temporal ally of the temporarily democratic fraction of the capitalist **class** which is trying to elevate itself to a more productive capital that needs far more productive labourer).

For Marx, contradictions stemming from capitalist production are not solved unless the capitalist mode of production is replaced by a higher form of social production. But they are solved only momentarily and can be solved only by their transference to another scale:

Capitalist production constantly strives to overcome these immanent barriers, but it overcomes them only by means that set up the barriers afresh and on a more powerful scale (Marx, 1991b, 358).

The *true barrier* to capitalist production is *capital itself*' (Marx, 1991b, 358).

This is so because **dialectic is an alienation process** and the development of capitalist **production makes capital an alienated power even for the capitalist** class besides the producers. Nonetheless, this alienation of capital arrives at a certain point where its contradictions are fully developed and manifested. **Alienation is always a relation between creator and creation**, between producer and product and **the reverse of alienation is the appropriation of the alienated thing by its creator, producer**, and its true owner.

The **barriers** within which the maintenance and valorisation of the capital-value has necessarily to move- and this in turn depends on the dispossession and **impoverishment of the great mass of the producers**- therefore **come constantly into contradiction** with the methods of production that capital must apply to its purpose and which sets its course towards an unlimited expansion of production, to production as end in itself, to an unrestricted development of the social

productive powers of labour. The **means**- unrestricted development of the forces of social production- **comes into persistent conflict with the restricted end**, the valorisation of the **existing** capital. If the capitalist mode of production is therefore a historical means for developing the material powers of production and for creating a corresponding world market, it is at the same time the constant contradiction between this historical task and the social relations of production corresponding to it (Marx, 1991b, 358-9).

Surplus Capital alongside Surplus Population: The falling rate of profit is a disadvantage for the small capital since it is accompanied by the growth in the minimum capital for the use of labour. A larger capital with a lower rate of profit accumulates faster than a small one with a higher rate of profit. But this situation leads into another fall in the rate of profit. Small capitals go into speculative activity. The mass of profit is not compensated by the falling rate of profit, and there emerges “the plethora of capital”, which is turned into credit. The reasons behind the surplus capital are the same with the reasons behind relative surplus population-“unoccupied capital on the one hand and an unemployed working population on the other”. “**Overproduction of capital**”, which “always involves **overproduction of commodities**” is “**overaccumulation of capital**” (Marx, 1991b, 359). This overproduction of capital becomes absolute when it affects all spheres of production and when there is no additional capital for production is meaningful in terms of new additional profit. Here we have idle capital or capital that can be valorised at a lower rate of profit (Marx, 1991b, 359-60). In addition, the fall in the rate of profit decreases the amount of profit (Marx, 1991b, 360). The idle capital begins to devalue. But this devaluation, says Marx, takes place within a struggle and which capitalists are to be effected negatively is determined by a “competitive struggle”. Marx describes **competition as a principle** and ritual (“a practical freemasonry”) of “the capitalist class”, in which the general profit rate is established and shares of each capital is defined. But if the question is not the inter-class division of profit, the losses are to be passed into some capitalists. But, “For the class as a whole, the loss is unavoidable” (Marx, 1991b, 361). This is the question of strength, and “competition now becomes a struggle of enemy brothers” (Marx, 1991b, 362). Here we see

intra-class struggle is accompanied by inter-class struggle. **“The opposition between the interest of each individual capitalist and that of the capitalist class as a whole now comes into its own, in the same way as competition was previously the instrument through which the identity of the capitalists’ interest was asserted”**. This *intra-class conflict* is resolved by a competitive struggle in which “the loss is divided very unevenly and in very different forms according to the particular advantages or positions...in such a way that one capital lies idle, another is destroyed, a third experiences only a relative loss or simply a temporary devaluation, and so on” (Marx, 1991b, 362). Idleness of gold and silver (in terms of capital), price reductions, the devaluation of fixed capital, and general fall in prices follow the disruption. “This disturbance and stagnation paralyses the function of money as a means of payment”. “The chain of payment obligations at specific dates is broken in a hundred places, and this is still further intensified by an accompanying breakdown of the credit system”. “All this leads to violent and acute **crises**, sudden forcible **devaluations**, an actual **stagnation** and **disruption** in the **reproduction process**, and hence to an actual **decline in reproduction**” (Marx, 1991b, 363).

However, as Marx has stated above, these all are **a part of dialectical process**, and lead into other **contending agencies**. “Stagnation in production makes part of the working class idle and hence places the employed workers in conditions where they have to accept a fall in wages, even beneath the average”. “The fall in prices and the competitive struggle, on the other hand, impel each capitalist to reduce the individual value of his total capital below its general value by employing new machinery, new and improved methods of labour and new forms of combination”. This means the unemployment of workers since the capitalist tries to rise the labour productivity and hence to reduce the variable component of his total capital as against constant one. This is artificial creation of surplus population. On the other hand, the profit rate rises due to the devaluation of the elements of constant capital. Though the amount of constant capital relatively grows, its

value falls (Marx, 1991b, 363). Stagnation also prepares the condition for expansion of production in later times (Marx, 1991b, 64).

Overproduction of capital is overproduction of means of production which can be used as capital. It means that capital does not exploit labour. So, a fall in the exploitation below a certain degree leads into “stagnation”, “disruption”, “crisis” and “the destruction of capital”. For this reason, overproduction of capital coexists with a relative surplus population, which is not used by excess capital (Marx, 1991b, 364).

Excess capital, which cannot be used at home, can be sent abroad where there is a higher rate of profit. Nevertheless, it exists as excess capital for the working population and the country (Marx, 1991b, 364-5).

Marx states that total capital and big capitalists compensate the fall in the profit rate by an increase for profit. The competitive struggle among capitalists is caused by the fall in the profit rate, and is accompanied by temporal wage increases and consequently another fall in the rate of profit. This struggle also reflects itself in the overproduction of commodities. But since these commodities are produced for profit rather than for the satisfaction of social needs, “there must be a constant tension between the restricted dimensions of consumption on the capitalist basis, and a production that is constantly striving to overcome these immanent barriers”. In addition, “capital consists of commodities, and hence overproduction of capital involves overproduction of commodities”. For Marx, it is not enough to say that overproduction emerges due to a disproportion between the spheres of production, since under capitalist production the proportionality leads into disproportionality. This occurs because

the interconnection of production as a whole here forces itself on the agents of production as a blind law, and not as a law which, being grasped and therefore mastered by their combined reason, brings the productive process under their common control (Marx, 1991b, 365).

The more interesting point is the situation of the countries where the capitalist mode of production is not yet developed. Those countries also **must consume and produce “on a level that suits the countries of the capitalist mode of production”** (Marx, 1991b, 365-6). Marx states that overproduction and barriers to the capitalist production is relative. But they are “only absolute for it, on its basis”.

How else could there be a lack of demand for those very goods that the mass of the people are short of, and how could it be that this demand has to be sought abroad, in distant markets, in order to pay the workers back home the average measure of the necessary means of subsistence (Marx, 1991b, 366).

This is the **character of the international trade**, which creates many costs for social production and as clearly expressed in our day, results in environmental problem since there is not always a **subsidiary criterion** for production and consumption. Marx says that “character of capitalist production” is “the valorisation of capital, not its consumption” (Marx, 1991b, 366). The another formulation of “the **contradiction** in this capitalist mode of production” lies “precisely in its tendency towards the absolute development of productive *forces* that come into continuous conflict with the specific *conditions* of production in which capital moves, and can alone move” (Marx, 1991b, 366).

It is not that too many means of subsistence are produced in relation to the existing population. On the contrary. Too little is produced to satisfy the mass of the population in an adequate and humane way (Marx, 1991b, 366) (In passing, **for “a miserable mode of production”** according to the editorial note, Marx here refers to petty commodity production of smallholding peasant s).

Nor are too many means of production produced to employ the potential working population. On the contrary. **What is produced is firstly too great a section of the population** which is in fact **incapable of work**, which owing to its situation is **dependent** on the exploitation of the labour of others or on kinds of work that can only count as such within **a miserable mode of production** (according to the editorial note, Marx here refers to petty commodity production of

smallholding peasant s). Secondly, not enough means of production are produced to allow the whole potential working population to work under the most productive conditions, so that their absolute labour-time is curtailed by the mass and effectiveness of the constant capital applied during this labour-time (Marx, 1991b, 366-7).

What is produced too much is the means which are to function for exploitation at a given profit rate, and is to be realised under the existing conditions of distribution and to be transformed back into capital. Marx says that it is “**impossible to accomplish this process without ever-recurrent explosions**” (Marx, 1991b, 367). What is produced too much is not wealth, but wealth according to the antagonistically capitalist manner.

The **barriers to the capitalist mode** of production, (to say “*the limits to capital*” as called by David Harvey in his book with the same name, 1982) can be summarised as follows: 1) the development of productivity, the falling rate of productivity and the problem overcome through crises; 2) **proportion between unpaid labour and paid labour determines the expansion or contraction of production, rather than the proportion between production and social needs**, “the needs of socially developed human beings”. Production is not determined by the satisfaction of the social needs, but by profit (Marx, 1991b, 367).

Marx observes that when the rate of profit falls, some capitalists reduce the value of individual commodities below the social average value with new methods of production, and hence obtains “**a surplus profit**” or “extra profit” at the given price. In addition, in order to secure these extra profits, swindling appear in the new methods and adventures, which are out of the general determination of the social average (Marx, 1991b, 367).

The rate of profit is significant for new capital formations, and new “offshoots of capital”. But if a few big capitals control capital formation, driving force behind production vanishes since there is no adequate profit. Marx says that Ricardo understands this phenomenon of capitalist production, but

“underlying reason is something deeper, about which he has no more than a suspicion”. What is clear here in the economic terms is that barriers to capitalist production, “its relativity” is “the fact that “it is not an absolute but only a **historical mode** of production, corresponding to a **specific and limited epoch** in the development of the material conditions of production”. “The development of the productive forces of social labour is **capital’s historic mission** and justification. For that very reason, it unwittingly creates the material conditions for a **higher form of production**” (Marx, 1991b, 368).

The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation: The process of primitive accumulation expropriates “the immediate producers”, in other words, it dissolves the “private property based on the labour of its owner”. And private property, says Marx, “exists only where the means of labour and the external conditions of labour belong to private individuals”. In this sense, it is opposed to the, as “the antithesis” to, “social, collective property”. Private property gains a different character according to “whether these private individuals are workers or non-workers”. For this reason, there are many forms of private property that carries the intermediate forms between “the two extremes”. The small-scale industry is based on the private property of the workers over the means of production and is the sine qua non of “the development of social production and of the free individuality of the worker himself”. It exists in the other forms of production like slavery and serfdom, but acquires its perfect form “only where the worker is the free proprietor of the conditions of his labour, and sets them in motion himself: where the peasant owns the land he cultivates, or the artisan owns the tool with which he is an accomplished performer”. Marx observes that “This mode of production” excludes the concentration of the means of production and holdings, and consequently excludes “co-operation” and “division of labour”, “the social control” and “regulation of the forces of nature”, and also “the free development of the productive forces of society” (Marx, 1990a, 927).

As Marx likes to describe, this mode of production that reproduces itself within narrow limits and in a natural base begins to destroy itself: “At a certain stage of development, it brings into the world the material means of its own destruction. From that moment, new forces and new passions spring up in the bosom of society, forces and passions which feel themselves to be fettered by that society. It has to be annihilated; it is annihilated. Its annihilation, the transformation of the individualised and scattered means of production into socially concentrated means of production, the transformation, therefore, of the dwarf-like property of the many into the giant property of the few, and the expropriation of the great mass of the people from the soil, from the means of subsistence and from the instruments of labour, this terrible and arduously accomplished expropriation of the mass of the people forms the prehistory of capital”. After the processes of the expropriation of the “direct producers”, “Private property which is personally earned... based on the fusing together of the isolated, independent working individual with the conditions of labour, is “supplanted by capitalist private property, which rests on the exploitation of alien, but formally free labour” (Marx, 1990a, 928).

This “metamorphosis” decomposes “old society” in its all aspects. Workers are turned into “proletarians”, and their means of production into “capital. and, after “the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet”, “the further socialisation of labour and the further transformation of the soil and other means of production into socially exploited and therefore communal means of production takes on a new form”. It is seen that the further socialisation of labour and the further transformation of the means of production to the socially and collectively used means of production is a point where new socialisation and transformation begins. “What is now to be expropriated is not the self-employed worker, but the capitalist who exploits a large number of workers” (Marx, 1990a, 928).

The expropriation of the capitalist expropriators is already a result of “the immanent laws of capitalist production itself”. The centralisation of capitals means the expropriation of “many capitalists by a few”. Besides this, the other developments occur and make capitalist society another old society: “the growth of the co-operative form of the labour process, the conscious technical application of science, the planned exploitation of the soil, the transformation of the means of labour into forms in which they can only be used in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world market, and with this, the growth of the international character of the capitalist regime”. These are the positive base for a new society. But they are also accompanied by the negative results of the capitalist transformation: “Along with the constant decrease in the number of the capitalist magnates”, “misery, oppression, slavery, degradation and exploitation grows; but with this there also grows the revolt of the working class, a **class** constantly increasing in numbers, and trained, united and organised by the very mechanism of the capitalist process of production”. These are the *objective* and *subjective* conditions of the *new* mode of production. Both of them imply only that “The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production which has flourished alongside and under it. The centralisation of the means of production and the socialisation of labour reach a point at which they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated” (Marx, 1990a, 929). It is sure that since Marx suggests that the growing revolt of the working class and the objective conditions of the new mode of production are the product of the same process, the act of expropriation of the capitalist expropriators can be only the act of the working class and its revolt, i.e., its revolutionary act.

The capitalist mode of “appropriation”, which is the product of the capitalist mode of “production”, “produces capitalist private property”. The first negation of individual private property is the capitalist private property. The negation of

the negation is that the capitalist production does not “re-establish private property”. It “begets... its own negation” (Marx, 1990a, 929). Marx suggests that the transformation of the capitalist private property into “social property” is “naturally an incomparably” less “protracted, violent and difficult” than that of the scattered private properties into capitalist private property, “which in fact already rests on the carrying on of production by society” (Marx, 1990a, 929-30). In the latter case, “it was a matter of the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers”, whereas in the former case, “w have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people” (Marx, 1990a, 930).

The Modern Theory of Colonisation: It is remembered that in the *Communist Manifesto*, when Marx’s replies the bourgeois criticism of the communists’ attitudes about capitalist private property, he argues that the capitalist system itself abolish the private property of the producers. *The Modern Theory of Colonisation*, which is the last chapter of *Capital’s Volume I*, begins with the definition that political economy confuses tow kinds of private property, one is “the labour of the producer himself” and the other is the private property that rests on “the exploitation of labour of others”. The latter is both “the direct antithesis of the former” and “grows on the former’s tomb and nowhere else” (Marx, 1990a, 931).

Marx observes that Western Europe has accomplished its process of primitive accumulation. Here “the capitalist regime has either directly subordinated to itself the whole of the nation’s production, or, where economic relations are less developed, it has at least indirect control of those social layers which, although they belong to the antiquated mode of production, still continue to exist side by side with it in a state of decay”. Despite this fact, he says that “political economist applies the notions of law and of private property inherited from a pre-capitalist world”. But “the facts cry out in the face of his ideology”. Here Marx use the term “ideology” in the double sense that the first refers to the diachronic relation between the past

and the present and the second to the ideas incompatible with the actual situation. Ideology implies the system of thoughts that are separated from its material base and from the realities of the time.

In contrast to the ideology of the political economy, the colonies demonstrate a different situation in which independent producers work for themselves instead of for the capitalist. But, the capitalists, having the power of the mother country behind them, try to eliminate the mode of production and appropriation that is based on “the personal labour of the independent producer” (Marx, 1990a, 931). For this aim, the political economist, “the sycophant of capital” points to “the antagonism between the two modes of production” and suggests “the expropriation of the workers and the corresponding transformation of their means of production into capital”. Otherwise, the development of division of labour, co-operation, labour productivity and the large-scale machine production are impossible (Marx, 1990a, 932).

Wakefield's theory of colonisation: Marx says that the solution is founded by “Wakefield's theory of colonisation”. This theory is also enforced by Act of Parliament in order to manufacture “wage-labourers” in the colonies. This “systematic colonisation”, which is called by Wakefield himself, discovers what makes the owner of money and the other means of production a capitalist and what capitals really is. Marx states that he discovered that for the former the essential component is “the wage-labourer, the other man, who is compelled to sell himself of his own free will” and he discovered for the second that “capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons which is mediated through things” (Marx, 1990a, 932). It is indeed that when the means of production and subsistence are the property of “the immediate producer”, they are not capital. “They only become capital under circumstances in which they serve at the same time as means of exploitation of, and domination over, the worker”. Nevertheless, the political economist “christens them under all circumstances, even where they are its exact

opposite". Even more, as in the example of Wakefield, the fragmentation of the means of production within the numerous "mutually independent and self-employed workers" is seen as "equal division of capital". Wakefield suggests that every member of society should have a portion of capital". But Marx replies that as long as the worker can accumulate itself, "capitalist accumulation and the capitalist mode of production are impossible" since "The **class** of wage-labourers essential to these is lacking". If so, he asks how capitals and wage-labour come into existence". The answer is this: "By a social contract of a quite original kind". Wakefield answers that "for promoting the accumulation of capital", Mankind "have divided themselves into owners of capital and owners of labour". If this "self-denying fanaticism" is correct, asks Marx, "why his "systematic colonisation" should be put forward in the place of this "spontaneous and unregulated colonisation". This solution is suggested by Wakefield as he reveals the situation in American Union where the labouring **class**, the wage labourers did occupy at most a tenth of the people whereas in England the labouring **class** formed the large part of the people. For this reason, according to Wakefield, slavery was necessary for the colonial wealth. For example, as he himself stated, the first colonisers must have lost their capital if slavery would not have been existed. This occurred in the Swan River Settlement (Marx, 1990a, 934).

The theoretical answer is given by Wakefield who proposes that the government should artificially rise the price of land so that the immigrant is compelled to work for another in return of wage before he could be capable of buying land and becoming an "independent farmer" (Marx, 1990a, 938). The fund obtained from the sale of land is also to be used for the importation of European paupers into colonies, "so as to keep the wage-labour market full for the capitalists". When the labourer has enough money and becomes a landowner, the fund will increase for the importation of "fresh labour into the colony". The price of land must be so determined by the state (in an adequate degree) that it can prevent the workers from turning themselves into independent landowners. Marx states that the Wakefield's theory was for

years practiced by the English Government as a method of primitive accumulation.

The question of the expropriation of the independent and free Americans is solved by the diversion of the emigration wave from the English colonies to the United States (Marx, 1990a, 939). As a result, labour market, especially in the eastern parts of the country was rapidly supported by the wave of immigration. The other support came from the American Civil War, which created “a colossal national debt” and hence needed heavy taxes. The result was also the creation of a finance aristocracy. In this process of the development of capital in America, the public lands were granted to “speculative companies for the exploitation of railways, mines, etc.” “In short”, the Civil War “has brought a very rapid centralisation of capital. The great republic has therefore ceased to be the promised land for emigrating workers”. The “relative surplus population of workers” is also created by the “squandering of uncultivated colonial land on aristocrats and capitalists by the English government”. This squandering took place especially in Australia which also met with the stream of the gold-diggers and the competition of the English commodity exportation. Consequently, there emerged a glut in the labour market of Australia (Marx, 1990a, 940).

Marx completes *the Volume I of Capital* by refereeing to the discovery made in the “New World” by the political economy of the Old World: “that the capitalist mode of production and accumulation, and therefore capitalist private property as well, have for their fundamental condition the annihilation of that private property which rests on the labour of the individual himself; in other words, the expropriation of the worker” (Marx, 1990a, 940) and we must recall that the *worker* becomes *proletarian* through this expropriation.

CHAPTER 3

ENTRY OF CAPITAL INTO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND THE DEBATE ON THE MODES OF PRODUCTION IN *THE AYDINLIK*

Economic structure of the rural Turkey and its class structure are important for the socialist theorizing of 1960s. This analysis were expected to reveal the real allies and the enemies of the working class. Whether the dominant classes are the merchant and usurer or the feudals and semi-feudals would point to different dominant and dominated class configurations. One side of the debate asked whether the wage-labourer and capital relations were existing or not in rural areas, while the other side focused on the small commodity relations and the existence of the merchants and usurers. The former identified the rural Turkey with “primitive capitalism”, while the latter with “feudal” and “semi-feudal relations”. Political extensions of these two rival analyses were surely different. Therefore different to determine whether the struggle to become anti-capitalist (against the merchants and usurers) or anti-feudal (against big landlords in general).

I think that the development of capitalist relations, of the primitive accumulation, and first take-off of the capitalist industrialisations could follow different paths according to Marx. There could be mixed relations and simultaneously existing categories under the capitalist domination. This point seemed to exist in the analyses of *the Aydınlik*.

3.1 Subordination of Agricultural Production into Capital: Ground-Rent

Before explaining the genesis of capitalist ground-rent, Marx says that the difficulty with which modern economics faced is to show how after the equalisation of profit and “after the distribution of all the surplus-value that

there is to distribute has apparently already taken place, there is still an excess part of this surplus-value left over, a part which capital invested on the land pays to the landowner in the form of ground-rent. It must derive from somewhere" (Marx, 1991b, 917). In other words, the difficulty is to explain "the excess of agricultural profit over average profit", "the extra surplus-value specific to this sphere of production", "the extra net product over and above the net product of other branches of industry". So we have to have an average profit "established as a measure" to be able to mention for "an excess over the average profit", "as the overall regulator of production" as seen in the capitalist mode of production. This means that "in forms of society where it is not yet capital that performs this function of extracting all surplus labour and appropriating it for itself, at least in the first instance- i.e. where capital has not yet subsumed society's labour or has done so only sporadically- there can be no question at all of rent in the modern sense, of rent as an excess over and above the average profit, i.e. over and above the proportionate share of each individual capital in the total surplus-value that the total capital produces" (Marx, 1991b, 918).

The formation of money rent is seen first sporadically and then in a national scale in the conditions where trade, urban industry, commodity production and money circulation develops and where "products have a market price and are sold more or less approximately at their values, which in earlier forms need in no way be the case". Marx observes that this sort of development, the transition to money rent and the development of its presuppositions is still seen in Eastern Europe and he recalls that the conscious but failed attempts for this transition to money rent faced the difficulty caused by the lower level of development of the social productivity of labour in the Roman period and in **pre-revolutionary France** (Marx, 1991b, 933).

The Genesis of Capitalist Ground-Rent: Ground-rent is surplus profit which is transformed into landowner as a form of payment by the capital invested

on land. However, Marx distinguishes capitalist ground-rent and its previous non-capitalist forms, in which surplus labour or surplus value consists of all ground-rent rather than the sum of profit, interest and ground-rent in capitalist manner.

Before explaining the genesis of capitalist ground-rent, Marx says that the difficulty with which modern economics faced is to show how after the equalisation of profit and “after the distribution of all the surplus-value that there is to distribute has apparently already taken place, there is still an excess part of this surplus-value left over, a part which capital invested on the land pays to the landowner in the form of ground-rent. It must derive from somewhere” (Marx, 1991b, 917). In other words, the difficulty is to explain “the excess of agricultural profit over average profit”, “the extra surplus-value specific to this sphere of production”, “the extra net product over and above the net product of other branches of industry”. Therefore, we have to have an average profit “established as a measure” to be able to mention for “an excess over the average profit”, “as the overall regulator of production” as seen in the capitalist mode of production. This means that “in forms of society where it is not yet capital that performs this function of extracting all surplus labour and appropriating it for itself, at least in the first instance- i.e. where capital has not yet subsumed society’s labour or has done so only sporadically- there can be no question at all of rent in the modern sense, of rent as an excess over and above the average profit, i.e. over and above the proportionate share of each individual capital in the total surplus-value that the total capital produces” (Marx, 1991b, 918).

In a natural economy, at most a very small part of the agricultural product enters into circulation. Even this part is the unimportant part of the products that “represents the landowner’s revenue”. In addition, surplus product is not composed of the agricultural products, but also those of the handicrafts and manufactures which supports agriculture. Existence of this industrial works on the side of agriculture forms “the basis”, “the condition for the mode of

production on which this natural economy is based, in European antiquity and the Middle Ages, as still today in the Indian village communities, where the traditional organisation has not yet been destroyed” (Marx, 1991b, 922). Marx here use a general term “natural economy” upon which the mode of production is based and points to its existence in European antiquity and the Middle Ages, still today in the Indian village communities. “The capitalist mode of production completely abolishes this connection” (Marx points to the low level development of natural economy within the unity of agriculture and manufacture); “a process which can be studied on a large scale particularly during the last third of the eighteenth century in England” (Marx, 1991b, 922). Large scale abolishment of the natural economy by the capitalist production is seen in this period (In addition, the unity between manufacture and agriculture is seen in the natural economy, in a way that is not peculiar to, for instance, the Ottoman society), and “the separation of agriculture and manufacture” in that period is not welcomed well by some “who had grown up in **more or less semi-feudal societies**” (Marx, 1991b, 922).

Marx refers to Adam Smith who said that in his time rent and profit was not yet separate because the landowner and the capitalist was the same person. However, Marx says that this separation is “precisely the precondition” for the capitalist mode of production. However, an “incorrect conception of the nature of rent” still existing in the modern times originates from the fact that “rent in kind still survives from the Middle Ages” partly because of the tithes taken by the Church and partly because of “a curiosity in old contracts” (Marx, 1991b, 923). This incorrect conception gives an expression that “rent arises not from the price of the agricultural product but rather from its quantity, i.e. not from social relations but from the earth itself” (Marx, 1991b, 923). (This is because rent as surplus profit is also an extra surplus-value produced by the productive labourer, whether the condition of the production of this extra surplus value is, be it differential or absolute). Rather, any surplus product because of the increase for products does not represent a surplus-value (that is, the same value can be represented by more products).

“It can represent a deduction from value” (Marx, 1991b, 923). The interesting example is the fact that “Rent may grow enormously as the result of a serious of bad harvests, since the price of corn rises, even though this surplus-value is expressed in a smaller amount of dearer wheat” (Marx, 1991b, 923-4). (Here rent appears as the difference between the new and old *real* prices so that an additional profit above the normal profit of the past is obtained). Even more, good years may lead to a fall in rent because of falling prices even if greater amount of cheaper wheat express the lower rent (Marx, 1991b, 924).

Labour Rent: Labour rent, if it is taken account as the “simple form” of ground-rent, says Marx, is seen where the immediate producer devotes one of part of his labour time to the landlord in the estate in return for any reward. The producer apply his tools which “belongs to him either legally or in practice (plough, draught animals, etc.) to land that is in practice his own” for the other parts of his labour time (Marx, 1991b, 925). Land on which he works belongs to him in practice and he owns the tools he applies legally or practically. Marx observes that in such a situation, “rent and surplus-value are identical” (Marx, 1991b, 925-6). The “unpaid surplus labour” expresses itself in the form of rent, rather than profit. The “worker (a ‘self-sustaining serf’) can have a surplus over his necessary means of subsistence (which would be expressed in **wages in the capitalist mode**) and this surplus is determined by the level of ground-rent. It is also “the **nucleus of what appears as profit in the capitalist mode** of production (Marx, 1991b, 926).

Marx pointed out above that the direct producer here applies his tools which “belongs to him either legally or in practice (plough, draught animals, etc.) to land that is in practice his own”. So the direct producer is the possessor of the means of production even though he is not the owner of them. Even more, he can have legal ownership over the tools of production. (And we must recall that “possession” implies a de facto ownership and carries in itself some aspects of the property ownership. See *Grundrisse*, Marx, 1979, 168-70). Marx states that “**in all forms where the actual worker himself**

remains the 'possessor' of the means of production and the conditions of labour needed for the production of his own means of subsistence, the **property relationship must appear at the same time as a direct relationship of domination and servitude**, and the direct producer therefore as an **unfree person-an unfreedom which may undergo a progressive attenuation from serfdom with statute-labour down to a mere tribute obligation**". The actual worker here is "in possession" of "the objective conditions of labour", and "pursues **his agriculture independently, as well as the rural-domestic industry associated** with it" (Marx, 1991b, 926). In his pursuit the direct worker is independent. But he is unfree because of a **direct relationship of domination and servitude** as a result of the property relationship. The level of unfreedom decreases from **serfdom with statute-labour to a mere tribute obligation**. "This "independence is not abolished when, as in India for example, these small peasants form more or less natural community, since what is at issue here is independence vis-à-vis the nominal landlord". The small peasant has an independence vis-à-vis both the pursuit of work and the nominal landlord. So its independence is not abolished in places where peasants form more or less natural community. Marx seems to say that these small peasants do not face with a **direct relationship of domination and servitude** because of their natural community and their independence from the nominal landlord. "Under these conditions, the surplus labour for the nominal landowner can only be extorted from them by extra-economic compulsion, whatever the form this might assume" (Marx, 1991b, 926). The situation of the peasant of this more or less natural community is different from the slave or plantation economy in which "Relations of personal dependence", in other words "personal unfreedom" is necessary. "If there are **no private landowners but it is the state, as in Asia, which confronts them (Marx means peasants) directly as simultaneously landowner and sovereign, rent and tax coincide, or rather there does not exist any tax distinct from this form of ground-rent**". Marx observes that in Asia there is only a public landowner, or the state being **simultaneously landowner and sovereign** in general. Rent is

appropriated through taxation of the state. He continues to say: “Under these conditions, **the relationship of dependence** does not need to possess any stronger form, either politically or economically, than that which is common to **all subjection to this state**. Here the state is **the supreme landlord**. Sovereignty here is landed property **concentrated on a national scale**. But for this very reason there is **no private landed property, though there is both private and communal possession and usufruct of the land**” (Marx, 1991b, 927). Here **we must ask whether Asia involves the Ottoman society**, putting aside the question whether Asia of Marx has these characteristics completely.

However, Marx is rather careful when he points to the relationship between the economic basis and its various forms of appearance. In addition, it should be noted that in the above-mentioned statements, (the question of Asia is not important here) Marx deals with personal unfreedom (“which may undergo a progressive attenuation from serfdom with statute-labour down to a mere tribute obligation”, that is, to state taxation), public or private character of landownership, the form of rent extorted from the direct producers. In Asia, personal dependence is replaced by the subjection of all to the state.

Now let us make a long quotation from Marx:

The specific economic form in which unpaid surplus labour is pumped out of the direct producers determines the relationship of domination and servitude, as this grows directly out of production itself and reacts back on it in turn as a determinant. On this is based **the entire configuration of the economic community** arising from the actual relations of production and hence also its specific political form. It is in each case **the direct relationship of the owners of the conditions of production to the immediate producers-** a relationship whose particular form naturally corresponds always to a certain level of development of the type and manner of labour, and hence to its social productive power- **in which we find the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social edifice**, and hence also the political form of the relationship of sovereignty and dependence, in short, the specific form of state in each case. This does not prevent **the same economic basis-** the same in its major conditions- from

displaying endless variations and gradations in its appearance, as the result of innumerable different empirical circumstances, natural conditions, racial relations, historical influences acting from outside, etc., and these can only be understood by analysing these empirically given conditions (Marx, 1991b, 927-8).

On the one hand, we have an economic form, or an economic basis in which surplus labour is appropriated through a relationship of domination and servitude. This relationship is determined directly by the production itself, but then determines that relationship. This is the economic form for the appropriation of the surplus labour and framework which determines the appropriator and the appropriated. Afterwards, the economic life of the community and its political form is based on the economic form. The direct relationship of the owners of the conditions of production to the direct producers corresponds to the level of development of labour's productivity and type (for this connection, we may point to the tremendous difference existing between the natural economy of the Middle Ages and the modern capitalist production in terms of the productivity of labour both in individual and social contexts). This relationship reveals the hidden basis of social edifice and its political form, or the form of state. The economic base is taken account as the same as long as its major conditions are the same, and it may manifest itself in various forms as the result of different empirical circumstances. These empirical circumstances are the subject of empirical analysis.

Here it can be asked that if we have different relations of personal dependence, for example, a relationship between the immediate producer and the agent of the state as the supreme landlord, can we have a different economic base or form. In the above-mentioned observation, Marx said there: "If there are no private landowners but it is the state, as in Asia, which confronts them (Marx means peasants) directly as simultaneously landowner and sovereign". "Under these conditions, the relationship of dependence does not need to possess any stronger form, either politically or economically, than that which is common to all subjection to this state. Here the state is the

supreme landlord. Sovereignty here is the landed property concentrated on a national scale. But for this very reason there is no private landed property, though there is both private and communal possession and usufruct of the land". We have still a "relationship of dependence" in the form of "subjection to this state". Hence, it is clear that we have a specific political form for the relations of the production.

This form of surplus labour, labour rent or "statute-labour, depends on the undeveloped conditions of all labour's social productive powers, on the crudity of the mode of labour itself". This results in the fact that "only a far smaller aliquot part of the direct producers' total labour to be confiscated from them than in more developed modes of production, and in the capitalist mode of production in particular" (Marx, 1991b, 929). The more interesting definition is this. Marx refers to some historians who are observing the fact that when the direct producer is a possessor, his surplus labour legally belongs to landowner. But, it is also possible, for example, "villain or serf to develop independent means of his own and even become quite wealthy". But such a problem is solved first by the traditional and customary ways, then by law: "It is in the interest of the dominant section of society to sanctify the existing situation as a law and to fix limits given by custom and tradition as legal ones" (Marx, 1991b, 929). We can add that all surplus labour is somewhat a statute-labour in this sense in which necessary and surplus-labour is legally defined in the last instance.

Rent in Kind: Marx states that rent in kind does not change the economic nature of ground-rent since the latter is still the only form of "surplus-value or surplus labour". Here we have a surplus product which "the direct producer who finds himself in *possession* of the conditions of labour needed for his own production has to provide for the *owner* of the one condition of labour that includes everything else at this stage, the land" (Marx, 1991b, 930). Land is "the property of another" and "is personified in the landowner". However, when his form of rent is dominant, it is still accompanied with the earlier

forms of rent; “and this is **irrespective of whether the landlord is a private individual or the state**”. Rent in kind corresponds to **a higher level of development of labour and society and culture of the direct producer**. It is different from the previous form in terms of the fact that “surplus labour is no longer performed in its natural form, i.e. **no longer under the direct supervision and compulsion of the landlord or his representative**” (Marx, 1991b, 930). (Here Marx does not distinguish private landlord from the state as the supreme landlord, or from the representative of the state in terms of the nature of ground-rent in economic terms. This is related with what Marx means by the economic form or the economic basis of the society). “Rather, the immediate producer, driven on by force of circumstances **instead of direct compulsion** and by legal stipulation **instead of by the whip**, is himself responsible for performing this surplus labour” (Marx, 1991b, 930-1). Here we see that the relationship of the landowner to the direct producer loses its preceding crudeness and the direct producer lives a far more freedom and initiative in his productive activity. Here Marx seems to be mentioning about a far more developed form of the feudal mode of production.

Surplus production is realised by the immediate producer in a spontaneous way. It becomes “the self-evident rule, and surplus production in a field of production that actually belongs to him, the land he himself exploits, instead of on lord’s estate alongside and outside his own”. Even if one part of his labour time belongs to the landowner, he has “the use of more or less his entire labour time”. The part belonging to the landowner is received indirectly, in “the natural form of the product”. Direct and constant intervention of the landowner disappears. Unlike the case of the labour rent, the division of work in time and pace into the one for the landowner and for the producer himself, too, disappears in the perfect form of labour in kind. Marx observes that even though this form may continue in a more developed modes of production, it “**still presupposes a natural economy**”, in which “**economic conditions are produced entirely or at least in the main by the economic unit itself,**

being directly replaced and reproduced out of its gross product”, and “also the **union of rural domestic industry and agriculture**; the surplus product which forms **rent is the product of this combined agricultural-industrial family labour**” (Marx, 1991b, 931). The union of agriculture and industry, and the family labour is what Marx means by the “**configuration of the economic community**” above. In addition, the economic form or the basis takes the character of the form of surplus labour and its mode of appropriation determined by the relationship between the owners of production and the immediate producer. The production in the main is based on a natural economy of the economic units which operate within it.

This form of rent does not necessarily point to the all surplus labour of the family labour (“rural family”). “The producer has a greater room to manoeuvre, compared with labour rent, to gain time for excess labour whose product belongs to himself”. “There is at least the possibility of this, and the possibility for the immediate **producer to obtain the means whereby he may exploit the labour of others**” (Marx, 1991b, 931). The producer may have an excess which he does not have to give up to the landowner and which is over his own subsistence. Even more he may obtain the means of production and by this exploit the labour of others. Here it is an interesting definition in the fact that **the exploited labourer may also exploit the labour of others** if he can obtain some means of production. And the more important is the fact that when Marx analyses **a pure economic form or a perfect condition, he does not exclude the mixture of forms**. For example, at this point, he says that “Yet **this does not affect our discussion of the pure form of rent in kind, as we cannot embark here on the endlessly varied combinations in which the different forms of rent may be combined, mixed together and amalgamated**” (Marx, 1991b, 931-2). A pure form analysis relates to the analysis of the form of surplus labour or surplus value and its division among itself, as the relationship between the direct producer and the owners of the conditions of labour. And this analysis concerns the level of the productivity of labour and the economic

power of the agents of production, i.e. the classes. For this reason, the analysis of wealth or capital is the analysis of classes. Meanwhile, the debate over the modes of production in Turkey has always suffered from the definition of the pure forms of surplus labour and the varied combinations and mixtures of the economic forms. However, I will deal with this problem in the part of the thesis about Turkey.

The rent in kind is closely related with “particular type of product and of production itself”, with the union of the agriculture and domestic industry, the self-sufficiency of the peasant family, “independence from the market and from the movement of production and of the history of that part of society outside itself”. The natural economy “makes this form eminently suitable as the basis of those static conditions of society that we can see in Asia for example. **Here, as in the earlier form of labour rent, ground-rent is the normal form of surplus-value**, and therefore of surplus labour, i.e. of the entire excess labour that the immediate producer must perform for nothing, in actual fact therefore **compulsory**, for the owner of his most essential condition of labour, the land—even if this compulsion no longer confronts him in its previous brutal form”. **If the direct producer obtains an excess** over the necessary labour he appropriated for himself (“Profit, if we incorrectly give this name”, says Marx), this excess is rather insignificant since it meets “a **natural limit in the level of rent in kind**”. Even more, this **natural limit** may “endanger the reproduction of the conditions of labour” “making the expansion of production more or less impossible and reducing the direct producers to the physical minimum of means of subsistence”. Marx states that Britain faced such a situation when it founded this form rent in existence and exploited it in India.

Money Rent; the signs of dissolution: At the presentation above, Marx seems to use the term ground-rent as if it is in the capitalist context. However, this is wrong since Marx analyses the genesis of capitalist ground-rent, and hence starts with the acceptance that there is also non-capitalist

form of ground-rent. In non-capitalist condition, ground-rent is related with the surplus labour or value itself whereas in capitalist condition, it is related with surplus-profit, an excess over normal profit, which is not included in the surplus-value and not distributed from it.

It is already Marx who starts the case of money rent by saying: “By money rent, in this connection, we mean not the industrial or commercial ground-rent based on the capitalist mode of production, which is simply an excess over the average profit, but the ground-rent that arises simply from a formal transformation of the rent in kind, as this was itself simply transformed labour rent” (Marx, 1991b, 932). In addition, the statement “the **industrial or commercial ground-rent** based on the capitalist mode of production” also means that the existence of capitalist ground-rent does not necessarily requires the existence of the land owners or private property in land separate from the industrial and commercial capital. It is already the fact that the sixth part of *Capital's Volume 3* takes the name “**The transformation of Surplus Profit into Ground-Rent**”. That is something existed or produced is transformed into landowners. However, in a condition where industrial or commercial capital has its own land for its operations, ground rent as surplus-profit remains its own.

Here the ground-rent is simply the surplus labour or value itself which is transformed into money form. “Instead of the product itself, the immediate producer now has to pay his landowner (whether the state or a private person) the price of this” (Marx, 1991b, 932). The fact that the landowner is a private person or the state does not change the analysis of the form of rent under consideration. Now an excess product has to be transformed into money, and hence into a commodity, and be produced for this purpose (Marx, 1991b, 932-3). “The character of the entire mode of production is thus more or less changed. It loses its independence, its separation from any social context. What now decisive is the portion of production costs, which now include greater or lesser expenditures in money”. Although this type of

rent begins to dissolve, its basis remains the same: “The **direct producer is still the hereditary or otherwise traditional possessor of the land, who has to provide for the landlord...**an excess and compulsory labour...in the form of the surplus product transformed into money”. The direct producers have the property of the conditions of labour such as equipments, with the exception of land. These properties already becomes their own in the earlier forms firstly in practice and then in law. The property as such is “still more of a premise for the form of money rent” (Marx, 1991b, 933).

Marx continues to say: “In its further development, money rent must lead-leaving aside all intermediate forms, such as that of **the small peasant farmer**- either to the transformation of the land into **free peasant property** or to the form of the capitalist mode of production, rent paid by **the capitalist farmer**” (Marx, 1991b, 934). Here Marx distinguishes the small peasant farmer as an intermediary form and free peasant property besides capitalist farmer paying rent under the capitalist mode of production. We have two way of transformation: free peasants and capitalist farmer. It can be said that the former corresponds to French model and the latter to the English model.

With the development of money rent, the old relationship “fixed by customary law” between **the landowner and his dependent** (the direct producer possessing the land) turns into “a contractual relationship”, which is “a purely monetary relationship determined by the firm rules of positive law”. “The tiller” (the direct producer) becomes “**a mere tenant**”. In this process, Marx observes that, there is also an opportunity to expropriate the old peasant possessor and to replace him with a **capitalist farmer**. In addition, the old possessor may “buy himself out of his rent obligation” and then become “**an independent peasant-farmer**” by obtaining the ownership of land. Meanwhile, Marx observes that the formation of money rent also goes hand by hand with the formation of “**a class of non-possessing day-labourers, who hire themselves out for money**” (Marx, 1991b, 934). While this class rises sporadically at the beginning, some “better-off rent-paying peasants

exploit “**agricultural wage-labourers** on their own account” (Marx, 1991b, 935). This opportunity was also existed, says Marx in “the feudal period” during which “the wealthier peasant serfs already kept serfs of their own”. These “**better-off rent-paying peasants**” gradually takes the possibility of accumulating an amount of wealth and then “transforming themselves into future capitalists”. Marx states that some of the old possessor of the land finds a good economic environment for transforming themselves into **capitalist farmers**. However, their “development is conditioned by the development of capitalist production, not just in the countryside but in general” and they “advance particularly rapidly when, as in England in the sixteenth century, they are aided by such particularly favourable conditions as the progressive devaluation of money at that time, which, given the traditionally long terms of tenancy contracts, enriched them at the landowners’ expense” (Marx, 1991b, 935).

The formation of money rent and the emergence of contractual relation between the rent-paying peasant and landowner, says Marx can be possible only with a certain development of world market, trade and manufacture. Afterwards, “land inevitably starts to be leased to capitalists, who were formerly outside rural limits and who now transfer to the land, and to the rural economy, capital that has been obtained in the town, together with the capitalist mode of operation which has also been developed there: the production of the product as a mere commodity and a mere means of appropriating surplus-value. As a general rule, this form can come about only in those countries that dominate the world market during the transition period from the feudal to the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 1991b, 935). Before we continue, we see that this early model of the transition from the feudal mode of production to the capitalist mode of production is based on the conditions such as: in the rural economy, the position of tiller or possessor of land changes; land is leased to the capitalists; a world market, trade and manufacture develop; in the towns, a certain amount of capital is accumulated; and then the capital accumulated in the towns is transferred

into rural economy. But this model is seen in the countries which dominated the world market at that time. Afterwards, the early capitalisation model, described above, seen with the dissolution of money rent, and with the formation of rent-paying peasants, is replaced with another model represented by the capitalist farmer: “With the intervention of the **capitalist farmer** between the landowner and the actual working tiller, all relationship that arose from the **former rural mode of production are torn asunder**” (Marx, 1991b, 935). In this new model,

The farmer becomes the real controller of these agricultural workers and the real exploiter of their surplus labour, while the landowner stands in a direct relationship only to this capitalist farmer, and a mere monetary and contractual relationship at that (Marx, 1991b, 935).

Now this is the point where the nature of rent completely changes in its dominant form: “From the normal form of surplus-value and surplus labour, it declines into the excess of this surplus labour over and above the part of it that is appropriated by the exploiting capitalist in the form of profit; the entire surplus labour, both profit and the excess over profit, is now directly extracted by him, received in the form of the total surplus profit and turned into money” (Marx, 1991b, 936). Here the ground rent is an excess over the capitalist’s profit and the entire surplus labour is extracted by the capitalist farmer. The excess part of this surplus-value is handed over by the capitalist to the landowner as rent. **Amount of this rent is “determined on average, as a limit, by the average profit that capital yields in the non-agricultural spheres of production and by the non-agricultural price of production that this governs”** (Marx, 1991b, 936). Marx observes that this “excess” is “peculiar to one particular sphere of production, the agricultural”. Not rent, but profit becomes “the normal form of surplus-value”. It is “independent form only under special conditions”, and “a particular offshoot of...surplus profit”. “It is no longer land, but capital, that has now subsumed even agricultural labour under itself and its productivity” (Marx, 1991b, 936).

We have previously seen that **the average profit of the individual** capitalist or any particular capital is “determined” “by the total surplus labour that the total capital appropriates, from which each particular capital simply draws its dividends as a proportional part of the total capital”, rather than by “the surplus labour that this capital appropriates first-hand” (Marx, 1991b, 742). This means that the average is determined by the general profitability of total capital and hence given in terms of individual capitals. Marx states here that **“The average profit and the price of production governed by it are formed outside the rural situation, in the orbit of urban trade and manufacture”** (Marx, 1991b, 936). The more interesting point is this: **“The profit of the rent-paying peasant does not enter into this equalisation process, for his relationship to the landowner is not a capitalist one”**. The peasant may obtain this profit by realising an excess over and above the necessary means of subsistence through either his own labour or the exploitation of the labour of others. But its level does not determine the rent. Rather, the rent determines its limits (Marx, 1991b, 936). We have still a concept of rent which is not a capitalist category and a profit similarly. For example, Marx observes that the high rate of profit in the Middle Ages is not simply caused by the low composition of capital, but “by the fraud committed against the countryside, the appropriation of a part of the landowner’s rent and the income of his dependants” (Marx, 1991b, 936-7). We have still non-capitalist surplus-labour in the form of ground-rent and only embryonic forms of capitalist profit. “If the **countryside exploited the town politically in the Middle Ages**, wherever feudalism was not broken through by exceptional urban development as in Italy, then **the town everywhere and without exception exploited the countryside economically** through its monopoly prices, its taxation system, its guilds, its direct commercial trickery and its usury” (Marx, 1991b, 937).

If we go back to the initial entry of the capitalist farmer to the agricultural production, Marx pointed to some possible conclusions that might be imagined: one is the imagined existence of the higher price level of the

agricultural products than those of manufactured goods, and the possibility of higher prices than those governed by the average profit. If there is no such a possibility, the capitalist farmer does not realise the average profit and does not take rent into account till the general rate of profit starts to govern agricultural or rural production and hence finds an excess for paying rent to the landowner. Marx replies that this is traditional explanation for the entry of the capitalist farmer into agricultural production, as seen in **Rodbertus** (Marx, 1991b, 937). He observes that firstly, capital penetrated into agriculture gradually and in certain **branches of production whose product “offer at first a market price permanently in excess of its price of production**, in conditions of the rise of industry”. These branches, for instance, were stock-raising and sheep-farming in order to produce wool as in England of the sixteenth century (Marx, 1991b, 937). This is a selective and gradual penetration to the branches of production whose products have a market price over the production price (Marx, 1991b, 937). Secondly, capital entered into **the farms which can pay a differential rent** due to their fertility or advantageous location (Marx, 1991b, 937-8). Thirdly, even in the case that the market prices of agricultural products are not above their production prices, the entry of capital is seen **as a result of the development of the capitalist mode of production, increasing urban demand, improvement in agriculture**, and the declining production costs in agriculture (Marx, 1991b, 938). For this reason, Marx says that “rent as an excess above the average profit cannot be explained in this traditional way” (Marx, 1991b, 938). To sum Marx’s explanations in terms of the capitalist industrialisation of rural production: first, certain branches of agricultural production which offer a surplus-profit, and certain farms which have advantageous position in terms of location or fertility and lastly the demand created by the development of the capitalist mode of production lead the capital enter into rural production.

As regards with the formation of money rent, Marx observes that also “the capitalised rent, the price of land, and therefore its alienability and actual alienation, now becomes an important aspect” for the transformation of the

previous mode of production and “the relationship between owner and actual tiller, and of rent itself”. Due to this formation, “the former rent-payer” can become “an independent peasant proprietor”, and also all kind of money holders can buy a plot of land and lease it to peasants or to capitalists and thereby can “**enjoy the rent on their capital thus invested as a form of interest**” (Marx, 1991b, 938).

Share-Cropping and Small-Scale Peasant Ownership; intermediary and mixed categories: In all form of ground-rent, Marx states that he has assumed that the rent-payer is a possessor of land and the actual tiller and surplus-labour goes to the landowner (Marx, 1991b, 938). For the formation of “capitalist rent”, Marx says that “we can take the system of share-cropping, where the tenant farmer provides, besides his labour (his own or others’), a part of the operating capital, the landowner providing not only the land but also a further portion of capital (e.g. livestock), and the product being divided between share-cropper and landowner in definite proportions, which vary between different countries”. The cropper, the farmer has not sufficient capital for cultivation. On the other hand, the share of the landowner is **not “the pure form of rent”**. “It may include interest on the capital he advances, and a surplus rent on top of this. It may absorb the entire surplus labour of the farmer, or leave him a greater or smaller share of this”. Marx states that here the rent is not “the normal form of surplus-value”. The “share-cropper, whether he applies his own labour or that of others, has a claim to a share of the product not in his capacity as worker but as owner of a part of his tools, as his own capitalist”, while “the landowner claims his share not exclusively on the basis of his ownership of the land but also as the lender of capital” (Marx, 1991b, 939). Share-cropping is “**a transitional form from the original form of rent to capitalist rent**”, so we have a mixture of roles and not a pure form of rent. Cropper is somehow both his own capitalist and a worker, while the landowner is also a lender of capital. Marx also points to other forms. For example, In Romania and Poland, a residue from common property survived with the independent peasant economy and this mixture

affected a transition to “the lower forms of ground-rent”. Independent peasants owned a part of land while the other part was used in common for communal expenses and for reserves. The surplus-product produced in these common lands was “gradually usurped by “the state officials and private individuals” (Marx, 1991b, 939) and, “the originally free peasant proprietor”, who was still obliged to work for common lands, was “transformed into a statute-labourer or a payer of rent in kind”. On the other hand, those who usurped the surplus product of common lands become landed proprietors “not only of the usurped common land but of the peasant lands as well” (Marx, 1991b, 940).

The another mixture is given only as an example by Marx in the case of the landowner who “cultivates for his own account, possessing all the instruments of production and exploiting labour, whether free or unfree, by deliveries in kind or services paid in money”. Here there is **a coincidence between rent and profit** in the sense that “**there is no separation of the various forms of surplus-value**. The landowner owns the means of production and “the direct exploiter of the workers who are numbered among these elements of production”. The entire surplus-value is “conceived as profit” where “the capitalist conception prevails”. It “appears as rent” “where the capitalist mode of production does not exist itself, and the mode of conception corresponding to it is not transferred from capitalist countries”. The form is the same. “The landowner’s income, the available surplus product he appropriates, whatever name it might be given, is here the normal and prevailing form in which the entire unpaid surplus labour is directly appropriated, and landed property forms the basis for this appropriation” (Marx, 1991b, 940). Let me call this landowner, industrialist landowner, or entrepreneurial landowner.

The Genesis of the Capitalist farmer: Marx asks: “where did the capitalists originally spring from?” At the end of the sixteenth century, England had “a **class** of capitalist farmers who rich men in relation to the circumstances of

time” (Marx, 1990a, 907). The origin of these farmers goes back to the peasants of the second half of the fourteenth century who were different from other peasants only its extensive exploitation of wage-labourer. They became share-croppers (*métayers*) and shared the product with landlord according to a contract. These farmers employed wage-labourers and paid a part of the surplus product to the landlord as ground rent (Marx, 1990a, 905). The agricultural revolution of the late third century and the usurpation of the common land enriched them at the expense of the agricultural population. Another factor was the inflation of the precious metals in the sixteenth century. The wages were diminished. The ground rent was also decreased because it was determined by the initial contract. Apart from these favourable conditions, the rise in the prices of all agricultural products brought additional wealth to the farmers (Marx, 1990a, 906).

Impact of the Agricultural Revolution on Industry. The Creation of a Home Market for Industrial Capital: The “expulsion of the agricultural population supplied the urban industries... with an mass of proletarians standing entirely outside the corporate guilds and unfettered by them”. This was caused by “the revolution in property relations on the land”. The revolution as such was also the product of the new methods of cultivation, co-operation and the concentration of the means of production and hence intensification of the labour process (Marx, 1990a, 908). The peasant had to obtain his means of subsistence from “his new lord, the industrial capitalist, in the form of wages”. The raw materials were turned into “an element of constant capital”. Marx states that both capital and labour is concentrated in a way that “You cannot tell from looking at the large factories and the large farms that they have originated from the combination of many small centres of production, and have been built up by the expropriation of many small independent producers” (Marx, 1990a, 909). But the agricultural transformation not only expropriated and evicted a part of the agricultural population and created free workers for industrial capital, but also it created “home market”. The small peasants were turned into wage-labourers, and their means of subsistence

became the elements of capital, in other words, “a home market for capital” (Marx, 1990a, 910). Their consumption items and raw materials were turned into commodities, which were the articles of manufacture. Just as the scattered producers were concentrated into certain centres of production, the scattered consumers were concentrated into “one great market provided for industrial capital. “Thus the destruction of the subsidiary trades of the countryside, the process whereby manufacture is divorced from agriculture, goes hand in hand with the expropriation of the previously self-supporting peasants and their separation from their own means of production and only the destruction of rural domestic industry can give the home market of a country that extension and stability which the capitalist mode of production requires” (Marx, 1990a, 911). For the home market to be formed, the independent peasantry has to be expropriated from his soil and has to be alienated from his means of production; and manufacture have to be separated from agriculture. The manufacture is not so revolutionary that it can dominate the national economy. This is because it partially conquers the national economy and because it depends on the handicrafts of the towns and the domestic industry of the countryside. Even when it destroys the old forms of production, it recreates them in other places since it depends on them in terms of the raw materials. For this reason, it “produces... a new **class** of small villagers who cultivate the soil as a subsidiary occupation, but find their chief occupation in industrial labour, the products of which they sell to the manufacturers directly, or through the medium of merchants” (Marx, 1990a, 911). We can conclude from this that a new **class** of small villagers and even the continuation of the small peasantry are also conditioned by the preponderance of the manufacturing period. Small villagers, manufacturers and the merchants reproduce the manufacturing period at the expense of industrial capital’s domination on the home market. However, the situation as such is not suitable for the development of capitalist agriculture. For the case of England Marx observes that:

A consistent foundation for capitalist agriculture could only provided by large-scale industry, in the form of machinery; it is large-scale industry

which radically expropriates the vast majority of the agricultural population and completes the divorce between agriculture and rural domestic industry, tearing up the latter's roots, which are pinning and weaving. It therefore also conquers the entire home market for industrial capital, for the first time (Marx, 1990a, 913).

The dawn of the capitalist production are also characterised by “The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the indigenous population of that continent, the beginnings of the conquest and plunder of India, and the conversion of Africa into a preserve for the commercial hunting of blackings”. These “chief moments of primitive accumulation” are followed by the commercial wars in Europe, which “has the globe as its battlefield”. The “idyllic proceedings” as such were started by “the revolt of the Netherlands from Spain”, and “England’s anti-Jacobin War” and was continuing with “in the shape of the Opium Wars against China” when Marx published *Capital’s Volume I*. The periodical moment of primitive accumulation was seen in turn in Spain, Portugal, Holland, France and England. “These different moments are systematically combined together at the end of the seventeenth century in England; the combination embraces the colonies, the national debt, the modern tax system, and the system of protection”. The methods that were used in the stage of primitive accumulation were sometimes “brute force” as in colonies, but in each case, “the power of the state, the concentrated and organised force of society” (Marx, 1990a, 915). The power of the state was used to “hasten, as in a hothouse, the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition”. Here Marx explains what he understands by “force” (not “brute force”): “Force is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power” (Marx, 1990a, 916). Marx implies that “the concentrated and organised force of society” becomes “the power of the state”. He also implies that economic power is the revolutionary force. The state is seen both an instrument for the transition and concentrated-organised force of the society. But the power of the state and the economic power are clearly distinguished. The other observation can be made by

following Marx's phrase "the concentrated and organised force of society" that if the force of society is concentrated into somewhere, it also stands in a dispersed and unorganized way in society and accumulates in it as a whole. In addition, since "economic power" is nothing but the wealth of society that is to a large degree, possessed by the capitalists, economic power and the power of the capitalists are the same things. In other words, economic power is seen as the *economic class* power of the capitalists.

Differential rent and absolute rent: Let me stop the exposition of ground-rent as surplus-profit in its forms of differential rent and absolute rent. **The former** takes as given the general production price of any commodity and emerges from "the difference between the individual production price of the particular capital which has the monopolised natural force available to it and the general production price for capital invested in the sphere of production in question". Its source is not "any absolute rise in productivity of the capital applied or of labour it appropriates", but is "the greater relative returns from certain particular capitals invested in a sphere of production, as compared with those capital investments that are excluded from these exceptional, favourable conditions of productivity which have been created by nature" (Marx, 1991b, 785). However, the source of surplus profit is not the nature itself, but the nature is only a base for it (Marx, 1991b, 786). For the owner of this natural basis of rent, the landowner (or the proprietor of waterfall, for instance) his property is the cause of the transformation of the surplus-profit into ground-rent (Marx, 1991b, 786). The price of land or waterfall is "nothing but capitalised rent". "Landed property enables the proprietor to lay hold of the difference between the individual profit and the average profit; the profit captured in this way, which is renewed every year, can be capitalised and then appears as the price of the natural force itself" (Marx, 1991b, 787). Marx adds that things that will be said of agriculture are also valid for mining (Marx, 1991b, 787).

So we have seen that the differential rent as a form of surplus profit is caused by the difference between individual and general prices of production. It arises from the individual advantages of production.

Absolute ground-rent: The subject of absolute ground-rent is the 45. chapter of *Capital's Volume 3* and utilises many economic concepts which are developed by Marx throughout *Capital* as a whole. In the analysis of (agricultural) differential rent, it is assumed that the worst land pays no rent. In other words, this land has not a production price below the general market price and hence does not yield a surplus profit that is to be transformed into rent (Marx, 1991b, 882). However, the fact that the farmer can make his operation at the customary normal profit, that is no rent paid, does not mean that the landlord lease out his property for nothing just in the case of "interest-free credit". This means the absence of landed property (Marx, 1991b, 884). But, landed property is a barrier to capital investment and differential rent presupposes the monopoly over land. Otherwise, the surplus-profit is not transformed into ground rent. Marx states that "landed property remains such a barrier even where rent in the form of differential rent disappears on the worst type of land. Marx adds that **if capital investment takes place "without payment of rent" in a capitalist country**, we face "a factual- if not a legal- abolition of landed property, an abolition that can occur only under very special conditions of an accidental nature" (Marx, 1991b, 885). This may occur where the capitalist is a landowner or the landowner himself a capitalist. But "the capitalist cultivation of the land assumes a separation between functioning capital and landed property" and "generally rules out cultivation by the landed proprietor himself" (Marx, 1991b, 885). Secondly, "A leasehold may include particular pieces of land that pay no rent", and "in fact rented free". However, the reason behind this is the fact that the farmer pays rent for the land to which his pieces of land are an accessory (Marx, 1991b, 886). Thirdly, "A farmer may invest extra capital on his existing leasehold" and obtain a surplus profit and gets it for himself during the contract time (Marx, 1991b, 886). However, the farmer inevitably

faces the competition of additional capital investments (Marx, 1991b, 887-8). Nevertheless, the examples of this factual abolition of landed property do not solve the problem of rent.

Differential rent has the peculiarity that here landed property seizes only the surplus profit that the **farmer himself would otherwise pocket**, and under certain circumstances does pocket for the duration of his tenancy. Here landed property simply causes the transfer of a portion of the commodity price that arises without any effort on its part... a portion reducible to surplus profit (Marx, 1991b, 889).

It is here not “a cause that creates this component of price or the rise in price that it presupposes”. If the worst land is not cultivated up to the point where it yields a rent, a surplus over and above the production price, even if its cultivation meets the production price, “then landed property is the *creative basis of this rise in price*”. “*Landed property has produced this rent itself*” (Marx, 1991b, 889). However, the source of this rent of the worst land is not a rise in the price of its products. But, it is caused by the fact that “the worst soil has to yield a rent for cultivation to be permitted at all would be the reason why... prices rise to the point at which this condition can be fulfilled” (Marx, 1991b, 889). Only when the prices of product rise to a certain point where a rent can be yielded, the worst soil will be cultivated by eliminating the barrier or the monopoly of the landed property. The fact that the worst land “cannot be cultivated until the governing market price has risen high enough to let it yield a rent is the sole basis here for the rise in the market price to a point which... still pays a price of production that also yields a rent for” the worst land (Marx, 1991b, 889).

In the cases where rent is paid by a deduction from the normal wages or normal profit, rent here is not an independent category distinct from wage and profit. In addition, where the wages of agricultural worker is below the normal average level, a part of wages goes into rent. This situation is also seen in the farmer of the worst land. The price of production includes this lower wage and the sale of the product at its production price does pay a

rent. In addition, the landowner may lease his land out to the worker, and the worker later pays a rent out of his wage. However, "In none of these cases is a genuine rent paid, even though a lease-price is. Where relations corresponding to the capitalist mode of production exist, however, rent and lease-price must coincide. This is precisely the normal situation that is under analysis here" (Marx, 1991b, 890). It should be noted, meanwhile, that "paying rent" not always mean "yielding rent". As Marx states the fact that "capital investments can be made on the land in the capitalist mode of production without yielding rent" is possible. Moreover, the analysis of ground-rent can not be made by referring to colonies where landed property forms "no barrier to the investments of capital, or of labour without capital", and the exploitation of land is not "impeded by the monopoly of landed property" (Marx, 1991b, 891). Moreover, Marx takes attention to the fact that "Legal ownership of land, by itself, does not give the proprietor and ground-rent. It certainly does give him the power, however, to withdraw his land from cultivation until economic conditions permit a valorisation of it that yields him a surplus, whether the land is used for agriculture proper or for other productive purposes such as building, etc." (Marx, 1991b, 891). If any capital investment takes place on the land, it "must yield" the owner of land "a rent". "He leases only when a lease-price can be paid. The market price must therefore have risen above the price of production, to $P + r$, so that a rent can be paid to the landowner". For this reason, "a small rise in the market price above the price of production is sufficient to bring new land of the poorest kind onto the market" (Marx, 1991b, 891). But the rent cannot be derived here from the difference in fertility since the poorest land is under consideration. Marx points "the distinction between the value of commodities and their price of production". These are not identical with each other "even though the production prices of commodities considered in their totality are governed only by their total value, and although the movement of production prices for commodities of different kinds, taking all other circumstances as equal, is determined exclusively by the moment of their values" (Marx, 1991b, 892). Production price of a commodity may be "above or below its

value” and “coincides with it only in exceptional cases”. But it should be noted that higher selling price above the production price does not mean that they are sold above their value (Marx, 1991b, 892).

Landed property place a barrier upon capitalist investment for uncultivated or unleased land and permit it only by demanding a rent, even though these lands does not offer any differential land and could have been tilled dues to a little increase in the market price which met the price of production. It is the barrier of the landed property that must lead the market price to rise to a point where land can offer a rent, “a surplus over the price of production” (Marx, 1991b, 896). If rent is not equal to this extra value, a part of surplus goes into the equalisation, on the other hand, if it is equal to this excess, the all excess is withdrawn from the equalisation process. In any cases, **“agricultural products are always sold at a monopoly price, not because their price stands above their value but rather because it is equal to their value, or is below their value but above their price of production”** (Marx, 1991b, 897). The relation is set up between the market price and the production price of the agricultural commodity rather than between the value and the price. Marx states that **“Their monopoly consists in this, that their value is not levelled down to their price of production as it is with other industrial products whose values stand above the general price of production”** (Marx, 1991b, 897). The prices of agricultural products cannot reach their value, and because of the monopoly of the landed property, the excess value over their price of production “can come to be their general market price”. However, Marx states that “it is not the rise in the product’s price that is the cause of the rent but rather the rent that is the cause of the rise in price” (Marx, 1991b, 897) and the relation of the absolute rent here to the differential rents is so formed through the governing market price that “all differential rents rise by corresponding multiples” of absolute rent in “a unit area of the worst land” (Marx, 1991b, 897).

To simplify, Marx gives the example where “the average composition of the non-agricultural social capital” is $85c + 15v$ in the case of “the rate of surplus-value 100 percent”. Here the price of production is 115, and where the composition in agricultural capital is $75c + 25v$, “the value of the product and the governing market value” is 125 in the same rate of surplus-value. (It should be noted that in the former the price is given whereas in the latter the value of the product). Here the total capitals are assumed to be the same (100, and 100). If there emerges an average price, the total surplus-value will be $15 + 25 = 40$, or 20 percent for the total capital 200. Both agricultural and non-agricultural products would be sold at 120. But as the result of the equalisation of production prices, the normal market prices of the non-agricultural products (120) will stand above their values (115) and the agricultural products (120) below their value (125). If the agricultural products were sold “at their full value” (125), their market value would become 5 higher than average market value of the agricultural and non-agricultural products while this would be for the non-agricultural products 5 lower than the equalisation process operated. If market conditions were not available for the realisation of the full value of the agricultural products, the total surplus over their price of production; “industrial products would be sold somewhat above their value and agricultural products somewhat above their price of production” (Marx, 1991b, 898) (the former above 115, and the latter above 125). For rent to be yielded for the latter, as Marx has demonstrated above, the necessary condition is that the market price is above the production price because of the monopoly set up by the landed property. However, here the difference “depends on **the general state of the market**, how far the market price rises above the price of production and towards the value, and to what extent, therefore, the surplus-value produced over and above the given average profit in agriculture is either transformed into rent or goes into the general equalisation of surplus-value that settles the average profit”. However, whether one or the other is valid, Marx observes that “**the absolute rent, arising from the excess value over and above the price of production, is simply a part of the agricultural surplus-value, the**

transformation of this surplus-value into rent, its seizure by the landowner; just as differential rent arises from the transformation of surplus profit into rent, its seizure by landed property, at the general governing price of production” (Marx, 1991b, 898). In the absolute rent, Marx points to the surplus-value embedded in the agricultural product, On the other hand, in the case of differential rent, he refers to the surplus-profit which is transformed into rent. This is related with the fact that even if there is no surplus-profit of the agricultural capital, but only a normal average profit, there should be a part of surplus-value which must be paid to the landowner in the form of rent. This caused by the absolute barrier which is set up by the landed property itself. For example, Marx states that even if all agricultural land were leased out under the capitalist mode of production, each land would yield a rent. However, some capital investments on land could not yield a rent because of the absence of “an absolute barrier” to the capital. Land here would impose only “a relative barrier”. In such a case, **all rent would be transformed into a differential rent** determined not by the quality of the soil but rather by the difference between the surplus profit arising on a particular class of land after the final capital investments, and the rent that would be paid for the lease of land of the worst class” (Marx, 1991b, 899). If there is permission for the capitalist utilisation of land, landed property will be no longer an absolute barrier (Marx, 1991b, 899).

Absolute and differential forms of rent, says Marx, are “**the only normal ones**”. Rent is also originated from “**a genuine monopoly price**, which is **determined** neither by the price of production of the commodities nor by their value, but rather by **the demand of the purchasers and their ability to pay**, consideration of which therefore **belongs to the theory of competition**, where **the actual movement of market prices is investigated**” (Marx, 1991b, 898).

Disappearance of absolute rent can be observed in the condition where the average composition of agricultural capital equals to the social average or is

higher than it. But this means only “namely a rent that is different both from differential rent and from rent depending on an actual monopoly price” (Marx, 1991b, 899). It loses its own distinctive character in terms of differential rent or rent caused by the monopoly price. In this *form* of disappearance, the value will not stand above its price of production and agricultural capital puts into action the same amount of labour and realise the same amount of surplus labour with the non-agricultural capital. These points to a development of agriculture (Marx, 1991b, 899).

Another peculiarity of agriculture is seen in the stock-raising in which labour-power is very small according to the livestock (constant capital). So it is not always true that in agriculture more labour-power is set into motion than non-agricultural capital in the social average (Marx, 1991b, 901). Marx states that in his analysis of rent, he has concerned the agricultural capital which produces main and major foodstuffs “for all civilized peoples”. If agricultural capital which does not produce main foodstuffs such as corn, the prices are determined in a different way. For example “an artificial **pasture**” for cattle can be turned into an arable land and the price of cattle “has to rise high enough to yield the same rent as equally good arable land”. Here the price of cattle is determined also by “the rent of the corn-growing land”. Marx says that “Ramsay was correct to note that in this way **the price of cattle is artificially raised by rent, by the economic expression of landed property**, and thus by landed property itself” (Marx, 1991b, 902).

In the case of absolute rent, rent seems to be caused by a mere monopoly price. For example, natural woodland is paid a rent in timber by a capitalist. Here rent seems to be “a simple monopoly surcharge”. However, his capital is composed solely of variable capital. For this reason timber involves a greater excess of surplus-value than another capital of same size or capitals of higher composition. “The average profit can thus be paid from the timber, while a significant excess accrues to the owner of the woodland in the form of rent”. On the other hand, if the demand for timber rises, the price of timber

will equal to its value and an excess over the normal profit will go to the owner of woodland in the form of land (Marx, 1991b, 903).

There are **two rival factors in the case of differential rent**. The one is the rises in market prices which lead the previously excluded fertile lands to be cultivated. The other is the fact less fertile lands may obtain the advantage of location (Marx, 1991b, 903). Or the development in the transit technology can include the better lands into the market competition (Marx, 1991b, 903-4). Even in older civilised countries, this is valid and “as Wakefield correctly notes, location is decisive”. Marx here inserts special question to the competition of capitals in addition to his analysis of the absolute barrier which the landed property puts against capital. However, location is not a static factor just like in the case of the fertility of land. He observes that “**firstly the contradictory effects of location and fertility**, and the **variability of the location factor**, which is constantly balanced out, bringing about **constant progressive changes** which also tend to balance out, alternatively bring equally good, better or worse tracts of land into competition with those previously cultivated” (Marx, 1991b, 904).

In the determination of rent, besides the factors of fertility and location, also the development of agricultural technology and natural sciences changes the fertility of land itself. For example, lands that are previously considered inferior, can be made first rank of lands as was done in France and England. Or mechanical obstacles for the cultivation of land which is not poor in terms of chemical composition can be overcome (Marx, 1991b, 904).

Last observation to mention is the condition of market and the business opportunities in the country under consideration. If the business is not good, farmer may not have the opportunity of an average profit with or without rent payment on the uncultivated land and hence this condition of business will not be adequate for additional capital investment to the agriculture. On the hand, “when capital is abundant, it streams into agriculture even without a

rise in market prices, as long as the normal conditions are fulfilled". In addition, Marx observes that even if the new land is better, between it and the last cultivated land, "there always exists a distinction in the shape of the varying cost of ploughing up, and it depends on the level of market prices and credit conditions whether this is undertaken or not". That these lands are included into competition reduces market price to the previous level and the same rent goes to it. It is wrong to assume that the last land bears no rent. "One could prove in the same way that **the last houses to be built** yield no rent besides simple interest on the building, even if they are rented out". But "they yield **ground-rent** even before they bring in **house-rent**, for they often stand empty a long while" (Marx, 1991b, 905). *Last land theory without rent* is so ruled out by Marx.

Formation of agricultural rent as a monopoly price is small just as the absolute rent is small in normal conditions whether the excess value above the production price is greater or smaller. Marx states that "The essence of absolute rent consists in this: **equally large capitals** produce different amounts of surplus-value in different spheres of production according to their differing average composition, given an **equal rate of surplus-value** or equal exploitation of labour. **In industry these different amounts of surplus-value are equalised to give the average profit** and are **divided uniformly between the individual capitals as aliquot parts** of the total capital". On the other hand, if the land is a factor of production as in agriculture and mining, landed property "blocks this equalisation for the capitals invested on the land and captures a portion of surplus-value which would be otherwise go into the equalisation process, giving the general rate of profit". It should be noted that this portion of surplus-value which does not enter into the equalisation process of different amounts of surplus-value does not go into industry, rather stays in the capitalist production which needs land. So it is not a transferred value from agriculture to industry. Marx goes on to say: "Rent then forms a part of the value of commodities, in particular of their surplus-value, which simply accrues to the landowners who extract it

from the capitalists, instead of to the capitalist class who have extracted it from the workers". Here the relation takes place between the capitalist and the landowner, between the profit and the ground-rent. "It is assumed in this connection that agricultural capital sets more labour in motion than an equally large portion of non-agricultural capital". It is sure the greater amount of labour set in motion is contingent on the development level of agriculture in the face of industry and "this difference must decline with the progress of agriculture, unless the ratio in which the variable part of capital declines vis-à-vis the constant part is still greater in industrial capital than in agriculture" (Marx, 1991b, 906). In other words, this is valid as long as industrial capital waits for the development of agricultural capital to catch it.

Rent of buildings, of mines and price of land: Marx states that as long as rent exists, "differential rent always appears and always follows the same laws as it does in agriculture". Monopoly over the natural forces, which can be a mine, building site, or fishing ground, and a surplus-profit sized from the functioning capital are enough for the analysis of ground-rent. The base of the rent of the building lands and of other non-agricultural land is "governed by agricultural rent proper". In the land for building, "rent is characterised first by the preponderant influence that location exerts here on the differential rent (very important, for example, in the case of vineyards, and building land in big towns)". Another characteristic of this rent is seen in the fact that activity of the owner of land "consists simply in exploiting advances in social development... towards which he does not contribute and in which he risk nothing, unlike the industrial capitalist". Finally, the existence of monopoly prices in many cases and "the most shameless exploitation of poverty (for poverty is a more fruitful source for house-rent than the mines of Potosi were for Spain)". Marx observes that when this power is combined with industrial capital in the same hands provides capital an immense power in its struggle against workers by excluding them from their habitat (Marx, 1991b, 908).

House-rent, “in as much as this is interest and amortization for the capital invested in the house, is not “rent of land pure and simple” especially where “the landowner and the speculative builder are completely different persons” as in England (Marx, 1991b, 909). In the growing cities and especially where “building is carried on factory-style, as in London”, ground-rent, rather than houses themselves, is “the real basic object of speculative building”. Marx refers to a speculative builder, who says “the builder makes very little profit out of the buildings themselves; he makes the principal part of the profit out of the improved ground-rents” (Marx, 1991b, 909).

The rent which originates from the monopoly price for the products or the land itself and the rent which leads into monopoly price must be distinguished. The former is caused by the desire and ability to pay of the buyer and is independent from the price of product. Here, surplus-profit, which is transformed into rent, is caused by the monopoly price or it can be said that it is created by the monopoly price. On the other hand, in the second case, rent creates the monopoly price since the product is sold above its production price and above its value “as a result of the barrier that landed property opposes against the rent-free investment of capital on untilled land” (Marx, 1991b, 910).

3.2 Dissolution of central military feudalism, and the comprador alliance

Dominant Contradiction in Imperialist Era: Imperialism belongs to a period which Marx did not live. It was imperialism which characterised the twentieth century, not free competitive era of capitalism in Marx’s time. Imperialism, which was the last phase of capitalism as described by Lenin, was the domination of the monopolies, the domination of finance capital which was composed of the financial capital and industrial capital. The finance capital was directed by a group of bank owners and monopoly owners (financial oligarchy) and controlled the capitalist state and the formation of the state monopoly capitalism. In the previous era of capitalism, which was the foreign

trade age of capitalism, and existing in the pre-capitalist countries, exploitation was realised through commodity exportation, while in the imperialist era, it was realised through industrial capital exportation and debts. By doing so, interest and profit transfer were the main exploitation of the immense quantity of surplus-value.

In the imperialist era, the main contradictions of capitalism were threefold:

- 1) Contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist-imperialist countries,
- 2) Contradiction between the imperialism and the exploited and dominated nations and people,
- 3) Contradiction between the imperialist countries and monopoly groups, caused by the competition over the distribution of the world market, raw materials.

In the imperialist era, **in the capitalist countries**, the production are socialised and individual production is liquidated while the property is completely individualised and the means of production is concentrated in the hands of a group of finance capitalists (finance oligarchy). The masses are predominantly proletarianised. The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie became the basic class contradiction. Production is concentrated into certain places, and the productivity of labour increased in large degree. These all implies that all objective conditions for the transition to socialism are completed (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 2-3).

Imperialism has different and inverse impacts over the pre-capitalist countries it exploits. It created a dependent social and economic structure. A large part of local bourgeoisie which did not compete with industrial capitalism even in the time of pre-imperialist era became a comprador bourgeoisie which represented imperialism and became its agents. This class is a mere instrument of the imperialism. With the development of capitalism, this class

developed more and became more dependent on imperialist capital. Imperialism made political alliance with this bourgeoisie and with the feudality which has an interest in the continuation of the pre-capitalist structure. In sum, ***imperialism-comprador bourgeoisie-feudality alliance*** became dominant in all exploited countries.

However, in the exploited countries, with the development of imperialist capital investments, there also emerged a proletariat, and rival powers against imperialism. ***All national classes***, firstly the proletariat, rural labourers, petty-bourgeoisie and the national sections of the bourgeoisie had interests which contradicted with imperialism. For this reason, in the exploited countries, the national classes revolted against the imperialism and there emerged ***national liberation wars***.

Imperialism also increased the ***contradiction between the monopoly capitalist states and the groups***. The division of the world among them was completed in the beginning of the twentieth century. Imperialist countries had to go into two world wars in order to solve their internal economic problems. The First World War was a new sharing war of the world among the imperialists. One of the results of the world wars was the militarization of the imperialist economies. These economies provided maximum-profits for the monopolies (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 3).

The important ***debate among the socialist*** camp emerged between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party in the evaluation of the 1961's party program of the former and its definitions about the state, the party and the relations between the capitalist and the socialist camps. In the programme, it was stated that The Soviet Union completed the pause of the proletarian dictatorship and entered into communism. There were no longer exploiter classes. On the other hand, The Chinese party replied that societies in socialist phase and the proletarian dictatorship were class societies and had sharp class contradictions. The

proletarian dictatorship should continue till the classes and the state would completely disappear. Transition to communism could not be phase that could be mentioned in that day onward (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 6).

The other disagreements were related with the ***peaceful coexistence*** of the socialist and capitalist camp and with the ***peaceful transition*** to socialism in the capitalist and exploited countries which had an anti-imperialist national liberation struggle. For the Soviets, the world peace, which was the duty of the socialist countries, would prevent nuclear danger and also “***competition in peace***” could demonstrate to the people of the capitalist countries that socialism deserves struggle. Socialism would “compete in peace”. In addition, in the current conditions, in both capitalist countries and the other countries which continued an anti-imperialist national liberation struggle “peaceful transition” to socialism was possible. On the other hand, the Chinese party argued that “peaceful coexistence principle” was valid only in the relations between the capitalist and the socialist countries. It was not valid for the relation between the dominated people and the imperialism, and between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 7).

I can argue that *the Aydınlık's* position towards the division and the problems within the socialist camp has a common sense and had no sharp attitudes. However, in the cases of the dominant contradiction, of the events of Czechoslovakia, of the 1961 Soviet's party programme, of the existence of the class contradictions in the socialist society, ***it implicitly feels closeness to China's criticism and attitudes.***

The **main exported ideologies of the imperialism** are those: 1) to conceal the real enemy, it is imposed that the division between the developed (including both capitalist and socialist countries) and undeveloped countries are the dominant contradiction, rather between the imperialism and the exploited nations, 2) to prevent the national fronts and to create divisions

within the national fronts, anti-communism is imposed through the ideas of religion, family, etcetera, 3) religious institutions are put forward and The idea is imposed as if anti-imperialism is the same with anti-religious attitude, 4) opportunism is supported and injected into the national liberation movement in order to limit the movement within the status quo and to the parliamentary struggle and it is tried to gain the control of the left movement (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 12).

Despite all attacks towards American economic hegemony (also from Japan) its military world hegemony is valid. America was still the commander of the imperialist camp. After the Second World War, the formation of the socialist camp led the European countries to postpone their inner competition and to make limitless military and political alliance with USA. The product of this relation was the establishment of NATO. Until late 1950s, the confrontation between the socialist and capitalist camp resulted into the extension of American hegemony and into other treaties and pacts such as CENTO; SEATO, which aimed to encircle the socialist camp. In this period, western societies were propagated by so-called “Red Alarm” and “The Soviet occupation”. In this tension, USA’s imperialism put forward “Marshal Plan” and “Truman Doctrine” for the American monopolies to dominate post-war Europe and Turkey. In this period, the strategy of NATO was based on the encirclement of the socialist camp, “total attack doctrine” and “the farness of USA to the military attacks”. European countries had no nuclear power and hence they depended on the military power of USA (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 16). However, after 1957, the fact that the Soviets developed intercontinental missiles and then the establishment of a nuclear balance after 1960 fundamentally changed the NATO’s strategy and the relation between USA and the Europe. After 1962 Cuba crisis between the Soviets and USA led USA to create far more flexible doctrine. The Western societies and particularly France recognised that in a war situation USA could not help Europe. AS a result, militarist block among the imperialists was broken down. France left from the military organisation of NATO. Similar development

emerged in other pacts. CENTO became insignificant for Turkey, Pakistan and Iran. Pakistan leaned into China.

These developments signalled that the tensions within the capitalist world increases and that USA would increase its forceful actions (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 16-7).

Feudalism: Erdost states that “The feudalism is today the most important problem of the agricultural countries which is connected to a backward technology”. These countries are “completely or nearly dependent or semi-dependent” Such a dependent or semi-dependent condition and feudalism or semi-feudalism is closely interconnected. A capitalist development in such a condition of agriculture can be possible due to a rural bourgeoisie which is determined by the imperialism, rather than due to “an independent rural bourgeoisie” as a result of the inner dynamics of the society itself. For this reason, an exact definition of feudalism is necessary for the exact definition of independence struggle (Erdost, 1969a, 343). Erdost says that according to the definitions which Marx obtained from the information about the Far East societies in that time but did not publish because of their “not proved conclusions”, Asiatic mode of production of eastern societies had not their own inner dynamics of development and they were turned into either feudalism or capitalism under the impact of the capitalist world market. Marx pointed to these “not proved conclusions”, but these ideas later on were to be used by the Westerners to justify their dominations on the Asia and Africa for their development. On the other hand, Lenin, Stalin and Mao did not concern this subject so much and put aside while socialist countries of Asia did not accept its validity (Erdost, 1969a, 345-6).

Before the analysis of the social structure of the Ottoman Empire (in the history of Anatolia only), Erdost accepts the definition of feudalism made by Maurice Dobb’s article “*The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*”: “the direct seizure of the unpaid surplus labour from the producer”. This definition

is opposed to the idea that feudalism was seen only in the Western Europe where it was classically defined conceptually. It is also “the most practical explanation” for a Marxist analysis of the feudalism today. Legal forms vary in different countries and each feudal unit (Erdost, 1969a, 346). In feudal society, “surplus labour of the feudally dependent producer” is appropriated by the feudal “in the form of product”, i.e. “directly” and “through seizure”. In this society, the equivalent of the necessary labour is the product itself produced by the producer himself. In capitalism, the wage –labourer is a citizen who has legal rights and politically independent despite its economic slavery. He sells his labour-power as a commodity and his surplus labour is bought by the capitalist with a payment for the equivalent of the necessary labour. Surplus-labour is bought through a contract by the capitalist without paying its equivalent. Necessary labour is paid by the capitalist to the wage-labourer in the form of money. In capitalism, surplus labour is hidden in the labour power itself which sold in return of money. In feudalism, surplus labour is directly captured from the producer in the form of the product which the later produces. This relation of production has various legal forms in different countries, but these legal forms provide the **direct seizure** of the unpaid surplus labour of the producer (here and hereafter all emphasis in bold, writer’s own) (Erdost, 1969a, 347).

As for the transition from feudalism to capitalism in the context of agriculture, Erdost points to two alternatives. One is the French and American path where lands were completely or partially appropriated by the peasants and their transformation into capitalist peasant farms. The other is exemplified by the Prussian Germany and the Tsarist Russia where feudal farms were turned into capitalist farms through the continuation of the power of the feudal estates over the villages. Here the serf peasants were transformed into either daily workers or the tenants of the farm. However, this transition does not mean that capitalism immediately replaces the feudalism completely in agriculture. They can coexist for along while. In addition, this transition takes

different forms under the imperialist era. The last point is the subject of another study, says Erdost (Erdost, 1969a, 347).

The relationship between the owner of ikta and the peasant (reaya) is regulated by the feudal state. The reaya possessed the land and could inherit it to his children. But, it did not have any right of leaving the land or keeping it idle. A portion of product he produced went to the owner of the ikta in the form of rent in kind according to a portion determined by the state. İktas frequently changed hands or were seized by the state since the owners of the big iktas and the sultan frequently irritated each other. Both that the iktas could be inherited by their owners and that they could be possessed by the reaya implied the first seeds of the private property on both parts of the reaya and the owners of the iktas, in the case of the owner of the timars in the Ottoman Empire (Erdost, 1969a, 356).

The greater part of the direct producers was the peasant reaya. Its dependency was determined by the state and took various forms in the governments (of the Kurdish districts), the yurtluks and ocaks (of the big Kurdish families), the malikane-divani system, free timars and unfree timars. Although the state regulated the dependency of the reaya, the serfdom of the reaya, its legal and administrative dependency was implemented by the local lords and the heads of the great families. Nevertheless, “the reaya was in the position of **serf** in terms of the dependency”. “Reaya is in the condition of a class by its born and not free to change his class” (Erdost, 1969a, 358). He may be given a part of land (dirlik) due to his services, but in his death, this land does not go into his children or his father. The reaya was registered in a book and had not a right for being a sipahi (small state military officer owning the timar). Wherever the reaya left his farm (timar), the sipahi had a right to find him and bring him back to the timar as long as ten years did not pass. He, together with his family, was taken to the new lands occupied in exile. He was tied to the land and had to make farming. If he did not till the farm which was registered for him, he had to pay a tax (çiftbozan vergisi). He had not

any right for changing his occupation (farming) and making another job. Otherwise, he had to make a payment which is defined by the state. Erdost observes that such a situation is not different from the position of the serf in Europe who wanted to immigrate to the cities had to make payment to the feudals (Erdost, 1969a, 359).

Reaya is tied to the land, the timar, his job and the sipahi. Otherwise, he had to make payment. This dependency was determined by the state rather than the sipahi. But, “the fact that the military-feudal state legalises this dependency, and defines the relationship between the sipahi and the reaya does not at all suffice to explain that the reaya was a ‘free peasant’” (Erdost, 1969a, 357-8). The relationship between the sipahi and the reaya was determined by the state, hence the sipahi did not have unlimited legal and administrative authority over the reaya. But these fact only mean that, says Erdost, the feudal characteristics or the authorities of the sipahi was not proper. This was caused by the fact that “the central-feudal state” did not allow the formation of “the independent feudals” which would threaten it and wanted to feed the sipahis who were to be ready for the military service under the army controlled by itself (Erdost, 1969a, 360).

In the Empire the state lands and the private lands followed a line through which the one invaded the other. In the rising period of the Ottoman Empire, the former increased at the expense of the latter. In the declining period (after 16.century), the latter expanded at the expense of the state lands. When we came to the half of the 19.century, the miri lands (state lands) which had long been possessed by the peasants and rendered semi-private properties were defined and then turned into the private lands through successive land laws after the 1848 Land Law. The last residues were abolished in this development of private property in 1926 Citizen Law. Formerly, state lands were rented out to the peasant farmers in terms of their sufficiency by the sipahi or emin in the name of the state. This lease form was inherited from the peasant to his son and took a permanent tenancy. These units of farms

could not be sold and could not be divided or merged. Erdost observes that this land regime and possession prevented both “the proletarianisation of the peasant” and the concentration of land in certain hands (Erdost, 1969a, 364). This prevented the transition from feudalism to capitalism in agriculture (Erdost, 1969a, 364-5).

The fact that the Ottoman Empire could not transform into capitalism was not the result of the Asiatic mode of production. This mode is not valid for the Ottoman society. In the Asiatic mode of production, there is no private property. The land is the property of the commune. All surplus product belongs to the state. The ground-rent forms the tax in kind. The villages concentrate all industry and agriculture. The villages are self-sufficient economic units. None of these is seen in the Ottoman society. “The Ottoman empire is the feudal central state”. However, this feudality did not reach in its completed form as in Europe. In the empire, the capitalism began to appear. The usurer’s capital was prevalent in the 16. century. In the commercial and artisanal spheres, the capital was entering to the production in a direct way. Capital became “capitalist category”. In the seventieth century of Istanbul, there were 9466 private workshops which employed 46426 workers (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 287). In Bursa, there were approximately 50 textile weavers (287-8). However, with the beginning of the 19. Century, “the world capitalist system” destroys the developing industries. The empire needed the protective tariffs. However, it did not do this. The world capitalist system did not only destroy the newly emerging capitalism in the empire, but also transformed it into a “semi-colonised” country (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 288).

Pre-capitalist economic formations: Meanwhile, the question of oriental commune has a different problematic to me in Marx’s *Grundrisse*. The most attractive section of the *Grundrisse* has been the part named “*Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*” (in Marx, 1979). The first subtitle of the section was “the formation of capital-relation or the process before the first accumulation”.

The second subtitle was the Asiatic form of property, antique form of property and German form of property. Here Marx did not deal with the modes of production, but forms of property. It was already the fact that the title was “formation” rather than “mode”. Marx always dealt with the problem in the context of “community” as the “unity of the subjective and objective conditions”. The other subject was the emergence of “the free labourer”. It was followed by the first formation of capital” and “the expropriation of the labourer”. Marx’s purpose of the analysis was to take notes on the formation of the free labourer and capital. It can also be said that Marx tried to compare the degree of possibilities of transition to capitalist mode of production in the different forms of property and community structures. Marx’s analysis pointed to the difficulties rather than impossibilities of transition to capitalist mode in the so-called Asiatic communities based on Asiatic or oriental communal property.

Beginning of the domination of “the imperialism and the comprador capital”: The imperialism turns Turkey in a semi-dependent country through commodity and capital exportation, debts and raw materials required by industry such as petrol. It cooperates with “a section of the local bourgeoisie” and with “all big landowners” whether they are capitalist or not (Erdost, 1970a, 250). *The Aydınlık* here firstly points to the exact numbers of semi-dependent position of Turkey thanks to Erdost. According to the Industrial Survey of 1927; there were 13683 firms which employed 4 and more workers (“men”); 642 of 10299 total employers were “foreigner”, 702 of 7115 total servant (“memur”) were “foreigner” and 347 of total 147128 workers were “foreigner”. The nationalisation of the foreign firms took place between 1928 and 1945. The state debts were completely paid between 1924 and 1946. First military aids were obtained from the US in 1945. But before 1950, the debts were not very high. After this year, the debts rapidly increased. In the same year, the interests for the private debts were permitted to be transferred to the foreign countries. Erdost quotes from Kenan Bulutoğlu (Foreign Capital in Turkey in 100 Questions): Between 1951 and 1954 the

state issued several laws which encouraged the entry of foreign capital into the country. Thereby, first military aids were followed by the state debts, and regulations for foreign capital. Capital that entered into Turkey between 1951 and 1968, was composed of the direct capital investments (52, 3 percent) and money capital (42, 2 percent) and patents and licences (3, 5 percent). Between 1961 and 1968, the firms of the United States form the majority (Erdost, 1970a, 250). 85 percent of money capital and 38 of the other form of foreign capital were transferred in the form of profit in this period (Erdost, 1970a, 250-1). To these profits must be added the interests paid by the private firms. The period after 1945 pointed to sharp difference from the period between 1927 and 1946 in terms of nationalisation and debt policy of the state. According to the industrial survey of 1964, the private foreign firms owned all shares of 46 firms and 104 firms in the form of joint stock. Only American private firms transferred an amount of profit, which was close to the amount of two years' national income of Turkey between 1951 and 1968 (106 billion liras). Even only the four Dutch private firms transferred more than this amount (119 billion liras). The state debts, including interests, was 26 billion liras and private debts were approximately three times greater than the state debts of 1924 (Erdost, 1970a, 251).

Erdost concludes that "Local private capital, particularly the capital in the stage of development preserves its national character in general, that is to say, the national bourgeoisie objectively existed". The foreign capital makes the state and the local firms indebted directly or indirectly through the imperialist states. In addition, "a section of the local capital and the state have fused with the foreign capital". Foreign capital also influenced the economy without direct cooperation (Erdost, 1970a, 252).

The dominant mode of production and the dominant classes: Erdost says that according to Boratav, the prevalent producer in Turkey is the small producer in agriculture, and the exploitation provided from these producers covers the most part of the exploitation in the country. This exploitation is

realised by the merchant who buys the products of the small producers and the usurer to whom the producer is indebted in return of interest. Erdost argues that these ideas are completely wrong.

Firstly, the surplus value produced in Turkey is provided by “the proletariat” rather than “the small producer peasant”. **In 1965**, according to the current prices, although 64 percent of total 31,3 million population, 20,5 million, lived in the villages, the share of the agriculture in the national income was only 37,1 percent. In the same year, active population was 13, 5 million, 9, 6 million of which worked in agriculture and husbandry (roughly 71 percent of total labour force) (Erdost, 1970b, 76). Erdost concludes that small producers had a very weak productive capacity against the background of the divided productive base (Erdost, 1970b, 76-7). On the other hand, in industrial active population (labour force) was only 1 million. **But this 1 million labour force had 23, 6 percent share within the national income.** The greatness of the small producer population implies that **the great mass of the small producers consume its own products.** Industrial surplus product is far more than the agricultural surplus product. The small labour force of the industry is a sign of the greatness of the mass of the surplus-value. The rate of exploitation for an industrial proletariat is more than rate for the small peasant producer; however, “the small producer peasant is poorer than the industrial proletariat” (Erdost, 1970b, 77). **Erdost here explains the reason behind the fact that Turkish peasant is more miserable than the industrial worker.** The means of production is dispersed; the land is either not so much fertile, or little, or there is not adequate means of production. For this reason, “the village labourer” “simultaneously becomes an unemployed semi-proletarian”. Small mode of production constraints the productive force.

Secondly, the worker in the capitalist production is exploited in terms of his surplus labour. The total labour power of the worker is bought as commodity by the capitalist. The worker is exploited in every working day. However, says Erdost, small peasant producer is exploited as long as he produces

commodity. I think that here Erdost seems to have made a good contribution. Exploitation of the small peasant producer is relative to his commodity production with total production. Self sufficiency is excluded from exploitative relation. Here Erdost excludes the cases where rent which is different from capitalist rent is paid for. In industrial production (Erdost must mean “capitalist industrial production”) where products are all commodity, the exploitation is existed for all national income. But, in agriculture, the exploitation is not existed in the portion of the products which go to the consumption of the immediate producer (Erdost, 1970b, 77).

Thirdly, in agriculture (of Turkey), all products are not produced by “the free small producers” and not all products are supplied to the market by the immediate producers. I think that Erdost here makes another contribution for the analysis of the agricultural production and agricultural producers. He refers to the inner differentiation of the peasant property owners and producers. 1) “The big landowner peasant”, “the rich peasant”, “the ağa of the village” produces together with family labour and “exploits alien labour” (Erdost, 1970b, 77). 2) “The middle peasantry” works together with the family labour, and sometimes “exploits one or two alien labour” (Erdost, 1970b, 77-8) .3) “Small peasant” has sufficient land for himself, and neither exploits alien labour nor works for another. 4) “Semi-peasant” has not sufficient land for himself. He both works for himself, and for others. 5) “Landless peasant” may be “cropper” (ortakçı), “share-cropper” (yarıcı), “leaser” (kiracı). One portion of the landless peasants is “the agricultural labouring families” who are not cropper, share-cropper or leaser. One portion of them is “agricultural waged-labourers”. This category of the peasant producers are exploited by the land owners. “Feudal and semi-feudal landowner, the agricultural bourgeoisie, the wealthy peasant which is himself also labourer and even the middle peasant exploit directly the semi-peasants, the landless peasants and meanwhile the agricultural waged-labourers”. Erdost states that the immediate producers do not put their own agricultural surplus product into exchange with the merchant and he concludes: “They share the exploitation

which they provide from the landless peasants, the agricultural waged-labourers and semi-peasants (semi-agricultural proletarians) with the merchant (or with the industrial bourgeoisie which is in the position of the comprador of the imperialism in general, with the imperialist monopolies or with the existing state)” (Erdost, 1970b, 78). Thereby, Erdost has pointed to pre-capitalist and capitalist mode of exploitations.

Fourthly, Erdost asks who exploit the small agricultural producer in the context of the commodity part of their products. Boratav thought that they were exploited by the usurer and the merchant. “But only if the merchant buys the product of the peasant it can be said that he exploits the peasant in terms of the product the peasant sells. If the producer peasant sells the total products he produces as commodity or become commodity, the merchant exploits the producer in a certain degree in the commodity he buys”. But the mass of the products supplied as commodity by the producer does not only go to the merchant but even “**in a direct way**” to “the industrial bourgeoisie” and “the state” to a large degree. The significant portion of crops as commodities are bought by Soil Products Office (Toprak Mahsülleri Ofisi) of the state, and large part of the tobacco is bought “**in a direct way**” by the Regime Administration (Tekel İdaresi). “**All**” beets are bought by “the industrial bourgeoisie” and “the state” “**in a direct way**”. The significant portion of the cotton is bought by “the industrial bourgeoisie” and “the state” “**in a direct way**”. Erdost concludes that “Let me say that the product which the merchant buys from the petty commodity producer peasant and therefore the share he takes from the exploitation of the small producer is very small in proportion to the exploitation provided from the mass of commodity produced by the small producer peasant” (Erdost, 1970b, 78). Here Erdost does differentiate the small commodity producers from the agricultural producers as a whole.

Fifthly, Erdost asks that if the commodity is sold directly to the merchant by the peasant, does this mean that all exploitation goes to the merchant. Erdost

refers to Engels who says that if the merchant is placed between “**two producers**”, “he exploit **both of them**”. He also refers to Marx who says that the merchant here benefits from both the seller producer and the buyer producer. However, if the merchant is placed “between the producer and the industrial bourgeoisie”, the exploitation of the small producer is realised (“shared by”) sequentially by “various capital owners” such as the merchant who directly buys the product from the producer, the wholesale merchant and the industrial bourgeoisie and the intermediary banking capital (Erdost, 1970b, 78). Here the peasant is in the same position of the worker whose surplus value is “shared by the various intermediary elements” such as the industrial bourgeois, the wholesale merchant, banking capital, retailer merchant. Here we have, too, “exploited mass” distributed to the various elements. Erdost says that in the case of the merchant who buys the product of the peasant directly, “the exploitation is dispersed and capital accumulation at these points gets slower” (Erdost, 1970b, 78-9).

Sixthly, Erdost states that Boratav sees that since the profit the merchant obtained from the immediate small producers does not originate from “capitalist production”, the source of the profit is “the petty commodity production”. Boratav also argues that here “the profit of the merchant” is “all surplus product produced by the petty commodity producers” (Erdost, 1970b, 79). Boratav reduce all profit appropriated by the merchant to all surplus product produced by the petty commodity producers. Erdost correctly observes that this merchant also sells industrial products to the small producers. His profit is “not composed only of the exploitation provided from the small producer peasant but also of the surplus value which is created by the industrial proletariat” (Erdost, 1970b, 79). Erdost here have replied to Boratav by dissolving the mixed position of the merchant. The merchant who confronts the petty commodity producers appear both a capitalist commercial capital and pre-capitalist merchant. He operates simply as a mediator between the selling and buying acts and exploits the difference in the latter case.

Seventhly, Erdost suggests that “the large part of the value which is subject to the exploitation is created by the proletariat, not by the small producers in agriculture” (Erdost, 1970b, 79). He also asks whether this surplus-value is distributed within “the national elements”, and whether “the foreign capital” has also share from this surplus-value, whether the significant portion of this surplus-value is appropriated by “the monopoly bourgeoisie” or “the national bourgeoisie”. Erdost observes that when we look at the extension of the foreign capital into the various spheres of industrial production such as heavy industry, montage industry, food industry, textile, drugs, petroleum industry in the main, it is seen that “the significant portion of the surplus-value produced by Turkey’s proletariat in Turkey (here also the exploitation of the Turkey’s proletariat in foreign countries must be taken account) is transferred by the foreign capital in the form of profit to the foreign countries through various ways” (Erdost, 1970b, 79). **Here we see that Erdost’s and the *Aydınlık*’s emphasis over the imperialist exploitation is based on the capitalist industry in Turkey.** 1) The investments of “the foreign capital” were concentrated to 150 big industrial firms according to 1964 Statistics of Manufacturing Industry. 46 firms were completely foreign capital investment. 86 firms were cooperation with the private firms and the 21 firms were cooperation with the state. Erdost says that according to information published in Milliyet newspaper in 4.7.1969, the foreign capital transferred 30,103 million dollars while it invested only 28, 353 million dollars. It transferred more than its investment. 2) The another source of exploitation of “the labouring classes and the stratum” is the debts of the state (Erdost, 1970b, 79). The debts and their interests are paid for thanks to “the value created by the labouring classes”. 3) Another mechanism of foreign exploitation is the difference between the export and import prices which are determined by the monopolies. Erdost gives the example of the prices of drugs and cotton. Between 1961 and 1967, the kilogram of drug imported increased from 99 liras to 235 liras, while the kilogram of cotton exported decreased from 525 piaster (kuruş; 100 cent equals 1 lira) to 478 piaster. Between 1956 and 1964, the exportation price index decreased from 113, 7

to 95, and 4 while in the same period, the importation price index increased from 89, 8 to 100, and 0. Turkey lost 939, 5 million dollars (approximately 10, 2 billion liras) due to the price differences according to the information given by The State Planning Organisation. This figure was half and once more than the interests of debts. This difference was paid for thanks to the value created by the labouring classes and stratum. Even the large portion of this difference, says Erdost, is paid for from the values created by “the rural labourers and the agricultural proletariat”. In 1967, the exportation was 4, 7 billion liras, 80, 5 percent of which was agricultural products, and 15, 5 percent of which was industrial products, the remaining 4 percent of which was mining products. Erdost concludes that when we consider that half of the raw materials of the exported goods are mainly the agricultural products, the large part of the causality list of Turkey in front of the foreign capital and the imperialist states are charged over the rural labourers (Erdost, 1970b, 80). Here the question could be dealt with also in the context of the **differences between socially necessary labours and the rate of profits of the local production and international production**. In addition, **monopoly prices determined by the monopoly capital could be considered as monopoly rent** which represented the **absolute form of capitalist ground-rent in the international framework**.

Eighthly, the imperialist mechanism of exploitation is also seen in the lower prices of production in Turkey. In the surplus-value produced by the proletariat there is also value produced by the rural labourers. In the semi-dependent country, although the price of production is low since the prices of labour power are low, selling prices are monopoly prices. The difference between the price of production and the monopoly prices are compensated largely by the rural labourers. While formerly, the foreign capital bought raw materials and semi-finished products and then sold finished products to the semi-dependent countries through tariff mechanism, now it makes direct investment in these countries. Therefore, foreign capital escapes from tariffs, transportation costs of the raw materials, and from higher wages at home

because of the lower prices of consumption items in the semi-dependent country. Hence, the price of production is lower in the semi-dependent country (Erdost, 1970b, 80). Here again, **Erdost utilises Marxian concepts of the production price and the monopoly price. The difference between the prices fixed by the monopoly capital is transferred in the form of profit to the imperialist country.** In the country which has lower level of living standard, consumption items are to a large degree composed of the agricultural products. The workers buy these items relatively lower than the developed countries. For this reason the price of labour power is cheaper for the foreign capital. However, the products of this labour power are not sold by the foreign capital cheaply. It sells them dearer due to monopoly prices, and “indirectly” exploits the rural labourer since it sells the products with monopoly prices although it buys the products of the rural labourers cheaply. In addition, although it buys the products of the rural labourers cheaply, it sells the finished products dearly to them with monopoly prices (Erdost, 1970b, 81). Erdost correctly points to the **capitalist rent which is caused by the difference between the lower price of production and the higher monopoly price.**

Erdost states that the small holder peasant who produce commodity is not exploited only by the merchant who buys the products of the peasant. “The town merchant mass which is in many times a petty bourgeois and exploited, too, time by time by the foreign capital and industrial bourgeoisie is an estate which takes relatively small share from the exploitation provided from the peasant which is small producer, and the industrial proletariat” (Erdost, 1970b, 81). The large portion of the surplus value produced by all labourers belongs to “the foreign capital, i.e. the monopoly bourgeoisie”. The monopoly bourgeoisie “shares the exploitation with the comprador bourgeoisie (one extreme of which is extended to the commercial petty-bourgeoisie) whom it created”. Erdost says that “In agriculture, the feudal and semi-feudal elements appropriate one portion of the products produced immediately by the labourer without paying any equivalent in return”. And he sums that “The

dominant powers are not town merchant and usurer, but the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie, feudal and semi-feudal land owners... which are their allies that must be counted as the main watchmen, the police station of the backward production in agriculture..." (Erdost, 1970b, 81). Erdost states that it is sure that the usurers and the wholesale merchants ("bezirgan") are the problems for the rural labourers. They are inherited from feudalism in Turkey and hence their existence is based on the feudal relations. The national democratic revolution abolishes the feudal relations and hence these "parasitic class" (Erdost, 1970b, 81).

As for the "national bourgeoisie", Erdost says that they must be counted as "being in the side of the exploiter classes, an intermediary element". A portion of the "unpaid surplus labour" is appropriated by it (Erdost, 1970b, 81). However, it is not "a powerful class". Semi-dependency is caused by the weakness of this class. The low level of the productive forces in Turkey is not the result of the national capitalist production, but the result of the imperialism and the backward relations of production in agriculture which "prevent inner accumulation, reproduction" through the exploitation of the value produced. The reason behind the fact that the industrial proletariat lives relatively in a better condition than the small peasant producer is not that the productive forces are constrained by the capitalist production, but by the backward relations of production in agriculture which prevents the development of the forces of production (Erdost, 1970b, 82).

The present condition of feudalism: In the Ottoman empire, in addition to feudal units proper, the lands given to the head administrators such as Vezirs (state ministers) by the state in return for their service in the form of the *has* and *zeamets*, (the greater timars than those distributed to the sipahis) turned into autonomous feudal units when they could escape from the control of the central feudal state. Moreover, the concentration of lands in some hands could be possible after the transformation of miri lands into private lands. As the central feudal state who owned both the lands and the reaya was

dissolving, it was turning into “the national and independent state of the petty bourgeois ideology”. This “independence and national state”, however, was established through “a war of all national classes and stratum against the foreign yoke rather than in the form of the struggle of the bourgeoisie against the feudalism”. Therefore, the overthrow of the feudal state was the first victory of the “national state ideology” and of “the democratic struggle of the peasant”. However, although in the Eastern Anatolia, the ottoman districts which were seen in the form of *yurtluks*, *ocaklıks* and the government, had disappeared, “feudal units remained as before in terms of social and economic terms” (Erdost, 1969a, 366). In addition, free timars had been turned into private properties proper, tax collectors (*mültezims*) and the big landowners (*mütegalibe*) extended their lands through purchasing, or expropriating some lands or through means of usury. In the republic, free land regime led into the concentration of lands in some hands. Feudals and semi-feudals emerged as politically influential powers from the ruins of the feudal state (Erdost, 1969a, 365-6).

In some regions such as Şemdinli, says Erdost, feudalism proper remained while the other parts of Anatolia witness some steps towards capitalisation process in great lands. However, as the *ağa* (head of the great family) begun to acquire the characteristics of capitalist *ağa* (capitalist landlord), he maintained his feudal *ağa* characteristic in substantial terms. Erdost observes that this mixture position of *ağa* was also observed by Lenin in 1905 Russia where the economy of the landowners had united the elements of capitalism and serfdom. So, Erdost says that the fact that the semi-feudal areas witness a capitalisation process does not mean that agriculture is deprived of feudalism and serfdom. “In the agriculture, the characteristic of capitalism is the wage-labour, i.e. the agricultural proletariat, and the commodity production. The poor peasant who does not employ wage-labourer completely in his land, settles with his family in the land of the landowner and is in the semi-dependent position in front of the landowner in terms of legal and administrative aspects, and does not have the possibility of selling

freely his labour-power as a commodity is not only the one which was turned into wage-labourer or the agricultural proletariat; but also the fact that he consumes the products he produces by taking the equivalent of his necessary labour directly from the product he produces demonstrates that the commodity production in agriculture has not yet been completed". "In Anatolia, the semi-feudal ađa so appropriates the surplus labour not in the form of commodity but in a direct way and by seizing it from the product the peasant produces that this is not capitalist production but feudal production". IN capitalist production, the labourer obtains his necessary labour in the form of wage not in the form of product he produces. But, here the necessary labour of the peasant is a portion of product he produces. For this reason, in the big farms the fact that commodity production begins to appear does not mean that therein feudal production no longer exists (Erdost, 1969a, 367).

Urban petty bourgeoisie produces commodities and maintains his labour by money he obtains by selling his commodities, and without being exploited. The small and middle holder peasants consume their own products and sell surplus product in return of his commodity needs. The ability of the transformation of the small and middle holder peasants into agricultural petty bourgeoisie and that they can make capitalist production proper can be possible only where they make commodity production completely and directly (Erdost, 1969a, 367-8). In the small farms where natural economy prevails and where commodity production has not yet developed, not the characteristic of capitalist production but "the dominant characteristic the feudal production" is seen. Erdost states that just like in capitalism, a petty bourgeois artisan "makes a production in capitalist manner by producing commodity" without confronting capitalist exploitation of labour, that "in small scale agriculture production is made in feudal manner without the existence of feudal exploitation". "Anatolian small peasant on one side makes commodity production and on the other side steps towards the stages of feudal production and we are, in the village where small scale agriculture is

made, in the stage of a mixed economy in which capitalist production and feudal production exists side by side” (Erdost, 1969a, 368).

I think that the relationship between the exploitation and the mode of production is confused. It had to be said that feudal exploitation was maintained without feudal mode of production in the case of the peasants (Marx, and the case of usury and pre-capitalist relations). In addition, for the exact definition of the capitalisation of the agricultural production, even the formation of wage-labour and the commodity production are not sufficient in Marx. These can be nominally existed. Moreover, the statement of feudal production without feudal exploitation is meaningless. What the former means is not explained.

The Feudal Characteristics of the Stock-raising in the Eastern Anatolia: The Eastern Anatolia, where “the pre-capitalist relations of production were still today in the dominant condition”, had 30 percent of the living stock of Turkey in 1965 (Erdost, 1969b, 117). According to the average of the period between 1952 and 1956, 61.8 percent of the value of the total agricultural product came from the stock raising. 4785 of the total 4835 villages were making stockbreeding. The aim of the article “The Feudal Characteristics of the Stock-raising in the Eastern Anatolia” was to reply to the arguments which claimed that the stockbreeding for market had meant the transcendence of the feudal relations in the region and the capitalist relations having become dominant. Erdost states that “the simple commodity production” can be seen throughout the history. The fact that surplus products and some secondary animal products are sold at the market is not the proof for the existence of “the capitalist commodity production” (Erdost, 1969b, 118-9).

Erdost says that for a capitalist production (stockbreeding here) to exist “capital-money is invested on commodity production to obtain profit and the profit is got by selling the produced commodity (money invested + profit)”. There must be “money which had been rendered as capital”. This capital is

invested initially to buy labour power besides other requirements of production such as living stocks, storage, land, houses, foodstuffs, pasture etc. Only after these, “commodity production becomes capitalist commodity production”, and thereby, “the produced wealth is the profit of capital”, and only by doing so, “surplus value of the wage-labourer is appropriated by the owner of capital” and “the capitalist exploitation is realised”. “The wealth which is obtained through the rights and privileges which feudal traditions offer without any capital investment can be not the profit of capital; in addition to this, also the dependency between the exploited labour and the dominant class, i.e. the characteristic of the exploitation, will carry a feudal or semi-feudal characteristic” (Erdost, 1969b, 119). The question here is “whether the means of production is concentrated into the hands of the class of capital or by a feudal class which is dominant class owning the means of production”, and whether the labour power is “waged labour power” or “semi-dependent labouring masses” (Erdost, 1969b, 119).

In terms of the technical level and of the conditions of production, Erdost observes that the stockbreeding in this region is realised on the pastures. The property structure of the pastures is composed of the private properties of the persons, family or great family (aşiret), common property (common property of the village or the aşiret) and lastly the state lands (hazine arazisi). Erdost states that all pasture land seem to be under the common lands which are open to all peasants. However, he observes that landownership and the amount of living stock are closely related. This means that the peasant who has little land and correspondingly little living stocks does not practically benefit from the pastures. For this reason, since the stocks are unevenly distributed according in proportion to the distribution of lands, common pastures are mainly utilised by the big landowning families. In the region, 35.6 percent of the farmer families had no land. These therefore did not benefit from the common pastures (Erdost, 1969b, 120). On the other hand, the relationship between the landowning peasant families was also uneven. In the region, 132346 of total 403453 families had no land; 244096 of the

total had 0-100 dönüm (one dönüm equals 1000 square meters) land; 19004 had 101-200 dönüm; 8056 had more than 200 dönüm. This uneven distribution manifests itself in the utilisation of the common pastures. Erdost observes that this form of possession of the pastures is “feudal form of possession” because “its root came from the feudal property of the land”. The owners of the large amount of living stocks and hence the big landowners, did not appropriate these pastures practically thanks to their own capital investments (Erdost, 1969b, 121).

Here the means of production are not purchased and appropriated by money-capital in capitalist manner. But the forms of the appropriation of the conditions of labour do not necessarily require that they should be *formerly realised* by the capital itself. Here capital has not yet emerged as *capital proper*. It is *a potential capital*. A monopoly over the means of production which is necessary for the beginning of capitalist production seems to be *ready as a fruit of history*. Such a situation also is seen in the fact that capital in Europe finds ready for itself a surplus population which is ready to be employed. In addition, for the definition of mode of production, the *form of surplus labour* appropriated rather than the *form of the initial appropriation of the condition of production* is decisive. **Marx** stated above that: “Capital is the **means of production as transformed into capital, these being no more capital in themselves than gold or silver are money**. It is the **means of production monopolised by a particular section of society**, the products and conditions of activity of labour-power, which are **rendered autonomous vis-à-vis this living labour-power** and are **personified in capital through this antithesis**. It is not only the **worker’s products which are transformed into independent powers**, the products as masters and buyers of their producers, but the social powers and interconnecting form of this labour also confront them as properties of their product. Here we therefore have one factor of a historically produced social production process in a definite social form, and at first sight a very mysterious form” (Marx, 1991b; 953-4).

As for the condition of labour, Erdost observes that 9111 of the families of 132346 families who had no land were share-cropper (ortakçı), and 3092 leaser (kiracı) and the remaining 113417 families was “agricultural worker”. The number of “the agricultural wage-workers” in Turkey 1960 was 651800 (of total 9696535’s active agricultural population in the country) and the total number of the family of “the agricultural workers” who had lo land in the Eastern Anatolia and the South Eastern Anatolia were above 250000 (Erdost, 1969b, 121). Erdost states that considered that each family had average 3 active members, in these two regions, active agricultural workers were 750000 (Erdost, 1969b, 121-2). Erdost concludes that if total “the waged agricultural labourer was 651800 in Turkey; the number of 750000 was not related with the families which had been registered as “the agricultural workers” in “the Village Inventory Studies”. The agricultural wage-labourers were seen in the state farms and more than this in the capitalist farms of the Western and the South Western Anatolia. In the Eastern Anatolia, “the agricultural workers” were not “the agricultural wage-labourers”. These agricultural workers were in the service of the big landowners and big owners of living stocks. These families worked for the big landowners were completely different from “the free wage labourer of the capitalist society”. They did not sell their labour powers at the market in return of wage in any form. The members of family work for the head of aşiret in a permanent dependency. Here “the surplus value was appropriated from the agricultural worker without capital”. There is no variable capital advanced for purchasing labour power (Erdost, 1969b, 122).

Another expression of the dependency of the agricultural worker is seen in the existence of the 5470 families who lived in leased houses in the villages in the Eastern Anatolia. In two regions, this number increases to 513000 families. Erdost refers to İsmail Beşikçi who said that since in these regions the social conditions of renting out of the houses were absent, renting out f the houses had to be another expression of “the feudal property relations”. Besikçi observed that leasers came from other villages to the village of ağa

and ağa leased out houses to these peasant families. These families were the agricultural labourers who had no property and had no security in front of the ağa. Beşikçi said that in some provinces such as Mardin, Urfa and Diyarbakır where there were villages owned by the individual persons, families or aşirets, this sort of relation was witnessed far more than other regions. In addition, such a phenomenon was not seen in the other parts of the country (Erdost, 1969b, 122). Erdost argues that here there was possibly no rent payment, and it implies only a dependency relationship between the big landowner and the agricultural worker (Erdost, 1969b, 122-3). Moreover, Erdost says that these houses were built by “the dependent peasant”. They were owned by ağa just in the case of other buildings needed for production. In all these cases, there was no capitalist investment. All buildings were “constructed within the ties of the system which were exited before the capitalist society” (Erdost, 1969b, 123).

Feudal characteristic of the share-croppers and the leasers in the Eastern Anatolia: As stated above, in the eastern Anatolia, 132346 families had no land. Of these 9111 families were cropper, and 3092 families were leasers. Remaining 113417 were the agricultural workers. In the case of share-cropper, the producer paid rent in kind to the owner of the land (Erdost, 1969b, 124). In the case of the leaser, he pays money rent or sometimes rent in kind to the landowner. The proportion of rent (leasing payment) may be determined according to the productivity of land, to the amount of seeds incorporated into land, or to a price per dönüm (Erdost, 1969b, 124-5).

Erdost says that rent obtained from the land depends on “the relations of production”. If the landowner tills his land as “a capitalist tiller” with his own capital, or if capitalist tenant obtains “profit” as “a capitalist tiller” and then pays “a capitalist rent” to the landowner, we can talk about “the capitalist relations”. On the other hand, if landowner exploits labour within the feudal property and relations, or if the product is produced in the lands given to the leaser or to cropper within “the framework of pre-capitalist relations of

production” and the a portion of this product is paid to the landowner in the form of rent in kind or money rent, we cannot talk about the capitalist relations. Here we have feudal mode of exploitation of labour and “feudal, semi-feudal form of dependencies” (Erdost, 1969b, 125). Erdost states that the necessary element for the capitalist mode of production is revealed by defining “whether rent is capitalist-rent or not”. The lands more fertile than the worst land or nearer than it to the market provide “a surplus profit” (Erdost says that market price is determined by the products of the lands which are in the inverse position in relation to the lands above. Here it had to be said that average market prices were given); “**this surplus profit is differential-rent**”. For the differential rent to exist there must be commodity production. In the case of self sufficient and local production, this rent is absent. The other form of capitalist rent (Erdost seems to say capitalist *ground*-rent) is absolute rent which is caused by “the profit difference” of the variable capitals which are invested in industry and in agriculture. Erdost says that “less variable capital is invested in agriculture than industry and provides more profit from the variable capital invested in agriculture in proportion to the variable capital invested in industry; **this surplus profit is absolute-rent**”. Erdost concludes that the existence of absolute rent requires the existence of variable capital. “In agriculture 1) wage-labourer is absolute rent; 2) capitalist commodity production, i.e. the existence of capitalist market is the source of differential rent” (Erdost, 1969b, 125).

Meanwhile, we must remember that when this article is written, Marx’s *Capital Volume 3* was not yet published. Absolute rent is caused by landed property itself which puts a barrier to the capital investment in agriculture and expresses itself as a difference between the market price and the production price of the commodity. This rent as a surplus profit is ensured by the fact that the agricultural production blocks the process of the general equalisation of profit in agriculture. It may also be caused by the monopoly price of land or its products.

In the case of share-cropper, a portion of rent appropriated is the equivalent of the seeds and the means of production given by the landowner. The other portion is “the rent of the land”. If only the land is rented out, he takes only the rent of the land in the form of rent in kind. In the case of leaser, the rent of the land is paid in the form of money rent (here the rent of land is ground-rent) (Erdost, 1969b, 125). If the amount of rent is large, this means that the share-cropper will be in the condition of poverty. Erdost asks whether the other portions paid out besides rent in return of the seeds or the means of production is “the profit of capital or a result of the feudal form of property”. Erdost replies himself that in this region, the landowner has appropriated the means of production “not thanks to capital and exploitation of waged labour power, but thanks to the feudal property”. Hence, “the wealth he obtains from these means of production is not the profit of capital, but a wealth which the feudal property provides” (Erdost, 1969b, 126). There is no wage-labour but the labour of the share-cropper, leaser and their family labour and there is no differential or absolute rent. Even the worst land pays the rent to the landowner. Rent is not the rent provided through capital and capitalist market. There is nothing else than the appropriation of land. “Labour which is exploited through rent is the labour of the cropper’s or leaser farmer’s family, and this exploitation is the form of semi-feudal exploitation” (Erdost, 1969b, 126).

On the Dominant Relations of Production in Turkish Agriculture: An organ of the WPT, **Emek**, published Korkut Boratav’s “The Feudal Relations of Production in Agriculture, Feudal Remnants and Simple Commodity Production” (issue 6). This article, says Erdost, was a covert respond to his articles published in **Türk Solu** (issues 80-81-82), which had criticised the editorial addressing of the first issue of **Emek**. Erdost’s article “On the Dominant Relations of Production in Turkish Agriculture” (November 69-13) deals with these all articles mentioned above besides Boratav’s newly published book (“The Income Distribution in 100 questions”) (Erdost, 1969c:34). Meanwhile we must say that **Emek** was an organ in the WPT of

some groups led by Sadun Aren and Behice Boran against the party president Mehmet Ali Aybar. The journal advocated “socialist revolution thesis” in a different perspective from “socialism with smiling face” of the president Aybar. Here all information about Boratav’s article and book from which Erdost quotes will be followed through the same words how Erdost presents us since for the purpose of the study, only the ideas put forward by Erdost concern us.

For Korkut Boratav, according to the statistics of Turkish agriculture there were “**three different relations of production**” as follows: “simple (small) commodity production, capitalist production, feudal and semi-feudal relations of production”. Erdost says that “the simple (small) commodity production is **not a relation of production** which is possible to be concerned as a distinctive mode of production” (Erdost, 1969c, 35). We see that both Boratav and Erdost seem to be not very sensitive in the terms of the mode of production and the relations of production. For example, when Marx points to “pre-capitalist relations”, he does not mean by this the “pre-capitalist modes of production. Marx uses the terms of “relation”, “mode” and “production” in some contexts in a flexible way. Exact definition of a relation of production is surely made with a reference to a mode of production. But, relation of production as the property relation between the producer and the appropriator of the product can take different legal and social forms. It is however, completely correct to say that a relation of production cannot be defined without a reference to a mode of production. It defines the division of total value produced into the dominant and dominated classes and the forms of this division as in the case of surplus labour as rent in the main and the surplus labour as profit, interest and ground rent.

As for the non-agricultural classes, Boratav is said that he defines the non agricultural income earners in four groups such as state personnel (first group), the workers of the state (second group), the wage-workers of the private sector including productive and unproductive and also small

workshops (third group), lastly remaining group which involves the bourgeoisie, petty artisans and shopkeepers, professionals, poor informal employees. The first three groups are called by Boratav as “**labourers**”. The last fourth group is the “**bourgeoisie**” which is composed of “big and small bourgeoisie”. Boratav suggests that although the artisans can be counted in the labourers’ group, according to “their incomes” and “population figures” they are counted in the group of the bourgeoisie (Erdost, 1969c, 35). Erdost correctly observes that Boratav’s division of classes classifies all bourgeois, the petty bourgeois and the semi-proletarian sections under the name of “the bourgeois” by ignoring that they are classes whose interests contradict each other (Erdost, 1969c, 35). Erdost continues to say “Such a class categorisation which thinks that the petty bourgeoisie is the small of the bourgeoisie and which place the semi-proletarian groups to the side of the bourgeoisie at least not to the petty bourgeoisie, cannot have any close or distant relation with the terminology of the scientific socialism” (Erdost, 1969c, 35).

Erdost says that “the petty bourgeoisie is a part being ‘small’ of the bourgeoisie, but in its essence, a distinctive class whose interests are opposed to it” (Erdost, 1969c, 35). The facts that both it “owns an amount of capital and the means of production” and it earns his life through its own labour “represent” simultaneously the bourgeoisie and the proletariat “in one and the same existence”, and hence it has “double characteristic”. For this reason, since it carries the word “the bourgeoisie” in it, it cannot be placed into the “the bourgeois” class, “the bourgeoisie” (Erdost, 1969c, 35-6).

Here we have to say that in Marx the petty bourgeoisie is presented in *Capital’s Volume 1* as the small capitalist, but only in passing. Despite this, he never places the petty bourgeoisie into the camp of the proletariat. This class may change its position in relation to other classes in the sharp economic and political conditions. If it lives an economic collapse, for example, it confronts the pressure of the big bourgeoisie and may tend

towards the proletariat. But if it also confronts the pressure of the proletariat, it possibly searches for another class alliance. These possible combinations of the behaviour of the petty bourgeoisie, however, can be defined only empirically by considering political, economic and even ideological environment of the class relations. Such an empirical definition is exemplified by Marx in the case of *the Paris Commune* and in the observation in the *Communist Manifesto*. The most important and distinctive characteristic of this class is the fact that he has both a small capital or opportunity to have capital and implements his direct labour in his job. Moreover, the petty bourgeoisie is not counted by Marx as one of the great classes which forms the framework of modern society, or in the model of the most developed capitalist mode of production in England of Marx's own time (*Capital's Volume 3*). This capital owning labourer can be observed throughout the history. Hence it is a category like commodity production. However, nonetheless, this class is defined as petty *bourgeoisie* simply because of the existence of a small capital in his possession. The prefix "petty" is also a comparative definition between the bourgeoisies themselves. In the French case, Marx said that the French bourgeoisie was counted as petty bourgeois in comparison to the English bourgeoisie.

For Erdost, there are "two main classes" outside the agriculture in "the capitalist society". The one is "the bourgeoisie" who owns capital and the means of production and forms "a minority", and the other is the proletariat which is to have been deprived of "the means of production and capital completely", "expropriated by the bourgeoisie", forms "the majority". Between these two classes, the petty bourgeoisie is settled, and demonstrates "a thousand of distinctions". This class forms the large part of the population in "the development phase of the capitalism" (Erdost, 1969c, 35). **I can say** that this class forms the large part of the population in the period of capitalist development because total capital is still small and divided into small parts. Exactly for this reason, the bourgeois is a small capitalist and a petty bourgeois.

But these all do not mean that Boratav's classification is correct. He confuses the division of classes with the divisions of labour. He also incorrectly places the lumpen-proletariat into the bourgeois camp. This may be a tool for the bourgeois dictatorship, but this does not mean that it is economically a class within the bourgeoisie. In addition, Erdost correctly says that Boratav does not differentiate "the proletariat" and "the labourer" (Erdost, 1969c, 36). The latter is a wider category which includes other labouring classes besides the proletariat. The proletariat is indeed a special category within the labourers in general, including even the petty artisans, state employees. Moreover, some categories such as small shopkeepers, as Erdost says, are counted within the category of the bourgeoisie. Boratav does not see unproductive labour within the category of the labourers, and sees for example the informal employees within the category of the bourgeoisie. Erdost says that categories that are counted by Marxists as semi-proletarian are defined by Boratav as "bourgeois" (Erdost, 1969c, 36). **Not only** "Marxists", but also initially Marx himself, does not see these categories within the bourgeoisie.

Definition of the feudal and semi-feudal relations and methodology: Erdost says that Boratav's ideas and his not yet published book (Income Distribution in 100 questions) are used as support to "opportunism" by the writers of **Emek**. By referring to Boratav's book, the ratio of the "feudal and semi-feudal features" in Turkey was defined as being "% 5". Erdost says that this percentage was not based on any scientific foundation. Statistics was possibly not confidential, but the method Boratav used was incorrect. Boratav used Village Inventory Studies and argued that the ratio of the numbers of the villages belonging to persons, families or aşirets" to the total number of villages were "the proportion of the feudal relations". Erdost says that when this method is applied to Hakkari, it will be seen that in Hakkari, "capitalist production is dominant in agriculture". In this province, according to the same Inventory Studies, 89,7 percent of total 134 villages belonged to the village people and 8,4 percent to the state, 0,8 to a person, and 1,1 percent to a great family. None of them belonged to any family. If so, Boratav would have

to say that the proportion of the feudal relations was 1,9 according to the method. As for the definition of the semi-feudal relations, Boratav took account number of “the **cropper** families owning no landed property” and divided them to the total families. The result was to be that the semi-feudal relations in Hakkari was 1,1 percent (equals 142 cropper families / 12397 total number of the families) (Erdost, 1969c, 37). According to these results, feudal and semi-feudal relations in Turkey and in Hakkari as exemplified by Erdost in the name of Boratav is almost insignificant. Erdost says the remaining 97 percent of Hakkari’s peasant families are as such: 12390 total farming families, families without land 5557, 142 of which cropper, 154 of which leaser, 5281 of which agricultural worker. Of the total 12390, 6813 have land; 53 percent of which has land below 100 dönüm, is “small holding farmer”. The remaining 43 percent is the agricultural worker’s family. Erdost says that for Boratav 53 percent of total peasant family farms is located within capitalist mechanism of exploitation (or “simple commodity relation of production”), and 43 percent’s agricultural worker’s family is counted as “the agricultural waged labourer” as an element of “the capitalist relations of production”. Agricultural workers are unconditionally counted within the capitalist agricultural farms (Erdost, 1969c, 38).

Boratav defined the percentage of feudal and semi-feudal relations as 5 percent. But the pressure and domination of feudal and semi-feudal elements over the country are attributed to the village bourgeoisie and the town merchant, which are “**feudal remnants**”, while agricultural workers without land are located into capitalist relations. Capitalist exploitation is ensured by primitive capitalist elements in rural structure such as “capitalist farmer, village bourgeoisie, town merchant”, which also continue semi-feudal exploitation. Boratav said that capitalist relations in agriculture were seen in both capitalist farms and in small peasant farms which were exploited by usurer and merchant. “New relations of production and distribution” also involved in itself “old and semi-feudal social relations”. Wage-labour is dependent on capitalist farmer not in terms of wage but also in terms of

“personal dependence”, while big landowner continues his own “political and legal domination over village life” and while town merchant continues “his personal influence” over village life through money and debt relations which was “beyond the functions fulfilled in **a normal capitalist order** by commercial capital”. “This capitalist farmer, and this bourgeoised land lord, and this town merchant subjected the peasant into their semi-feudal exploitation and pressure besides capitalist exploitation” (Erdost, 1969c, 53). Erdost says that influence of the feudal ağa, head of aşiret and seyhs are not taken into account (Erdost, 1969c, 53-4). In addition, says Erdost, even though Boratav points to semi-feudal exploitation and pressure, he suggests for the peasants “democratic slogans” rather than “socialist slogans”, and he defines “the dominant contradiction as feudal” and “the dominant exploitation as capitalist”. The aim is to prove that the dominant exploitation is capitalist when the capitalist elements carries semi-feudal characteristic. Rural bourgeoisie continues old social relations (Erdost, 1969c, 54).

The political conclusions of the dependent position of the agricultural labourers having no land demonstrated that the contradiction between the agricultural labourer having no land and the big landowner was not a contradiction between labour and capital, i.e. a “capitalist contradiction”, but a “feudal contradiction”. If this contradiction was to be solved through a struggle of the agricultural workers having no land, the meaningful slogan had not to demand the transformation of the lands from the big landowners to the state, but had to demand “the land for poor peasant families”. For these peasants to able to obtain the alliance of the families who had very little land (0-10 or 0-20 dönüm land), and who had little land (26-50 dönüm) and small peasant families who had land between 51-100 dönüm, the slogan had to be “land for the ones who had no land or had not adequate land”. This slogan was “the slogan of democratic revolution”. Erdost suggests that “since in Turkey the existence of the proletariat which had sufficient number and consciousness to take a socialist party to the power, and the seizure of power without providing the support of the poor and small peasants cannot

be mentioned, seizure of power by a socialist party is possible at least with the alliance and the support of the poor and the small peasants. As for the alliance of the poor and small peasant, it can be provided only with democratic slogan, rather than socialist slogan” (Erdost, 1969b:124).

The characteristics of” the classes dominant in agriculture” are portrayed by following the Village Inventory Studies of 1961. The number of the agricultural farms above 201 thousand square meters was 115137, and the ones above 501 thousand square meters were 15352. These had to be counted as big farms, says Erdost. A part of them is “the big landowners”, and the other part is “big landowner peasant”. The latter is also producer. The farms above 1000 thousand square meters were 3758, and the ones above 5000 thousand square meters were 329. 444 of the lands above 500 thousand square meters were in Urfa, and 438 of them were in Adana, and 387 of them were in Diyarbakır. 73 of the lands above 5000 thousand square meters were in Diyarbakır, 62 of them were in Urfa and 20 of them were in Adana. According to the same Inventory, 693 villages belonged to a family, person or great family in 43 provinces. This kind of villages was 123 in Urfa, 96 in Gaziantep. This fact demonstrates that “feudal relations are still so much strong”. Erdost says that majority of the agricultural farms have “feudal or semi-feudal characteristics”. Only a portion of them which produces industrial products in some regions are in the capitalist characteristic (Erdost, 1970, 254).

Erdost states that the economic and political domination of the feudal elements does not imply the absence or the minority of the free small peasantry in a country. “Similarly, the fact that determines the importance of the feudal relations in agriculture in Turkey is not the majority or minority of the feudal relations, but the political and economic activities of the feudals, the degree of their domination over the peasant masses” (Erdost, 1970, 254). Here *the Aydınlık* (Erdost) shifts the emphasis from the quantitative measurement of the feudal relations to the qualitative impact of the feudal

relations over the peasantry. The number of villages owned by the persons, the families also does not reveal the exact existence of the feudal relations. A feudal land owner can have a part of the village and can have lands in various villages. These alternatives are not seen in the Inventories (Erdost, 1970, 254). After this point, any counter argument such as the one which claims that the small holding economy is dominant in Turkish agriculture is impossible. "The essential thing for the definition of the feudalism is not the greatness of the feudal units but the feudal relations" (Erdost, 1970, 254-5). The feudal domination can be defined in terms of "the degree of the domination of the feudals over the labouring peasant masses". Here again *the Aydınlık* (Erdost) shifts the emphasis from the agriculture in Turkey in general to certain regions where feudal relations are predominant: "To us, the fact that 693 villages in 43 provinces belongs to the person, the family and great family, whether the proportion of these villages to all villages is, in the regions these villages concentrate, is the clear and exact proof that feudal and semi-feudal relations appears as bastion" (Erdost, 1970, 255). Another shifting emphasis is from "the feudal relations of production" to only "feudal the relations". Feudal relations are dominant "whether the proportion of these villages to all villages is" (Erdost, 1970, 255).

The other criteria for the existence of the feudal and semi-feudal relations are "the number of farmer families without land". In the same Inventory, in 26 provinces (Bitlis, Van, Tunceli, Ağrı, Hatay, Mardin, Erzurum, Kars, Diyarbakır, Elazığ, Siirt, Malatya, Adıyaman, Erzincan, Gaziantep, Maraş, İçel, Isparta, Ankara, Adana, Burdur, Niğde, Antalya, Urfa, Bingöl, Muş), approximately one-third of the families (32,84 percent = 445697 of 1356471) have no land. Croppers were 4, 22 percent, leasers 0, 53 percent and remaining 28, 09 agricultural worker without land. "The dependencies between the families without land and the big landowners, particularly in these 26 provinces, are feudal and semi-feudal relations in general". Here the "agricultural worker *farmer families* are not agricultural wage-labourer", but "semi-dependent peasant families which works in the lands of the big

landowners". Erdost suggests that "the proportion of the farmer families who are making farming in the villages and simultaneously having not any land and not being wage-labourer to all peasant farmer families" gives "the proportion of the feudal and semi-feudal relations to all peasant farms". According to the same Inventory, this proportion is 32 percent in 26 provinces and 28-29 percent in 46 provinces (Erdost, 1970, 255). **The portion of the necessary** labour in the products produced by these families can be outside the wage-relation with the landowner, but we must ask if their surplus labour is outside the categories of profit, interest and ground-rent in capitalist manner. **Marx** gives the example of plantations in America where producer is Negro slave while the owner of the plantation is indeed a capitalist who makes production for profit for the world markets. Even if the position of the feudal landowner is not the same with the plantation owner which is de facto capitalist, the semi-dependent peasant worker and his family labour seems to be subjected through a feudal mode of exploitation to the self-sufficient natural economy or a sort of petty commodity production or even to a capitalist commodity production. The fact that this labour is not a wage-labourer but merely a labourer who had been alienated from the conditions of labour, from the land and the means of production, demonstrates only the fact that necessary labour has been able to be obtained outside the capitalist labour market of free labourers. Erdost does not explain what sort of production takes place in these villages. Do they produce only for the personal needs in a natural condition of production? In addition, he does not distinguish the big landownership and feudal or semi-feudal landownership. Furthermore, we have not been presented the exact meaning of "semi-feudal" characteristic. Does it also mean "semi-capitalist"? We don't know.

Erdost says that Boratav himself also doubts his information and, he does not apply the number of "**the agricultural workers' families without**" land to the Eastern Anatolia. He also considers these families within the capitalist farm and within the category of the waged labourers. Erdost correctly asks for which capitalist farms these waged-workers work (Erdost, 1969c, 38).

(Meanwhile, landlessness does not necessarily mean the existence of waged-labourers). Erdost says that according to Boratav, Hakkari was capitalised in the proportion of 43 percent. He adds that to his personal experience there was no **waged** labourer in Hakkari (Erdost, 1969c, 39).

For Boratav, small and middle holder peasant farms (having 0-100 dönüm lands) are “within the simple commodity relations of production” (Erdost refers) which are subject to “the primitive exploitation mechanism of capitalism” (Erdost quotes). These farmers are independent and sell their tobaccos and cattle at market for two hundred years. But according to Boratav, quotes Erdost, “their surplus products” are captured by “the commercial and the usurer’s capital” rather than by “the feudal elements”. “That is to say; the petty producers which are within the exploitation relations of Turkish agriculture are subject to the primitive exploitation mechanisms of capitalism” (Erdost, 1969c, 39). In sum, in Hakkari, says Erdost, therefore we have 1,9 percent feudal relations, 1,1 percent semi-feudal relations, 53 percent simple commodity relations of production, 43 percent agricultural worker, that is, “complete capitalist relations”. Hence capitalism is the dominant relation of production in Hakkari. He says that the most of agricultural worker and agricultural family having no land in the country is existed in the Eastern Anatolia. But according to Boratav’s method, this region is to be defined as the one where the capitalism has developed the most (Erdost, 1969c, 39).

A more correct method would conclude that, putting aside the statistical defects, 43 percent’s agricultural worker without land was “semi-dependent peasants” and that 53 percent’s “smallholder peasants” were “patriarchal”, that is, “pre-capitalist relations”. Thereby, “the proportion of families in the feudal and semi-feudal relations could rise from 3 percent to 46 percent”, and 53 percent’s “small holder peasants”, even though they were exploited relatively by capital, could be seen as the pre-capitalist units which were under the feudal exploitation and pressure”. These would be nearer to the

reality. "That is to say the domination of patriarchal, feudal and semi-feudal relations, in other words, of the pre-capitalist relations in Hakkari". Poverty of the people in Hakkari lasting for ages cannot be explained by the capitalist exploitation (Erdost, 1969c, 39-40).

The capitalist exploitation in agriculture and its domination: Erdost says that in his article "Is There feudalism in Turkey?" published in **Türk Solu**, he classified "the relations of production in agriculture" as follows: a) "patriarchal production", b) semi-feudal production", c) "feudal production", d) "private capitalist production", e) "the state capitalism". The last one can be excluded from the classification since it does not aim at the formation of capitalist farms, but for the education, and betterment, etc. Among the other, capitalist farms which employs wage-labour is not beyond 600000, and hence does not form a dominant character for the general production of 9 million labourers. Tenth of the basic foodstuff, the wheat is produced as commodity, and hence this is not capitalist production. But capitalist commodity production has appeared in agriculture and there is wage-labourer in agriculture in a dispersed way. A contradiction between the cities and the villages has clearly appeared. However, these all facts does not imply the domination of the capitalist production in agriculture, but the fact that capitalist production has appeared and developed on the side of pre-capitalist production. As the capitalist production has appeared on one side, the fact that the pre-capitalist relations are in dominant position by "its body" demonstrates that "in agriculture the pre-capitalist relations of production, rather than that of the capitalist production, are the dominant" (Erdost, 1969c, 40).

I wonder that whether the statistics of the agricultural production outside the main foodstuffs, used as industrial input such as cotton, tobacco would change the analysis. But he is rather right when he gives the example of main foodstuff, wheat, which is important in quantity, and decisive in the determination of agricultural rents, the price of the labour power, etc. Another

point is that the term semi-feudal is used, but not “semi-capitalist”. In addition, there is again no differentiation which is made between the production and relations of production.

Erdost states that the subject of this article was to define the level of domination of the capitalist exploitation in agriculture, and to the extent that villages are exploited by the cities (Erdost, 1969c, 40-1). In that time, **Emek** journal argued that the capitalist mode of production became dominant and also that “a working class which could make the leadership of the struggle against the capitalist exploitation in both industry and agriculture and for socialism” (*as quoted* by Erdost). Moreover, it is said that Emek argued that small and middle peasantry was moved into an alliance with the working class due to the development of the capitalist relations which had negative impact over them. Therefore, they obtained a “socialist potential”. Furthermore, the peasant farms in which “small commodity production became dominant” entered into the capitalist relations and pressure more and more in everyday. Erdost says that he (they) had seen the existence of the capitalist relations in agriculture, which had not been yet dominant, and that “in a country where small peasant farms were dominant and also feudal and semi-feudal elements were prevalent”, capitalist relations could not have been counted as dominant in agriculture. Pre-capitalist relations were dominant in Turkish rural structure. This is because, says Erdost, capitalist agriculture requires the existence of wage-labourer and capital. In “patriarchal, feudal and semi-feudal production” capital is absent even though capitalist production begins to appear. Erdost also says that one contributor of Emek discuss the subject without distinguishing state sector and private sector and also including “the comprador bourgeoisie” to “the context of the national bourgeoisie” (Erdost, 1969c, 41).

Simple commodity production and relation of production: Simple Commodity Production is not a relation of production just like capitalist, feudal or socialist relation of production, in contrast to Korkut Boratav, says Erdost.

For the former, it is said that there is “**three distinctive relations of production** in agriculture”. These are according to their **importance**, “simple (small) commodity production, capitalist production, feudal and semi-feudal **relations** of production”. The dominant “**relation**” is “the small commodity production” (Erdost, 1969c, 43). Erdost replies that free peasant farms are observed in all forms of society after the late period of communal society. It will be seen, too, “in the **formation period** of socialism” (Erdost, 1969c, 43). In addition, in all forms of society, a portion of surplus product can be sold at the market, and hence producer such as serf in the feudal society, cropper or leaser in the semi-feudal relations can make commodity production in this sense. However, the portion of “**surplus**” sold at the market is “the simple commodity”, and the production is “the simple commodity production”. Erdost quotes from Marx: “for the product to be commodity it must have been produced to be transferred through exchange to another person for whom it is to be use value” (freely translated) (Erdost, 1969c, 44). For this reason, neither the surplus product by itself, nor the surplus product sold at the market is enough for the determination of commodity and commodity production. Here we see the unity of use-value and exchange value in the commodity. Product must have been produced to be transferred through exchange to another person. It has to have a use-value and must have been produced for market purposes, in other words, for exchange. I think that **Erdost is rather correct** to point to the unity of use value and exchange value for the commodity. But I have to note that this unity is also a contradictory unity as demonstrated by **Marx** in the *Volume 1 of Capital*.

Erdost says that “simple commodity production is not a distinctive relation of production”. It is seen in the agriculture of Turkey today when productivity is high where the patriarchal, feudal and semi-feudal relations of production existed (Erdost, 1969c, 44). He states that Lenin, by improving Engels’ thesis, stated that in the socialist country, small peasant farming did not disappear immediately, and “middle peasantry” must not be transformed into socialist agriculture by force, but must be confronted with “the productivity

and superiority of socialist production” (Erdost, 1969c, 45). In addition, Lenin also observed that in the good production seasons, middle holder peasant could produce a surplus which was to be transferred to another season, and could often employ wage-labour. This means, say Erdost, “small peasant farms” become capitalist in the “extremity”. But this does not mean that “middle peasantry” tends to the proletariat due to the employment of wage-labour, but to the bourgeoisie. However, the reverse is also possible. “When the small and middle holders begin to produce commodity in the capitalist order and for the capitalist market”, capitalist exploitation is realised in a far more systematic way in the village. Erdost argues that here “small and middle peasantry is turned into a **part** of which represents the early period of the capitalist relation of production and that “commodity-product which is produced for market therefore represents ‘labour power’ rather than capital”. In such a situation, Erdost says, peasant family seems to be an artisan employed by the capitalist as in the case of “the putting out” system. It produces according to “market demand” which “the demand of capitalist”. Small peasant farms, among the other producers, produce raw materials or commercial goods (commodity). For example, cotton becomes a raw material for the capitalist and is no longer produced as a raw material for producer himself. In the case of agricultural products which are used as raw material for industrial production, the peasant family is turned into “an extreme of very broad capitalist whole”, “an extreme for which produces raw material”, and thereby “peasant family enters through its labour into exploitation sphere of capital”. Here, the “rate of exploitation” does not cover all labour of the peasant family, but only the portion which enters into circulation as commodity since significant part of product produced is consumed by the family itself. Only labour which is used for commodity production stays in the capitalist exploitation. The proportion of the commodity to the total product is the proportion of exploitation. This proportion also determines the level of entry to the capitalist sphere of exploitation. For example, when 10 units of total labour is composed of 7 units for self-consumption and 3 units supplied as commodity for capitalist market, “capitalist exploitation sphere” covers only

“3 /10 of labour”. This rate also means that capitalist exploitation is not “dominant” (Erdost, 1969c, 46).

Here, Erdost confuses the surplus labour, or surplus product produced and appropriated by the peasant family with surplus labour produced by the worker (producer) and then appropriated by the owner of the conditions of labour or the owner of the means of production. What we see in the position of the small peasant family which can produce for market purposes (exchange value) is a position of petty bourgeois, which produces for commodity purposes through its own means of production and its own labour and appropriates his surplus labour by himself. He also employs his own family labour. He thereby may seem to exploit his own family labour. But there is no alienation between the producer and the product, putting aside the exploitation of family labour. But here the question is not the relationship between the father and his wife and children. Even in this case, relation is not between capital and labour but between the members of patriarchal family. For capitalist exploitation to emerge, labour must have been alienated to his conditions of labour and to his products in the context of capital’s formation.

“Simple Commodity Relation of Production” and “Feudal Relation of production”: Boratav is said that he accepts the simple commodity production as **“both an independent relation of production and a part of a more different and dominant mode of production”**. For example, it may be **“a part of feudal mode of production”**. Small commodity production “always forms a secondary relation”. To determine **“which mode of production the simple commodity production is a part of”** is defined by the analysis of through **“which mechanisms surplus product is gone to which classes”**. Boratav also continues to say (Erdost quotes): **“If there is no any surplus product”**, but only **“a limited exchange** for consumption purposes” between the producers in the absence of **“intermediaries”**, “there will be absolutely no exploitation”, and there is no capitalism or feudalism. Only in this condition,

“simple commodity production becomes a dominant relation” (Erdost, 1969c, 46).

Boratav also argues that there may be “a double domination” as in the case of the developed feudal society in which “**the peasant (serf)**” which possessed the land and make commodity production outside the estate in which he works for “the feudal lord”. The serf and the lord represent double relation of domination (Erdost, 1969c, 46).

Let me come back to Erdost. He says that as long as a relation of production keeps its own existence, it cannot be a part of another relation of production (Erdost, 1969c, 46-7). It can stay side by side with another relation of production, and one of them can “lose its character” and “turn into” another or “may enter into such a process” (Erdost, 1969c, 47). For example, in the case of the peasant (serf) which produces simple commodity, simple commodity production is not a part of feudal relation of production. Since he is a serf, the peasant is dependent on the senior. What the senior appropriates directly from the serf is not the surplus produced by the petty commodity producer, but an amount which is left after both the share of the senior and the share of the serf is excluded. The portion which is supplied to the market is not commodity in capitalist manner. And the simple commodity production here is not a relation of production, and not a part of feudal relation of production. The serf does not represent both “the simple commodity relation of production” and “the feudal relation of production”. The fact that he produces simple commodity on the senior’s land which is not divided does not point to a distinctive relation of production. “The serf is a part of the feudal relation of production as a whole”. In addition, the term “the simple commodity relation of production” is “an invented term”, says Erdost (Erdost, 1969c, 47). I think he is completely correct. But Boratav seems to mean a sort of petty bourgeois economy, or smallholding economy as Marx does in *Capital’s Volume 3*. Nevertheless, Boratav’s definition of the simple commodity relation of production in its theoretically dominant form (see

above) cannot correspond to the peasant serf who makes simple commodity production. Here there is a simple commodity production, but not a new relation of production. We may here have a potential conflict within the economic structure of feudal society and its relations of property or distribution. What Marx says about this conflict in his preface to the *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*: “At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or- what is but a legal expression for the same thing- with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto” (SW; 425). We must say that firstly, simple commodity production is not a mode of production and hence not a relation of production. Secondly, simple commodity production is a form of commodity production just as the capitalist commodity production. Producer of simple commodity is located within the feudal mode of production in the case of peasant serf. Thirdly, a relation of production is a property relation which corresponds to a level of the material productive forces of society. The property relation in which peasant serf is located is the feudal relation of production. The serf can sell only a portion of his product which is left to him after the share (feudal rent) of the lord is excluded. Amount of commodity which the serf can supply for the market for his own earning is contingent on his extra productivity or the opportunity of good seasons which is not seized by the lord.

Erdost points to Boratav’s statement, “if there is no surplus product”, and “there is only limited exchange for consumption purposes”, there will be no exploitation, and the simple commodity relation of production becomes dominant relation of production. Erdost is incorrect when he thinks that if there is no surplus, there is also no exchange (Erdost, 1969c, 47).

Erdost says that Boratav thinks that the surplus appropriated by the senior and the surplus sold at the market is the same (**I think** that this definition is caused by the term “double domination” used by Boratav, and also by that Boratav argued in the case of the serf producing simple commodity, that

simple commodity relation of production is a part of feudal mode of production. The last point means that feudal rent is divided between the serf and the lord). First of all, even though there is no surplus over and above the necessary for the serf, the senior takes a surplus product from the serf. The former does not take his share after he leaves a necessary portion for the serf. But he takes a certain share from the product produced. In some situations, there may be surplus over and above the necessary consumption on the part of the serf. This surplus becomes commodity in the “simple commodity circulation” (Erdost, 1969c, 47). It forms “one of the internal dynamics of feudal society” according to Marx, says Erdost. Merchants buy and sell this surplus product in the late feudal age; “commercial capital here enters into circulation in feudalism”. Simple commodity producer serf confronts with the merchant. Erdost asks to Boratav whether here the serf is exploited by the senior in the feudal relation of production, hence confronted by feudal exploitation or by the merchant in the capitalist mode of production, hence by the capitalist exploitation. Erdost says that here although the commodity goes to the merchant rather than to the senior, the relation of production is feudal. “And here the serf who has produced simple commodity is not in the simple commodity relation of production”. “The only factor which determines the relation of production is the form of the property of the means of production. Korkut Boratav changes the relation of production without changing the form of the property of the means of production” (Erdost, 1969c, 48). **Erdost is completely** correct since relation of production is legally expressed in the property relations. To which classes the surplus goes and through which mechanisms are not the criteria to define of which mode of production so called the simple commodity relation of production a part is. Here the problem is the fact that a development of commodity production creates a “solvent effect” over the mode of production or society in which it operates. But this effect requires, as Marx stated above, “a certain stage of ... development”, of “the material productive forces of society”, which will “come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or- what is but a legal expression for the same thing- with the property relations within which

they have been at work hitherto". In our case, simple commodity production carries *only potentials* for capitalist commodity production.

Erdost approaches to the statements above by pointing to a difference between the private property as a result of producer's own labour and the capitalist private property. The former cannot be part of the latter. and the latter is based on "the first negation" of the former, says Erdost by following Marx who points to the alienation of product to the producer in the later form of private property in the case of "primitive accumulation of capital" (Erdost, 1969c, 49).

Boratav says that "the dominant form of farming" in Turkish agriculture is "**small peasant farms**" which compose 75-80 percent of total peasant population. Erdost replies that this is not capitalist private property but its "negation", "the small private property which is based on producer's own labour". In addition, this form of property rather than capitalist private property will be temporally "conserved" and "supported" "in the construction period of socialism" "in order to encourage the peasantry to enter into collective property" (Erdost, 1969c, 50). It **should be noted** that the small peasantry has not been clearly defined in terms of its class position such as petty bourgeoisie.

The dominant exploitation in agriculture: Erdost says that Boratav also argues that a part of simple commodity production may stay outside both feudal and capitalist exploitation when "**large part of production is consumed by producer himself**" and when little part is exchanged locally between the producers and when the producers have not any obligation of tax or labour rent. As Erdost observes, for Boratav, a part of simple commodity production is consumed by the producer and the other part is exchanged. The consumed part is accepted as commodity "outside of social production". He correctly recalls that Marx does not see the product consumed by its producer as commodity and Boratav sees simple commodity

circulation as “**barter**” (Erdost, 1969c, 50). But Erdost correctly recalls again that simple commodity circulation is realised with money. In the extremes are commodities (Erdost, 1969c, 51). A capitalist agriculture requires that peasant farms should invest money capital and obtain additional money (“surplus labour from alien labour”) at the end of circulation. Peasant’s labour must have been seized by capital in any sort. For this, existence of “money” or “intermediary” is not adequate (Erdost, 1969c, 52). **But I must recall** that in the case of the origin of capitalist farmer, Marx sees a potential capitalist farmer in even the position of serf who could produce additional amount for market. Here the fact that land belongs to lord and that means of production are owned by the peasant or serf does not necessitate that these conditions of production have been formerly appropriated and used by the peasant through capital investment. The conditions of production can be appropriated or possessed through various ways. Erdost seems to think that foreign money capital must always come from outside the agriculture itself and then be invested in agricultural land.

The idea that “small producers are subjected to the primitive mechanisms of capitalist exploitation” contradicts the definition that usurer’s capital and merchant’s capital emerge in the dissolution of the feudalism. In addition, Erdost says that Boratav also argues that these forms of capital carry with themselves some elements of semi-feudal exploitation and pressures. Here it is argued by Boratav that, says Erdost, surplus product is seized by the usurer’s and merchant’s capital although these capitals exploits peasants through “semi-feudal exploitation and means of pressure” and then that “peasants are subjected to primitive mechanisms of capitalist exploitation”. Erdost tries to sum: exploitation of capital, semi-feudal exploitation and pressure, feudal contradiction between the peasant and the usurer and merchant and so on (Erdost, 1969c, 52).

I think that there is so much confusion that Turkish agriculture needs a new theory which is not existed in Marx. Boratav seems to say that usurer and

merchant have the primitive mechanisms of capitalist exploitation and uses semi-feudal exploitation and pressure. Leaving aside the confusion between feudal and capitalist means of exploitation, this is clear, we must recall that exploitation in Marx is realised in production sphere where surplus labour is appropriated by the owner of the conditions of labour even though there are secondary forms of exploitation in the circulation sphere outside production. In addition, in the confrontation of the usurer and the free peasant, usurer tries to conserve the existing mode of production and hence relation of production. It has only a solvent effect over the existing structure as Marx described well in *Capital's Volume 3*. Moreover, Marx distinguishes the usurer's and merchant's capital and the modern banking capital and credit. Only in the latter, capitalist means or mechanism of exploitation are put into action. Furthermore, capitalist exploitation of the agricultural producer requires capitalist production in agriculture and capitalist categories of surplus value such as profit, interest and ground-rent apart from usurer's interest and merchant's commercial profits in pre-capitalist sense.

The sources of reactionary ideologies: Boratav observes that, according to Erdost's quotations, "the **capitalist** development in Turkey has started and **continued** without the liquidation of the feudality by the bourgeoisie as a result of a democratic revolution". For this reason, "**capitalist evolution**" is emerging because of the transformation of old reactionary **feudal elements** into bourgeoisies (Erdost, 1969c:54). This phenomenon explains the continuation of the reactionary superstructure and the never existing revolutionary character of "**the big bourgeoisie**" (Erdost, 1969c:54-5). In the new relations there are still a residual of old social relations. But Erdost argues that according to Boratav, these old relations cover only the capitalist farmer, the rural bourgeoisie and the town merchant. But Boratav ignores the continuation of these old relations in the small and middle peasantry which forms the majority of the pre-capitalist relations. The embourgeoisment of the semi-feudal elements leads into the predominance of the reactionary ideologies in the superstructure. Ideological reactionism and semi-feudal

exploitation and influence are the products of the embourgeoisment of the dominant elements. They apply a pressure over the peasants thanks to their capital. Erdost states that these thoughts are “semi-idealist” since ideological reactionism is not a result of the embourgeoisment of the feudal elements, but of “the existence of the backward relation of productions, in the base, which is suitable for reactionary ideologies” (Erdost, 1969c:55). Erdost gives the example of the leaders of religious sects such as Said-i Nursi and Seyh İsmail Efendi. The former is not a feudal which had become bourgeois. His sects had an influence over all peasants and the rural bourgeoisie and the town merchant. The latter had a similar influence over the peasants and the town shopkeepers. He was not a feudal at the beginning, and he did not become a capitalist farmer at all later. Erdost ask why “feudal super-structural institutions” have so much influential. In contrast to Boratav who argued that reactionary ideologies were related with the embourgeoisment of the feudal elements, Erdost argues that these ideologies and feudal institutions were located outside “this embourgeoisment” (Erdost, 1969c:55). In the literature, feudal elements are, says Erdost, mentioned together with religious leaders. It is not possible to say that religious leaders such as seyh have become a bourgeois. He observes that the source of the reactionary ideologies is “the pre-capitalist characteristics” of “the small peasant farms” and the fact that the pre-capitalist characteristic is the dominant in the small peasant firms. If peasant masses had been “the free citizens of capitalist society”, in other words, “if democratic revolution had been realised in this country”, “the reactionary ideologies could not have developed and spread over in this body”. Exploitation here is based on “backward characteristic of the relations of production” (Erdost, 1969c:56).

Against the *embourgeoisment* thesis of Boratav and the *reflection* thesis of Erdost (to find out a superstructure for an economic base or conversely) I can say that not completely the *embourgeoisment* of the feudal elements but importantly the alliance between the bourgeoisie, the rural landowners, the rural bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie against the poor peasants, the rising

proletariat and the radical democratic and even socialist petty bourgeoisie help the bourgeois order to preserve and maintain its revolution which had been realised and completed the previous development of the bourgeois revolution after the second world war. This bourgeois-landowner alliance (not only the alliance of the big bourgeoisies and landowners) was consolidated in favour of industrial bourgeoisie after 27 May which would create a good environment for all sort of opposition to the ruling class alliance. As for the *reflection* thesis of Erdost, it seems to me that the beginning dissolution of peasantry and the emergence of the agricultural working masses and an reserve army in the rural areas were accompanied with the pressures of the newly developing industrial capital over the small provinces and the rural areas (over the old industry and the commerce of the small and middle size cities and the rural areas). Rural and provincial bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie must have reacted to these forces through ideologies which corresponded to the pre-capitalist economic and social relations. A revolution or a dissolution process always creates a reaction of the revolved and the dissolved to itself. In both Boratav and Erdost, a change in the economic base (the productive forces and the relations of production or property relations) is not taken account with political and ideological struggle which often uses existing material, for instance, religious conservatism.

Same or different Slogans for the proletariat and the peasants: Erdost says that Boratav suggests that socialist should offer two different slogans for the peasants and for the urban proletariat in a country where agriculture is dominated by small commodity production. Therefore Boratav seems to be support the national democratic revolution. He in this case supports Aren and Aybar who demand two different slogans for the proletariat and the peasants and confronts with “the proletarian revolutionaries who offer only the one revolutionary platform for both the proletariat and the peasants” (Erdost, 1969c:56). Erdost says that the proletarian party in Russia offered the same slogans for “revolutionary classes” in “each revolutionary period” even though it changed its revolution strategy and tactics in different periods. Erdost says:

“In the bourgeois democratic revolutionary period, the proletariat by allying with **whole peasantry** is against the monarchy and the big landowners”. As quoted from Lenin, “here the revolution stays as a bourgeois democratic revolution” in which the proletariat allies with “**whole peasantry**” against the monarchy, feudalism and big landowners. In the later phase of revolution, the proletariat allies with “**the poor peasantry**, semi-proletarians, all exploited ones” is “**against the capitalism**” and also against “rich peasants, kulaks, speculators”. Here “the revolution is socialist revolution” (Erdost, 1969c:57). Erdost states that “The slogan of the revolution is determined by the aim of the revolution”. “In the first stage of revolution” the target is the monarchy and the big landowners for both the proletariat and the peasantry. It is “not offered socialist slogans” to the former and “democratic slogans” to the latter. In “the second stage of the revolution”, the target is the bourgeoisie. In this socialist stage of revolution, “middle peasant” has to be neutralised since it has a doubtful position in socialist revolution. Middle peasant was not doubtful in the democratic revolution. Similarly here, it is “not offered ‘socialist’ slogans to the proletariat and ‘democratic’ slogans to the peasants”. In all stages of revolution, “the proletariat” is divided into “urban proletariat” and “rural proletariat”; and “the agricultural proletariat is not put into the same place with all peasants, i.e. the middle peasants and poor peasants (semi-proletariat)”. Erdost states that a revolution does not offer “different slogans to each class”. The “main slogan of revolution ensures the alliance of classes which come together around it in terms of their interests” (Erdost, 1969c:57).

It is sure that we cannot demand a point to point correspondence between the Russian case of revolution between 1905 and 1917 and Turkey after 27 May 1960. The target of the first stage of the Russian revolution is the monarchy, big landowners, and feudality. These targets are valid for both the proletariat and the peasantry as a whole. Lenin said above that here the revolution was democratic and bourgeois. In the second stage of revolution, the target is capitalism itself together with speculators, kulaks and rich peasants. I wonder whether the stage of revolution in Turkey after 1960s

corresponded to the Russian revolution in its first stage. It is in Russia that feudalism, big landowners, kulaks and the monarchy, i.e. the feudal form of the state are the main targets of the revolution. But Turkey had abolished the feudal state in 1920s. Turkey of 1960s had all modern political institutions. We have to ask Erdost how *his* reflection theory would explain the economic base of these modern political institutions after 1960s. The most important characteristics of Turkey in 1960s are industrialisation, urbanisation and democratisation in bourgeois framework. But problems of development in industrialisation, urbanisation and democratisation put into the agenda of Turkey after 1960s, the proletariat, the youth, and the intellectuals. Both industrialisation and urbanisation put into the agenda the agricultural problem and peasantry. It is indeed the peasantry which comes into the agenda as a problem because of industrialisation and urbanisation processes. Here, problem of democracy is not the same with the problem of democracy in Russia after 1900s. Therein democracy could be meaningful in a reference to monarchy and the feudal state. But the problem of democracy in Turkey in 1960s is not defined against feudalism and feudal state. But it is related with a democratic and rational reorganisation of the relationship between the state and society (ruling class alliance and the other classes, or to say the state and the civil society) according to the demands of industrialisation and urbanisation against the background of capitalist mode of production. It is not surprising that the most striking aspects of Turkey after 1960 are the rising socialist mobilisation, the formation of militant syndicalism, socialist intellectual renaissance, and the movement of socialist youth. These all pointed to a bourgeois democratic framework in which bourgeois order and socialism would eventually begin to conflict. It is already the fact that had emerged.

Wide mass of the petty bourgeoisie: the small and middle peasantry:

Erdost states that the division of the petty bourgeoisie to the urban and rural bourgeoisie has some drawbacks and necessary. Such a division has a drawback “since the petty bourgeoisie is a class of the capitalist society”.

However, it is necessary “since there are important differences between the agricultural and artisan and commercial petty bourgeoisie due to the fact that the relations of production are not pure”. Labouring peasants satisfies their needs mostly from their own products. The “small merchants” satisfy their needs through profit making. In addition, “the artisans” satisfy their needs with revenues coming from the exchange of the products. Both the “small and middle holder peasants, i.e. the rural petty bourgeoisie” and the urban petty bourgeoisie owns their means of production and are labourers “although they sometimes exploit alien labour”. The peasant families produce for themselves in the pre-capitalist production. Very little part of the products becomes the subject of commerce. However, under the impact of capitalism, more and more part of the agricultural products becomes the matter of commerce. On the other hand, the products of the urban petty bourgeoisie all take commercial form. The rural petty bourgeoisie makes production with his family. The means of production are under the family property. This condition is exceptional for the urban petty bourgeoisie. The small peasant farms carry exact pre-capitalist characteristics are connected to the capitalist market to the extent that they produce simple commodity. Erdost states after looking at the fact that the village is connected to the cities, credit system and its dependence on the power (the state power) and then looking at the characteristics of the cities, the credit system and the power, “it is impossible to argue that the peasant farms have become capitalist farms”. He quotes from Stalin: “The peasant farm is not a capitalist farm”. Unlike the Emek journal, the fact that “the village is dependent on the city and hence on the capitalist market does not form a proof for the claim that the peasant obtains the ideology of the proletariat after being pauperised due to capitalist exploitation”. Erdost also refers to Lenin who said that the claims of the “populist papers and journals” about that “the workers” and ‘labourer’ peasants belonged to the same class” were completely wrong (Erdost, 1970, 258).

Active population (above 15 years old) (according to 1965 population census) in Turkey was 13557860. This figure is 9279004 in agriculture. Only 376866 is the agricultural wage-labourer. Erdost says that this figure is beyond a half million in some statistics. Even in this case, the proportion of the agricultural wage-labourer to total agricultural labour force is 1/18. In agriculture, 3011433 persons work for themselves (this figure is 3885915 in Turkey). These are not proletarians. But according to Erdost, in terms of the proportion of their products supplied as commodity at the market to their total production, they can be counted as “semi-proletarian”. The mass, which works without wage within the family, is 6311500 in agriculture (this figure is 6418834 in Turkey). These own the family property although they are also labourers. They are also not proletarians. In sum, in agriculture, only 0,3 million is wage-labourer. Roughly 3 million people work for themselves. Roughly 6,3 million people work without wage within the family and total active labour force is roughly 9,2 million people. Erdost states that “We, for this reason, count the middle and small holder peasants with the ones working without wage within the family ‘*rural* petty bourgeoisie’ due to their similarities with and the differences from petty-bourgeoisie” (Erdost, 1970a,259) (Note: I have always translated the “*village* petty bourgeoisie” as the “*rural* petty bourgeoisie”). Here it will be surprising to compare the figures of the dependent and semi-dependent peasants with this rural petty bourgeoisie. A more interesting idea is the statement of Erdost about the free peasants above: “As today the amount and sphere of exchange grows and the commodity production becomes dominant, they are becoming semi-waged labourers” (Erdost, 1970a, 259). The dependent peasant which has no land and is not wage-labourer in the feudal and semi-feudal relations in 26 provinces (having total 1356471 farmer families) is roughly 32 percent and in 43 provinces roughly 28-29 percent according to the 1961 Village Inventory Studies, as Erdost evaluated for us (Erdost, 1970a,255). And now, according to the 1965 population census, in *agriculture*, only 0,3 million is wage-labourer. Roughly 3 million people work for themselves. Roughly 6,3 million people work without wage within the family. And total active labour force is

roughly 9, 2 million people. In one side, we have about 30 percent peasant dependency for 26 or 43 provinces (in 1961), and in the other side, we have 3 million people working for themselves with their means of production and total 6,3 million family members working for and within the family itself. Erdost here points to a petty bourgeois rural structure in the country level. But even in 26 or 43 provinces he presented above, only 30 percent of the families lives a dependency. And the last thing which must be mentioned is the fact that the rural mass which have no land and which can not be counted within the proletariat is always a reason for Erdost to label them peasant within the feudal and semi-feudal relations. But we know from *Capital's Volume 1* that this population can be related to the reserve army at least for the agriculture even if it is not yet industrial reserve army. However, the latter can be predicted after this mass moves to the cities. Nevertheless, even though this mass can be counted as a reserve, Erdost will say again that this reserve lives in dependent condition in feudal and semi-feudal relationship with the big landowners. But, nonetheless, this mass is a *potential* industrial reserve army which originates from the agricultural structure. They are either old "serfs" or old peasant "holders". Furthermore, the active population, which covers the persons between 15 and 65 years old, does not fit for the agricultural labour force. This fact demonstrates that agricultural population has much more labour force and reserve army than the census figures.

Tractors and the credit: The claims about the impacts of mechanisation over the capitalist development and the acceptance of the proletarian ideology by the small and the middle peasants due to the proletarianisation and pauperisation after capitalist exploitation is another question Erdost deals with. He says that some sees the mechanisation of agriculture after 1950s "as a criterion for the definition of the relations of production" (Erdost, 1970a, 259).

Erdost says that tractors and hence the credit system makes the peasant dependent on the world capitalism and the imperialism. Mechanisation

certainly affects the relations of production and the property relations. However, he asks whether these changes predominantly affect the property relations in agriculture by leading to turning a minority to the rural bourgeoisie and a majority to the rural proletariat. Erdost observes that the number of tractors rose from 16585 to 85475 between 1950 and 1968. In the same period, the lands tilled by the tractors rose from 1244 thousand hectare to 6411 thousand hectare. And the lands tilled by plough rose from 13298 thousand hectare to 17681 thousand hectare. Here the increment is 4353 while in the mechanised agriculture, it is 5167. Total lands tilled roughly doubles in the same period (from 14542 thousand hectare to 24092 thousand hectare). In the same period, the plots of land between 1-3 increase 28,1 percent to 30,4 percent. The plots of land between 4-9 decreases from 49,3 to 44,8. and the plots in 10 and above increases from 22,6 percent to 24,8 percent. Erdost states that these changes demonstrate that the big landowners, the small holders and semi-peasants increase their plots of land while middle peasants decreases. Mechanisation led the big landowners to extend their lands, but did not lead the small and middle holders to transform into the proletariat. Meanwhile, common lands were opened to agriculture by the big landowners at the expense of the labouring peasant masses. Erdost says that these figures do not mean that a change in the property is not realised in this period. In addition, such a change cannot be attributed to the mechanisation. Rich landowners and big farms are also a result of the new lands which has been opened to production. And the fact that the small holders increase while the middle ones decreases is a product of the division of lands through inheritance rather than the capitalist concentration of lands. Mechanisation of agriculture has increased the dependency of the village on the cities, the capitalist market and the imperialism. But it has not affected main property relations. "Middle and small peasantry is the majority" (Erdost, 1970a, 260). Here one point is striking. Erdost points to the decrement of the middle peasants and increment of the big and small peasants. But what are increased or decreased are the plots of land. The peasant holder who increases his plots of land does not increase himself, but elevates himself to

a higher category of peasantry. For this reason inner class structure of the peasantry is in the bourgeois direction.

Erdost states:

In agriculture, there is a body which changes from feudal relations towards the capitalist relations and which changes in the proportion of this change according to the regional differences. In this body, middle and small peasant covers the wide majority of the peasantry; they are both property owner and labourers by their class nature. For this reason, we take for granted the middle and small peasants as the petty bourgeoisie not as the proletariat (Erdost, 1970a, 260-1).

I must say that here we see a turning point for Erdost (on behalf of *the Aydınlık*). Turkish **agriculture becomes petty bourgeois in terms of the majority of the peasantry.**

Only after the Second World War, the modern politics with its institutions emerged in Turkey. A modern constitution, the constitutional court, the trade unions, youth organisations, political parties emerged together with class ideologies. Ideologies influenced each other and took some parts from each other. Socialism was influenced by Kemalism while Kemalists were influenced by new socialist ideas. Nationalists were influenced by religious ideas. European sort of political ideologies seemed to be modified to Turkish conditions. When the left was under the influence of the petty bourgeois ideology of Kemalism, the right was under the influence of the religion. But neither Kemalism nor religion was the same with the Kemalism and religious ideas of the previous periods. I think that the change in the ideologies is not well taken for granted by *the Aydınlık* and Erdost.

Erdost correctly points to the workers organisations, the development of capitalism and the workers activities: "When the proletariat grows and concentrates more and more in proportion of the development of capitalism, it organises within the professional organisations, it is in this wish and trying. Whatever the characteristic of the TUCT and the RTUCT are, this wish and

trying must be counted as the proof for that its political consciousness is increasing". In the period between 1961 and 1963, "176 worker movements took place". Erdost counts 10 strikes, 6 sitting strike, 7 beard strike, 12 silent march, 5 meetings, and 126 addressing (Erdost, 1970a,263) and between 1963 and 1968, 85 strikes took place in the state workplaces, and 254 were realised in the private ones (total 339). In the striking workplaces, 74280 of total workers participated in the strikes. These strikes, says Erdost, "economic strikes", but were "the proof of the struggle of the workers as a class". Erdost attributes a clear class consciousness to the workers movement:

Let me say, organisations and strikes point to both that the workers are not only the workers objectively and simultaneously they themselves have reached in the consciousness that they are class. It has reached in the consciousness of that it is a class, but with this consciousness, it is sure that it cannot be yet said that this consciousness has reached from the level of economic struggle to a level of political struggle which is higher level than this level (Erdost, 1970a,264).

Erdost continued to say: for the working class to obtain "political consciousness, i.e. socialist consciousness", the intellectuals have to fulfil some functions as stated by Lenin in his "What is to be done".

3.3 Rejecting the idea of Primitive Capitalism

Debates over the mode of production and social systems directly determine the debates over the state and the dominant classes which politically and ideologically rule the society through the mediation of the state. Erdost says that according to Boratav, the dominant mode of production in Turkey was "primitive capitalism" which was represented by "the merchant and the usurer" which seized the surplus product of the petty commodity producers, particularly in agriculture. The "profit" which is appropriated by the merchant does not originate from "capitalist production" since "the simple commodity production is a distinctive mode of production which is different from capitalist

production” (quoted by Erdost, Erdost, 1970b, 16). Erdost says that it is clear that this merchant is not exporter or importer or wholesale merchant, but “town merchant and town usurer” which confronts directly with “the petty producer in agriculture”. He concludes that if so, “class content of the political power” is formed by the merchant and usurer of the towns and that “both industrial bourgeoisie and agricultural bourgeoisie is under the hegemony of the town merchant and the usurer which form the content of the power” It is already according to Boratav that “in the primitive capitalism there is no place given to the agricultural bourgeoisie and industrial bourgeoisie and also it is stated that the industrial bourgeoisie did not even **nominate** itself for the political power” (Erdost, 1970b, 16) In the superstructure of this “primitive capitalism” there is no place for “the dominant classes which would represent the imperialist relations, the feudal relations and even the developed capitalist relations”. Erdost quotes from Boratav: “the ones who try to define the class content of the political power without knowing the dominant mode of production reach in **a m e a n i n g l e s s w e a l t h y o r p o w e r f u l** class coalitions **by counting side by side the dominant elements of the existing relations of production**” (*first three emphasis belong to Erdost;17*). The definition of the dominant classes as “the imperialism (monopoly bourgeoisie), the comprador bourgeoisie and feudal big landowners” thereby is rejected by Boratav who was transferred to the circle of the PRA. The dominant classes become “the town merchant and the usurer” (Erdost, 1970b, 17).

Erdost prefers to reply to Boratav’s definition of “dominant classes” by shifting the debate to the relationship between the mode of production and the superstructures. He exposes that for Boratav, “a superstructure” corresponds to “a mode of production”, if so, if there is more than one mode of production in a country, there had to be several superstructures corresponding to each mode of production; and if these mode of production live side by side, there also had be several independent superstructures living side of side, and hence there would be more than one “social-economic formation” and “many

independent social system” in a country. But such a situation is impossible since “it is necessary that **the most important instructions of the superstructure must be required for all society**” (emphasis belongs to Boratav); “even though it carries various elements in its body, **the superstructure as a whole** must essentially be in a consensus with **one** of the various modes of production” (*emphasis belongs to Boratav*) (Erdost, 1970b, 17).

Erdost says that although that “each mode of production creates its own legal relations, its own government” (quoted from Marx’s the Introduction to The Critique of The Political Economy of) is **theoretically** so much correct, in a country where the dominant classes are in consensus with each other and which covers various relations of production, the political and legal superstructure must be not only a political and legal superstructure which corresponds to only and absolutely **only one** mode of production and which protects **only that relation of production**, but a political and legal superstructure which represents the interests of each of the dominant classes which **are in consensus with each other** as a whole and in proportion to their powers”. There is “various political and legal elements which correspond to various modes of production”, i.e., those for “the feudal relations in one extreme”, and “the imperialist relations in the other extreme”, and the intermediary relations. These elements, argues Erdost, can not be seen in the superstructure which corresponds to “Boratav’s ‘primitive capitalism’”. The reality however demonstrates the reverse (Erdost, 1970b, 18). Erdost adds that according to *the Preface to the Contribution to the Critique of the Political Economy* the superstructure is based on “the totality of the relations of production” rather than “only one mode of production” (Erdost, 1970b, 18). The other point is about the existence of one dominant class in a mode of production. Erdost says that if there is only one dominant class in a mode of production, is the “Marx’s concept “the ruling **classes**” wrong? (Erdost, 1970b, 18). He argues that the logic of Boratav implies this. He says that “However, the ruling classes are the dominant classes which

cover 'the totality of the relations of production' and are made of the dominant classes which change according to the variation, the predominance, the powers, the vitality, the development or disappearance, the mutual positions, the conditions and activity of the relations of production, not of only **single class**" (Erdost, 1970b, 18-9).

Erdost states that Boratav's "primitive capitalism" ignores "the proletariat", and the feudal, semi-feudal and capitalist landowners. The surplus products of the small peasants which form the majority of the population is exploited not only by the merchant and the usurer but also by the monopoly capital, the comprador bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie in the main. The "ruling classes" are not "the usurer" and "the town merchant (tacir and even the shopkeeper) one section of which is petty bourgeois and exploited by the dominant classes", but "the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal big landowners; the national bourgeoisie is within and between this hegemony; but it does not have power for an establishment of his hegemony and is weak". The "socialist" slogan suggested by Boratav, "Stop the exploitation of the merchant and the usurer!" for "particularly small peasant producers" implies that the enemy is the town merchant and the usurer. Putting aside the meaning of this slogan "in a country where in agriculture the natural **economy** prevails" in terms of the revolution, says Erdost, the targets of the national democratic revolution are hidden away by "new opportunism" (Erdost, 1970b, 19).

For Marx the analytic unit is not the firms and not the national states in the context of the capitalist mode of production. But it is the unit of the production, circulation and realisation of the surplus value produced by the worker and appropriated by the capitalist. However, when he deals with the class struggles, he concerns the national and international frameworks of the struggle. Relationship between two capitalist countries or between weak and strong capitalist modes of production can be the problems of dependency and independency between the countries only in terms of the sub-categories

of capital and classes. According to the Marxian framework, dependency relationship can be set up between the production and circulation, between commodities and money, between productive labour and unproductive labour, between profit and rent, between value and price, between bourgeois civil society and the state, between the dominant classes and the bureaucracy of the state and so on. In Marx, any dependency relation is the relationship between the determinant and the determined within the dialectic relation. In capitalist mode of production, the capitalist exploits the labour of the wage-labourer. But an idea that one or several developed national capitalist mode of production exploit one or several undeveloped national capitalist mode of production through the imperialist relations, and let us assume also that there is no direct domination, means only that as if we have a big industrial capitalist who deals with a petty bourgeois. All capitalist countries are bourgeois societies. The fact that a capitalist country has a relation with another capitalist country means that we have the bourgeoisies who are dealing with each other. For Marx, the states are dominated, ruled and hence represented by the dominant classes rather than the proletariat. It is indeed that we have the relationships between numerous nations of capital. A more developed capitalist production is defined relatively by the far less developed capitalist production. It is sure that the hierarchy between the capitalist productions sees to follow the hierarch between the classes. Different rates of profit, i.e. the **absence of the general rate of the profit** or inequality of the profit rates between the national rates are related with the different levels of development or penetration of the capitalist mode of production in the different spheres of production. The question is the national and international articulation of the capitalist mode of production. The idea that a country exploits the other can be meaningful only when the former country establishes a capital-relation with the latter, i.e. the former is the capitalist as the latter is the proletarian in the first form of exploitation. It is sure that there are secondary forms of exploitation between the developed and undeveloped capitalist spheres of production through credit relations for example. But Marx never says that money-capitalist of the bank exploits the

industrial capital, for instance. Exploitation relation can be existed between the owners of the means of production and consumption, i.e. the owners of the conditions of labour and living and the non-owners. That a portion of a country's total surplus labour is paid or captured to another country in the form of interest or rent does imply **a relationship between different capitals or the sub-categories of capital in an international level**. Here the unit of analysis is not the national mode of production, but the international capitalist mode of production in general. International capital as a whole exploits international labour in different rates of profit in different national capitalist modes of production (in *Capital's Volume 3*, Chapter 10: *The Equalisation of the General rate of Profit through Competition. Market Prices and Market Values. Surplus Profit*).

Erdost says that the term "primitive capitalism" (which means that the surplus labour of the petty commodity producers is appropriated by the merchant and the usurer) implies that capitalism is existed in the previous eras of history (Erdost, 1970b:83). The merchant and the usurer appears in the era prior to capitalism through "a third great social division of labour" is based on the backward relations of production and fulfils the solvent function over these relations of production. Erdost here utilises the observations made by Marx in his *Capital's Volume 3* and says that these elements do not change the relations of production and are different from the merchant of the modern capital unlike Boratav's claims. For this reason, a slogan, which calls for the abolition of the usurer's exploitation does not mean anything since it is based on the backward relations of production. In addition, the merchant continues to be existed as long as the commodity production is existed. "Rather, it is a necessity to develop the commodity economy for a revolutionary due to the solvent, destructive effects of the commodity production over the natural economy" (Erdost, 1970b:83). Progressive forms are suggested against the backward forms.

Erdost quotes from **Lenin** who says that “the bourgeoisie takes its power from the small production... the small production ... gives birth to capitalism and the bourgeoisie”. However, Erdost states that **this small production is “the simple commodity production” rather than “the free small producer which is dependent on natural economy (patriarchal economy)”** (Erdost, 1970b, 83). In 1921, Lenin thought that the development of the **commodity production was needed** in order to develop the national economy, the productivity of labour and the exchange between the industry and agriculture and in order to **abolish the natural economy**. The necessary and needed development of the capitalism had to be canalised into “the state capitalism” (Erdost, 1970b:83-4). Erdost says that “the backbone of the production in agriculture” is “the natural economy”. This economy had to be destructed in Turkey, too. In Turkey of 1970, the slogan which would call for the abolition of the merchant’s exploitation implied only the paralysing of the commodity production and circulation. For the destruction of the natural economy in agriculture, commodity production and circulation and hence “free trade” is needed. “This is the embourgeoisment, this is the realisation of the democratic revolution in agriculture”. However, in a semi-dependent country, the development of commodity production and circulation also develops the imperialist exploitation and the monopoly bourgeoisie. For this reason, unless anti-imperialist struggle must be accomplished and independency must be realised, each progressive development for capitalist agriculture and commodity production will serve the imperialism. Each step towards socialism through the elimination of the obstacles before the development of capitalism simultaneously strengthens the imperialism and increases far more the contradiction between the labourer and the imperialism. The imperialism prevents the capital accumulation in the country. The fetters of the development of the productive forces are the imperialist relations and the pre-capitalist relations in agriculture (Erdost, 1970b:84). Erdost concludes that Boratav is a Trojan horse driven by the PRA to the proletarian revolutionary movement (Erdost, 1970b:85).

3.4 Dominant classes in the WPT Program

The program observes that Turkey was an agricultural underdeveloped country. The agricultural sector created 42 percent of the national income and employed 77, 4 percent of the economically active population. The country with its agricultural characteristic was dependent on foreign markets and was “a completing element of the developed foreign economies”. The developed foreign countries tried to maintain this position of Turkey.

The exportation of agricultural products was in the interests of the big landowners who owned the resources and the means of production. The small and even the large section of the middle family holders were “closed farms” which had either little or no interests in foreign markets. According to “previous surveys” (no reference), stated the program, the 510 thousands of peasant family of the total 2 million 700 thousands of the peasant families had no land. The small holdings, which were below 100 square meters (dönüm) were spacious while the middle and big holdings were little. The peasant families who operated the farms between 1 and 100 square meters exceeded 2 million 122 thousands a little. They covered 84 percent of all peasant families. However, the same number of families tilled only the 39 percent of the arable lands. However, the farms between 30 thousands square meters and 100 thousands square meters belonged to only 40 families and the lands above 100 thousands square meters belonged to only two families. The later surveys demonstrated that land property and tilling increased and that middle and even small holding farms became more and more divided and hence the small farms grew in numbers. It was stated that the polarization became sharper than before between the classes and the strata in agriculture. This polarization was also supported by the distribution of the means of production. The stock-raising demonstrated the same conditions with land.

“Big land owners”: The big landed property was seen in two systems of farming, (tenure) as a product of historical transformations it lived. The one was “the system of land ağas which is residual of feudalism” and the system of the capitalist form of farming.

The residual characteristic of the **land ağas** had nothing to do with the fact that the land ağas were the sons of the old old feudal families. The residual characteristic was related with the form of farming (tenure) itself. This system was no longer closed economic system. It produced for national and international markets. The land ağas had no legal privilege. However, they maintained their influence which was residual of the old feudal system traditionally. The big land ağas, like feudal lords in old days, were not farmer himself but lived through the rent of the land in the main. The land was divided into small parcels and was tilled in the old feudal forms like “share-croppership”. The relationship between the cropper (and similar ones) and the land ağas went beyond “rent contracts” and covered “personal ties” which were based on the traditions outside the economic relations. These ties offered the ağas political power. The peasants, croppers or similar ones lived in the village and on the land of the ağa. They served the ağas through generations. When the lands were sold, the village and the peasants who lived therein also changed the ağa. The peasants were nominally *de jure* free citizens. They were bandaged to the land *de facto*. In this sort of tenure, the means of production were provided by the ağas in general. The level of labour productivity was low and the technique was primitive.

The **capitalist farming** especially developed after 1848 and manifested itself mainly in Trace, the West, the South and partially The South Eastern Anatolia. The transition to capitalist farming was realized in favour of the big land owners with the state budget and the foreign aids through three ways: machinery was imported. The number of the tractors increased from 789 to 42 thousands 394 between 1948 and 1957. The agricultural credits were extremely and cheaply provided to the big land owners after 1947 through

Ziraat Bankası and the unions and the cooperatives supported by the state. These credits demonstrated that “the present remnants of the Middle Age’s feudalism” used the state’s local and foreign funds for their own “capitalist development”. The other sources of the development of the capitalist farms were the subventions and high prices for the agricultural products provided by the state. The program stated that agricultural prices before 1947 (with the exception of the war years) were kept low due to the priority given to industrialization for development by the state. But after 1847, policy of high prices and incentives for agricultural products were not only for populist voting purposes (the Democrat Party meant) in order to support the political power of an estate (the Democrat Party meant), but also in order to “facilitate the capitalist transformations of the big land owner class which this estate represents”. As a result, these three ways facilitated the elevation of the big land owners who were the remnants of the feudalism and used the agricultural methods of the Middle Age towards mechanized agriculture.

The development of the capitalist farming ensured the big land owners to establish closer relationships with the foreign markets, foreign capital and circles of interests. Hence this class increased its power and in parallel with this, the social and political life of the country was put under the impact of the reactionary forces more and more than before.

“The merchants”: The program described the Turkish economy as “undeveloped capitalism” which was based on “the agriculture that maintained a system of production which was residual of feudalism”. The internal market was undeveloped. The country exported agricultural raw materials and imported manufactured products. For this reason, the importer and exporter merchants occupied an important and powerful stratum. This stratum had close ties with relatively more powerful big land owners. In addition, the big landed property, the importing and exporting commerce were sometimes concentrated in the same hands.

This importer and exporter commercial stratum was connected to foreign capital through foreign commerce and made “the agency and the representative of the exploiter foreign capital”. Behind the dependency of the Turkey’s economy and the fact that it was not rapidly industrialized the reactionary impacts of this stratum was seen. It had common interest in general with the big landed property and did not want the development of the local industry and opposed the radical reforms. The foreign capital also supported this stratum for this reason. It seemed that the European Common Market was wanted by both foreign capital and this stratum because of the common interests of these local and foreign interests.

The section of the merchants which was related with the home market was weaker than, and dependent on the importer and exporter merchants because of the weakness of the home market. Nevertheless, this stratum obtained high profits from the shoulders of the small and middle agricultural producers from which it bought cheaper and from the urban consumers to whom it sold what it had bought from the formers. The town merchants also gave borrowings to the peasants and through this way exploited them.

Because of the weakness of the home market, the stratum of the merchants interested with this market could not turn its job into modern commercial operations and had to invest its accumulated capital on real estate or the primitive forms of industrial production. The ideological attitude of this stratum was similar with the importer and exporter merchant, but more reactionary than them.

“The industrialists”: Turkey witness industrialization attempts of the state between 1932 and 1939. After 1948 the private industry developed importantly. However, this industrialization of the private sector could not render the country economically independent and industrialized. The most developed branch of industry was the industries of the simple consumption goods. This branch was protected through tariffs and did not meet with the

foreign competition and hence did not demonstrate any resistance as national capital towards foreign capital. Rather, it tended to ally with foreign capital in recent period.

Since 1950, some industrial branches such as montage and package developed. These were not real industries, and through them foreign capital entered the home market. Like “commercial capital”, “the industrial capital demonstrates ‘agency’ (aracı) characteristic”.

The foundational, i.e., heavy industries, and national industry was not seen in the private sector. The other workshops of the private sector did not go beyond the level of manufacturing industries in general. In addition, the private sector wanted the state intervention to obtain aid and support of the state while it tried to liquidate the state managements in industry. On the other hand, the private sector ignored the rights of the workers which was recognized in the constitution and struggled fiercely against the working class.

“Although the industrialist group is a dynamic social estate, it tends to cooperate with the land ağas and merchants because of the pressures of the foreign capital in Turkey and intensification of the struggles for the provision of social justice”. However, the program predicted that the development of the European Common Market in the direction of the liquidation of the tariff barriers could increase the foreign pressure and force “our industrialists” to oppose “the impacts of the foreign capital”. The first clues of such a development had already emerged.

The program concluded that the place of industry in the national economy was weak, and hence the industrialists were weaker than the big land owners, the importer and exporter merchants.

The big land owners, the importer and exporter merchants, the industrialists and the circles of financial capital dominated “popular class and stratum”, i.e. “all labouring popular class and stratum”.

The “circles of financial capital”: The big land owners, the importer and exporter merchants, the industrialists also rose to the level of financial capital by becoming shareholder of the existing banks or establishing new banks and hence took the control of the insurance and credit institutions. In addition, they raised their economic power due to the concentration of the small deposits of the people.

The fact that the underdeveloped countries suffered from the shortage of liquid capital made stronger the owners of financial capital. The shortage of capital increased the rate of interest at the market. However, the banks and other financial institutions gave credits with lower interest rates which were kept low by the law. The ones who were able to control and effect financial capital were in a position for making some estates such as the entrepreneurs and the merchants benefit from the difference between two interest rates. On the other hand, small deposit owner’ people, who were the source of the credits, obtained very low rate of interest due to the law.

Public Sector: (State capitalism and the bureaucratic stratum) The state sector had the most modern industrial workshops and was a result of the weakness of the private capital and served to strength it till then although it seemed to have negative impacts over the power and the influence of “the private property owner classes”.

After the proclamation of the republic, it was accepted that the economic life would be operated with the private hands. However, the prediction for industrial development of the economy was not realized despite all supports of the state to the private sector through some financial instruments and protective tariffs. Besides this reality, the need for more effective national

security, the state began to intervene the economy and then “a state capitalism” emerged. The result of this “state capitalism” was the formation of “a bureaucratic stratum” using “economic and political power”. As the state intervention to the economy raised, there emerged close ties between the higher echelons of the bureaucratic stratum and the private sector particularly in the public tenders and import-export activities and also there emerged interest groupings. This close ties and interests were consolidated through foreign aids and credits.

It should be noted that the state capitalism which was a product of the weakness of the private sector created a bureaucratic stratum whose higher echelons had close ties and interests with the private sector. These sections of the bureaucratic stratum were mentioned in the “dominant classes”, although the program emphasized its “instrumental” characteristic, the fact that the stratum used “economic and political power”. We will see below that “the public servants” in general were placed to the middle classes (www.lycos.co.uk/turkiyesolu/texts).

CHAPTER 4

REVOLUTIONARY STAGES AND STRATEGY

Marx says somewhere that the revolutionaries live with the memories of the last revolution. For him, the 1848 was an unsuccessful proletarian revolution and the 1871 Paris Commune was another unsuccessful and unfortunate proletarian revolution. It may be these unsuccessful attempts that form the reasons behind Marx's emphasis over the detailed and systematic analyses of the bourgeois order. After 1848 defeat, Marx began to emphasise more than before the rupture from the democratic revolution and the bourgeois order. Till then he thought that the socialist development would follow the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution. However, the defeat of 1848 February Revolution demonstrated that the permanency of the revolution was nothing but the proclamation of socialist revolution rather than the completion of the bourgeois revolution. The proletariat acquired its independency as a class and political force in the face of other classes and forces. In Turkey, some circles like *the Aydınlık* saw the development of 27 May 1960 and after as a new possibility of the second Kemalist Revolution. The only difference would be that the proletariat and its proletarian revolutionary intellectuals and militants would lead this second Kemalist revolution (the NDR). Unless dependency, compradorship and semi-feudal relations were not eliminated, socialist revolution could be only a utopia. In addition, a socialist struggle, rather than a national democratic struggle, could prevent the alliance of the radical petty bourgeoisie, the small peasantry and some section of the national bourgeoisie with the proletariat. However, these ideas were based on the observation that democratic revolution had not been completed yet. However, such a completion can mean, in a Marxian or Leninist framework, democratic revolution in its bourgeois framework is accepted as being completed when the bourgeois order is threaten by the

independent proletarian and socialist forces. This is because the bourgeois class can no longer be a revolutionary force against the proletarian and socialist threat. 1848 revolution and 1871 Paris Commune had such meaning for Marx and Lenin. *The Aydınlık* made its analyses as if there did not emerge an independent socialist and proletarian politics in Turkey after 1960s.

4.1 Background of the Revolutionary Thought in Marx

Initial Remarks: Questions about the development of revolutionary class-consciousness of proletariat point to the main problem area of Marxism *after* Marx. Why can not the working class of advanced nations develop a socialist consciousness, a perspective for socialist revolution? Or, it is asked whether the proletariat is capable of developing such consciousness? These are the questions, but I am not sure whether they are always the true questions. Marx did not only leave behind a theoretical framework for the analyses of capital-class relations under capitalist mode of production, but also a form of thinking, which transposes these kind of questions into different sub-questions. Marx's own work demonstrates that the questions should also be asked in Marxist way. If the questions mentioned above implicitly assume that class-consciousness is a psychology of a group of men coming together to make their own revolution, I do not think that we asked the question in a Marxian way. Marx sees the class consciousness not only as a precondition, but also a product of revolutionary class action, Hence, for example If we have only a social uprising or a social movement, here whether the up-risers are mainly the proletariat does not matter, we will not concern completely and mainly within the Marxian problematic. In general, masses, groups can revolt against any social or political condition. Or they can be intellectually organised in order to criticise or protest against something. But only when we search for their class content, we deal with the questions of Marxian theory. In this sense, throughout his work, Marx tries to reveal class content of social and historical phenomena. Criticisms for Marx's class reductionism must be

understood in this content searching analysis. Our survey of young Marx will demonstrate that Marx is interested with the driving forces of historical change. These forces were formulated by him against the background of the French revolution and British industrial development. Marx's early period is located within this age of revolutions. Marx and his contemporaries witness rapid changes in the structures of society and the state. And the classes were easily seen as the driving forces behind change. The close relationship between class interests and ideological forms was clearly observed in Marx's time. As Eric Hobsbawm labels it, the time period between 1789 and 1848, was "the age of revolution" (Hobsbawm, 1989). For this reason, Marx's conception of classes and class-consciousness is predominantly influenced by the revolutionary and rapid change of history. As a result, my thesis is related with the main determinants of Marx's conception of class and class consciousness. It is neither a new bibliographical study for Marx, nor one that deals with the intellectual sources of Marxian theory. Similarly, it does not deal with the general questions of the socialism, or communism. But, it solely concerns with the problem of how Marx formulates his ideas of class and consciousness in the intellectual evolution of his theory. His relation to the original ideas of socialism, to Hegel, to left Hegelians, or similarly to the British political economy will be dealt with only to the extent that Marx refers to them. In addition, throughout my study, I will accept that Marx's presentation of theories and ideas in his works is correctly presented by him. For this reason, provided that his presentation is not controversial as regards with historical evidence, I will focus on what Marx tells us. The thesis will mainly deal with the internal evolution of Marx's theory. However, I will limit the discussion of this general theoretical development to his conception of class and consciousness, or to say, to the problem of class-consciousness.

Almost every study on Marx, with the exception of some general biographical studies that try to cover Marx's whole life and his complete work, concentrates on Marx's special theoretical contributions in certain fields such as the theory of the state, revolution, history, capital accumulation, or

alienation. Nonetheless, each of these studies tries to find out a central paradigm that can be thought of to encompass the totality of his ideas. Thus, his conception of alienation, for instance, is analysed as if it will dissolve each cell of the Marxian theoretical body. Alternatively, his theory of revolution is suggested as the central aspect of his theory. The present thesis may seem to be another example of such an attempt. The theory of class and of consciousness will be centralised to dissolve the whole problematic which is thought of as what the Marxian problematic essentially is. As a result, the thesis accepts that Marx's theories of capital, of the state, of the revolution, of alienation, et cetera, as much as he has, is all related with the classless society of the future. Besides his theoretical conception of class and class-consciousness, the other theories fall into sub-theoretical positions and become meaningful to the extent that his class-consciousness permits. This initial observation can be easily supported by a brief look at the twentieth century revolutionary approaches. Lenin's *what is to be done?* Lukacs' *History and Class-Consciousness* and Gramsci's theory of hegemony is directly related with the conditions of the development of (socialist) class-conscious and revolution strategy of the working class. There was a gap between the social existence of the working class and socialist consciousness. Lenin argued that social consciousness was not an integral part of class being of the proletariat, but could be injected by the bourgeois intelligentsia from without. Lukacs stated that class consciousness could be counted as socialist only when it was apprehended as something historical, theoretical and total. Gramsci defined bourgeois domination over masses in the form of ideological hegemony which was established mainly outside the state. The development of socialist consciousness was possible only when ideological and cultural hegemony of bourgeoisie that develops within and through civil society was eliminated. These three Marxists in fact pointed out that socialist consciousness had to be first theoretical and ideological. What they all implicitly say is that class consciousness of the proletariat did not exist in the proletariat itself, but in Marx and Marxist intellectuals. In other words, consciousness of class was the Marxist theory itself. Thorstein Veblen

observed that Marx thought that the working class possessed the “ability to calculate advantages” independently from his degree of alienation (quoted in Ollman, 1976; 245). This observation is true, but only a part of truth about what Marx meant. He believed that the working class possessed such ability. But, if it is so, it should be answered why Marx emphasised so much the necessity of an organised and theoretical political struggle. Marx conceived the alienation phenomena both as a ground for the development of class conflict, and as a negative condition, a constraint before the real solutions of the real problems of man. Therefore, Marx was rather aware of the fact that alienation increased the social conflict and revolutionary energy of the working class, but this conflict and energy were meaningful for Marx only when they could be conceived in the form of capitalist-worker relation. Consciousness necessarily emerges. However, what form of consciousness does emerge? I hope that my exposition of Marx’s criticism of “crude communism” and his analyses of private property on the basis of alienated labour will clearly demonstrate that Marx always asks the question of *which* consciousness. In fact, the questions of *alien* and *self*-consciousness seems to be injected to communist and socialist literature by Marx. 1844 Manuscripts demonstrate that rich-poor dichotomy of the previous socialist discourse was transformed into capital-class dichotomy through Marx’s dialectical analyses of private property and alienated labour. The problem is always here and it will, I hope, be completely answered throughout the thesis.

Thorstein Veblen’s criticism, mentioned above, can also be met by giving historical conditions of Marxian theoretical development. Firstly, approximately two and a half decades after French revolution, that socialism was acknowledged by the masses as an only valid criticism of the existing social order and that the ideology and program of the proletariat became the uniting element of all lower classes of society against nobility, king and liberals (Hobsbawm, 1989; 394-5) demonstrate that economic formation of the working class historically leads into a class movement having its own

class programme. Question is not whether workers can create their unique class consciousness. But it is what kind of class consciousness it can be. Background ideas of these early workers socialism, although they are not formulated by workers themselves, were labelled by Marx as “crude communism” and still under the influence of private property. Secondly, the 1830 events in France, and the increasing worker mobilisation, which would culminate in 1848, are the concrete facts for Marx and others to think that economic generation of the working class goes hand by hand with the working class movement and the development of class consciousness. While industrialisation created the material conditions of the working class, revolutionary ideas, which stemmed from French revolution, gave to the working class an ability to envisage a new revolutionary change. Socialism from the outset has been as a product of “double revolution”, to use Hobsbawm’s phrase. Young Marx tries to integrate the German philosophy of consciousness into economic and political movement of the working class. In other words, finality of Young Marx is to meet Germany with double revolution that was occurring in France and Britain, to meet the criticism of consciousness with politics and industrialism.

Germany before 1848: Germany was a newly industrialising country in the 1830s. The newly emerging bourgeoisie was not capable of starting his political revolution unlike its British and French counterparts. The fear of nobility and bourgeois’ corresponding incapability towards the revolution was accompanied by an intellectual radicalism. Neither gradualism of England, nor the revolutionary transformation of the ancient regime as happened in France, but a search for the synthesis of them can be seen in the ideological confusions of the German political intellect. At the beginning of the 1840s, Marx would start his theoretical building in such confusion. Just as Hegel had an information about British political economy (Smith) and French revolution in the context of his philosophical problematic, Marx would begin in time to concern with the political economy and French revolutionary heritage (radical democracy, socialism and communism) in terms of his socialist interest. It

should be noted that in Germany of the mid 19.th century, political ideologies do not seem in crystallized forms, but as in the example of Hegel's political thoughts, in a confused form. Neither conservatives nor liberals acknowledge Hegel's ideas. He was a supporter of the ideas of French revolution and of the Prussian monarchy. The ideological confusion was also caused by the Restoration period and the domination of the Holy Alliance over European politics. But, more sound explanation can be founded out in an observation made by Eric Hobsbawm. He identifies the thinkers such as Rousseau and Hegel as the thinkers of intermediary ideas between the progressivism and anti- progressivism. Hobsbawm observed that their middle range theorising necessarily needed a dialectic thinking (1989; 458-68).

The other line of ideology was the Political Catholicism, which was anti-democratic and romantic. They resisted to any subordination to the state, and seemed to advocate the separation of state and Church and the freedoms of the expression, organisation and information flow. The church had to be recognised and secured publicly. They rejected state education. It was the field of the Church. In the Rhineland region, there emerged also a sort of liberal Catholicism among the bourgeoisie that sympathised the French revolutionary principles (McLellan, 1970; 9).

The liberalism in Germany was fed by the demands of the commercial bourgeoisie. The most outstanding figure in a more conservative manner was Dahlmann, who believed in a conservative and organic state in which the individual had to be responsible and a free member of the society rather than being an isolated one. These conservative liberals rejected the idea that sovereignty resides either in the state or in the people. The power of the state had to be constrained by a balance of powers and written constitution, while the individuals had both rights and duties. Their model was the English version of a constitutional monarchy. The liberal Hegelians were in such a political position. In the Rhineland region, these sorts of liberals tried to protect Napoleon's Code Civil and the principle of equality before the law

against the Prussian religious feudal absolutism. The other liberal line was under the influence of the principles of the 1789 French revolution. Rotteck, a Baden politician was the typical example of this sort of liberalism, which was influential in the Western states having a parliament. Nonetheless, even in these regions, a mixture of monarchy and a sovereignty parliament was the model to be advocated (McLellan, 1970; 10-1).

As we have stated above, Germany in the 1830s is a newly industrialised country. The industrial workers do not form the majority of the population and are not ideologically socialist and revolutionary. Hence, socialist ideas in the country were developed by radical intellectual elite. Nevertheless, they see the newly forming working class as a mediator, an instrument to renew the society. The socialist ideas were under the influence of French utopian socialism in this period. The first examples are the intellectuals such as Ludwig Gall, who introduced Fourierist ideas in Trier where Marx was born, Heine's poems and Gans's famous lectures in Berlin where Marx was a university student. But the first book written about socialism belongs to Moses Hess, (1812-75) a son of industrial bourgeois in Cologne; His *The Sacred History of Mankind* (1837) explains the communist ideas he learnt in his Paris journey. The book talked about the polarisation of classes and the possibility of a proletarian revolution. In addition, Wilhelm Weitling (1808-71) wrote his *Mankind as it is and as it ought to be* (published in Paris of 1838) in which he advocated the social justice and equality in education and happiness. But the most influential book was written by Lorenz von Stein, the *Socialism and Communism of Present-Day France*, which spread the socialist ideas. Finally, some left Hegelians in the early 1840s took up seriously the socialist ideas in the context of their conception of man as "species-being" (McLellan, 1970; 13-4).

Hegel: Kant at large, made the philosophical formulation of the French revolution by advocating human reason and rejecting religious dogmatism. But, human reason was limited to the phenomenal world that is different from

the world of the things in itself. The reason was confined to the experience and experimental laws. The autonomy of the individual's conscience is the base of his moral philosophy. After Kant, epistemology was the main problem for German idealism. Fichte suggested that there was a basic unity of *being* and that the creativity of human mind contained the objective world. Schelling thought that spirit issued from the nature and then penetrated to the nature in a way that spirit and the nature became the one. The search for a single principle to understand all being also implied a rejection of any principle of transcendence in favour of a regulative principle inherently operating in it. In addition, the development and change were the crucial ideas to understand the world. Moreover, any change occurred because of contradiction and opposition. It was Hegel who would systematise these dispersed ideas into a general system (McLellan, 1970; 16).

The Disintegration of Hegelianism and the Hegelian Left: It was Hegel's thought on religion and the state that took serious criticism from his disciples. He argued that human spirit manifested itself objectively in the institutions through which it attains to a complete liberty. The family, civil society and the state in turn educates man, organises the economic, professional and cultural life and finally reconciles the particular with the universal at the level of objective spirit. For him, neither man is naturally free nor does the state limit this sort of freedom. But only the state gives man a real freedom. He also rejects the suggestion of the abstract ideals that are necessarily time-bounded. The example of the state as the "reality of concrete liberty" was the Prussian state. Nevertheless, it is a controversial point whether and to what extent Hegel embeds conservatism and liberalism in his thoughts. He advocated the French revolution while he proposed reactionary, conservative ideas. Religion and philosophy was the perfect form of spiritual life and he clearly portrayed this religion as Protestant Christianity by which the Absolute Idea attains to itself. Thus, religion and philosophy have the same content while their methods of evaluation were different. The concepts in the later play the function of the imagination in the former. Solely religious knowledge

was imprecise and dispersed. A philosophy of religion, using the rationalist method of philosophy, could eliminate the imperfect religious knowledge which contained necessary dogmatic elements in the attainment to Absolute Spirit. In this sense, Hegel rejected the division between science and religion as thought by the eighteenth century rationalists. Rather, the religion meets a psychological need of man and helps him to obtain his own and the world's image to which he adapts himself (McLellan, 1970; 19-20).

At the outset, we can state that disintegration of Hegelianism was caused by the requirements of the revolutionary thought. The Hegelian Left, or the young Hegelians, was "the philosophical expression of the republican, bourgeois-democratic opposition which criticized the feudal order of the Prussian state and turned its eyes hopefully towards France" (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 83). For the political ideas of the young Hegelians, Hegelian philosophy has two limits in itself. Firstly, it had "anti-utopian" character. Hegel thought that his method could be applicable only to the past history (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 81). Dialectic was not applicable to the future. Secondly, Hegel's statement of "what is actual is rational did not help to distinguish rational and irrational, actual and illusory. Anti-utopianism precluded any attempt to shape the development of mankind, and together with the second aphorism, to make reality rational according to the "requirements of the spirit struggling to be free" (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 82).

Germany's backward political conditions, in comparison to France also raised the criticism of Hegelian philosophy and hence the development of the left-Hegelian criticism. Western provinces of Prussia had been directly influenced by the French revolution during the time of Napoleon's invasion. Re-annexation of these regions that were under the influence of French revolution in 1815 to Prussian rule increased protesting against Prussian monarchy. Finally, the example of the new political order in France, and critical attitudes against Prusso-Christian monarchy that rises mid 1830s

seems to create a concrete ground for the theoretical criticism of left Hegelians. The beginners were Heine, Gutzkow, and Börne (a group called *Junges Deutschland*) in the literary context. The latter and more radical group, covering theologians and young philosophers was concentrated in Berlin. Their doctor's club was composed of persons like Köppen, Rutenberg and Bruno Bauer (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 83)

August Cieszkowski and the philosophy of action: Bauer published a pamphlet in 1841, *The Trump of the Last Judgement upon Hegel, the Atheist and Anti-Christian. An Ultimatum*, written with the collaboration of Marx, in which it was denounced that Hegel's thought, was anti-Christian, anti-Church and anti-religious. The necessary result of Hegel's pantheism was radical atheism, which was uncovered by the young Hegelians. Hegel's relation to religion was in the context of the development of self-consciousness and his world-spirit was the search for only the development of human self-consciousness. Hegel had strictly criticised everything for simply its existence; he championed the power of reason and philosophy, he loved antiquity, and greeted the French revolution; Hegel also hated Germans, and disliked Latin. For him, self-consciousness was the reality rather than God (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 90).

Arnold Ruge, the radicalisation of the Hegelian Left: Before Ruge, the left Hegelian movement remained at large degree philosophical despite Cieszkowski's philosophy of action and Bauer's demission from his university post because of his critical attitudes against religious orthodoxy. The former involves action in the philosophical form; the latter was an individual affair. None of them was factually political matters in nature. On the other hand, Arnold Ruge helped the young Hegelianism to develop in the sense of a political movement. During 1838-41, the *Hallische Jahrbücher* as a philosophical journal of the left-Hegelians was published under the editorship of Ruge. At the beginning, the journal advocated "a Protestant constitutional monarchy" and celebrated the Prussian State as the distinctive phase of the

historical self-consciousness and, like Hegel, conceived their state as the embodiment of historical reason. Freedom according to historical reason could be achieved through gradual reforms. A sort of Protestantism, which was put forward, would organise the institutions in accordance with the precepts of reason. The process of democratic revolution in which feudal privileges (estates) were abolished influenced their ideas, public offices were opened to all segments of the society, and other liberties were established. They envisaged a rational state in conformity with the ideas of the Enlightenment. For their aims, Frederick the Great seemed as a suitable nominee for such a democratic transformation (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 92). But, the government did not demonstrate any interest in their proposals. The new king, Friedrich Wilhelm IV emerged as a representative of the old, feudal regime and measures against the young Hegelians were put into motion. Liberties and tolerance were curtailed. The *Hallische Jahrbücher* was to be published under the name of *Deutsche Jahrbücher* during 1841-43 by Arnold Ruge.

The contributors to the *Hallische Jahrbücher* no longer thought that the precepts of reason was the means of reconciliation with the empirical reality. There was an inevitable opposition between history and the norms of reason. The philosophical conclusion was to reject the Hegelian idea of “the self-fulfilment of history” (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 93). In the religious criticism, all forms of Christian theology were disapproved and atheism proclaimed. and on the political sphere, reformism was replaced with the ideas of revolution for the emancipation of humanity and Germany. Kolakowski states that with the exception of Moses Hess and Edgar Bauer, such political ideas were not the ideas of socialism. The interest was not the production and property relations, but limited merely to the transformation of the political structure. Nonetheless, the division between state and civil society was thought to be transcended into the future of society. This belief was contrary to Hegel, who saw the division as inevitable, as a necessary division between general and particular interests. On the other hand, Hegel just thought that

such a division and its resultant tension could be decreased through the agency of the bureaucratic apparatus that saw its own interest identical with that of the state. Moreover, the state had its own interest above the totality of individual interest. Kolakowski observes that Hegel's political thought represents "the ideology of the Prussian bureaucracy", which he thought as to represent also "the general good", which was similar to "the good of the state", and which did not depend on private interest, and did not stem from them. The interest and value an individual obtains already comes from his membership of the state, that is, from his position as a citizen. On the other hand, according to the republican and democratic ideas of the Hegelian left, equal and universal suffrage, freedom of thought and criticism, public involvement to the political life, and elected government would abolish the difference between general interest and private interests. Only with these ideas the political institutions could disappear as "alien forces" to individuals. In such a state, individuals were educated and elevated to the universal consciousness and the precepts of Reason that would annul the division between public and private interest. These arguments, says Kolakowski, followed the eighteenth century's ideas of republic, which believed that political freedom and public education were the cure for the social ills, without changing the material base of the society.

The disintegration of the Hegelian Left began after the suppression of the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* in 1843 and led into the division between abstract thought and politicisation ((Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 92-5).

Moses Hess, the philosophy of action, revolution and freedom: Moses Hess (1812-75) educated himself with the readings of Spinoza, Rousseau, and the socialist ideas he met in France. His Hegelian interest came after his acceptance of socialism. He forms his communist ideas from the synthesis of these intellectual sources. Hess played a critical role for the formation of Marx's idea of scientific socialism (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 108). *The Sacred History of Mankind*, his first book published in 1837, argued that a

social revolution would emerge because of the growing polarisation between wealth and misery. His other book, *The European Triarchy* was a Hegelian interpretation of communism by transforming Hegel's philosophy into a philosophy of action. Similar with the other Hegelian Left, he envisaged an alliance between French politics and German philosophical creativity. This alliance also would help German thought to have a material base rather than remaining only in the speculative sphere. Like Cieszkowski's philosophy of action, Hess divided historical development into three phases. In antiquity, spirit and nature were unconsciously united. Christianity represented the world of dichotomies. In the present phase, the unity was consciously being restored. This final phase owes its beginning to the philosophy of Spinoza, who saw the unity of the world, and the identity of reason and will. The conception of the *Absolute* in Spinoza reintroduced the unity of "being-in-itself" and "being-for-itself", in other words, the unity of subject and object. Hegel elevated this unity to a higher form in the form of understanding. But, Hegel confined himself to the past and could not succeed in making his philosophy a means for the creation of the future. This transition was the job of the Hegelian Left (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 108-9). The sacred history, the history of the spirit, would become the history itself. The idea of future was the real surpassing of Hegelianism (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 109-10).

The emphasis on the future was supported by the idea of historical necessity, which would materialise itself only through freedom in the real history. The realisation of this historical necessity would also sanctify the past as regards with the future that meant "the accomplishment of mankind's historical mission". Free spirit was born with the German Reformation and acquired perfection in German idealism. Then, it had to be connected to the freedom of action, which was born with the French revolution. If this connection was provided, all Europe would be regenerated, Christianity would be fulfilled, and there emerged a religion of love. If society was organised voluntarily from within, the tension between order and freedom would lessen. Nonetheless, Hess, echoing other left Hegelians, thought that communism could be

realised *first* with and through the transformation of minds. He argued that all sorts of slavery begun in the slavery of mind. In addition, the society of the future would not need any repressive measures to maintain itself since it was based on the voluntary cohesion and on the reconciliation of the individual and collective interest that were the product of self-consciousness (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 110).

Hess's communism echoed the utopian ideas circulating in France in that time. Socialist movement, it was thought, was the product of poverty and misery that led to a conflict between capitalist and worker. As a result, the social revolution would emerge because of the polarisation of wealth and misery, and of the disappearance of the middle strata. Kolakowski observes that the similarity he suggested between religious and economic alienation was the seed of Marx's definition of the commodity fetishism in the future. The more important for our purpose of study, is Hess' idea that the historical necessity would be realised thanks to the free and creative activity and his equalisation of self-consciousness with the historical process. Although in Hess, this idea was formulated in terms of the self-awareness of humanity at the philosophical base, it would reappear in Marx as an identity between class-consciousness and the historical process in relation to the privileged position of the proletariat. Hess and Marx also share the idea of the abolishment of philosophy through its realisation. The former suggested that "When German philosophy becomes practical it will cease to be philosophy" (quoted in Hess by Kolakowski). Hess and Marx met in the autumn of 1841. Together with Karl Grün, Herman Pütmann and Herman Kriege, he belonged to a movement called "true socialism" in Germany. Marx's collaboration with him continued later on, and Hess somehow became a follower of Marx although he did not share Marx's idea of the workers revolution and his conception of history. Both *The German Ideology* and *The Communist Manifesto* are labelling the *true socialists* as an example of *reactionary utopianism* (Kolakowski, 1978, vol. 1; 113-4).

Marx's conversion to Hegelianism: Marx's conversion to Hegel (from his romantic idealism, from Kant and Fichte through Schelling) is completed through his systematic reading of Hegel's works and his joining of a Hegelian discussion group (McLellan; 1970, 49). In the group, called *Doctors' Club*, Adolf Rutenberg, a geography teacher and journalist, Karl Friedrich Köppen, a history teacher and an expert of Buddhism, and the most significantly, Bruno Bauer, who was the theology lecturer at the university and was to be the closest friend of Marx for the next four years. Another member of the Club was Eduard Gans, a professor of Law at the university. He elaborated Hegelian ideas in the studies of history and law. He advocated an English sort of monarchy and sympathised with the 1830 revolution in France and the Saint-Simonists as well (McLellan; 1970, 50). In 1836, Gans wrote a book, which would introduce the ideas of the Saint-Simonists. Therein, ideas about the bipolar class struggle in history were put forward, some observations about the existing condition of the proletariat were made, and the more significantly, foresights about the future class struggle that would occur between the proletariat and the middle classes, and that would result into the free co-operation and socialisation, were mentioned. But, these ideas had little influence over Marx for this time period (McLellan; 1970, 51). His main interest was philosophy and he took some notes about Hegel, Aristotle, Spinoza, Leibniz, Hume and Kant. In this time, Marx tried to obtain a university post and for this purpose, he designed a doctoral thesis, which he begun at the end of 1838 and submitted in the April of 1841. In the preliminary study of the thesis, there were notes about the Epicurean philosophy, relation between Epicureanism and Stoicism, the notion of sage in Greek philosophy and Plato's and Socrates' thoughts on religion, finally the condition of the philosophy after Hegel (McLellan; 1970, 52-3).

Transformative Role of Philosophy, Democritus versus Epicurus: revolutionary interpretation of Hegelian philosophy is typical for Marx, like other left Hegelians:

if a philosopher has accommodated himself, his disciples have to explain from his inner essential consciousness what for him had the form of an esoteric consciousness...It is not that the particular consciousness of the philosopher is suspect; rather, his essential form of consciousness is constructed, raised to a particular form of meaning, and at the same time superseded". It is this esoteric message of Hegel that is so interpreted that, for instance Bruno Bauer argued that real ideas of Hegel was "atheism, republicanism and revolution (quoted in McLellan, 1970; 64).

The Rheinische Zeitung: the Leading Article of the Kölnische Zeitung was a polemic against conservative *Kölnische Zeitung*. Marx's arguments did base on the principle of secularity and rationality in the constitution of the state. The state of the rationally free individuals could not be based on Christianity. The state had to be a realisation of reasonable liberties. Thinkers such as Machiavelli, Campanella, Hobbes, Spinoza, Grotius, Rousseau, Fichte and Hegel secularised the idea of the state and deduced "its natural laws from reason and experience and not from theology". They did what Copernicus did for the universe. Marx, following these philosophers, proclaimed that "the supreme civic quality was political virtue and not religious virtue" (SW; 24). Moreover, Prussia owed its civil code to the ideas of the French revolution and to the thinkers such as Voltaire, Rousseau, Condorcet, Mirabeau, and Montesquieu. According to Marx, modern philosophy saw the state "as the great organism in which juridical, moral, and political liberties must be realised and in which each citizen, by obeying the laws of the state, only obeys the natural laws of his own reason, human reason" (SW; 25).

The Law on the fts of Wood is the first writing of Marx, which conceives the relation between the system of private property and the legal structure of the state. Marx put his claims on the interest of the poor masses having no social and political power. The debate of the time is the theft of timber, and the Rhenish parliament and the government took many measures against the gatherers of the dead woods, which were available to the people before. Marx claims that "customary right by its nature can only be the right of the lowest and elementary mass of propertyless people" (SW; 26). The law is

already based on customary rights. But whereas the customary rights of the privileged are advocated, those of the poor are seen as out- of- law. Estates assembly are motivated by its particular interest. But the customary rights of the aristocrats contradict with the general law because they are based on lawlessness. Customary rights of the poor, which are seen now as being against the law, are as old as the history itself. Marx relates the subject to the political question: “We repeat once again that our estates have fulfilled their position as estates... The Rhinelander would have to triumph in them over the representative and the man over the owner of the woods” (SW; 27). Here we see that Marx was first concerned with the social problems in political and legal terms. Although he does not use any class language, he is seen to be rather aware of the difference between the interest base of the feudal estates and law and the political forms of liberal objectives of the newly emerging industrialists. Law, politics and economics first come together in Marx’s mind. In addition, the question of the liberal revolution is explicitly debated with direct references to the condition of poor masses.

In the article *On the Estates Committees in Prussia* Marx offers his conception of (political) representation in the context of the demands for people representation in that time. Marx states that “only the material, spiritless, dependent, insecure need representation; but no element in the state should be material, spiritless, dependent, insecure”. Particular interest alienate from “the political spirit of the state”. Action of the state must be people’s self-representation. The state “distinguishes itself by the universality of its content from the other manifestations of its political life. “In true state there is no landed property, no industry, no material stuff that can, as such elements, strike a bargain with the state” (SW; 29). Marx sees the representation as only the representation of particular interests, which constrain the state and its universality. There must be a sharp division between particular and universal and the state must be already universal. Thus, representation must be the self-representation of the people in the state form. Man must be the state itself. Therefore, there is no need to

representation. Nonetheless, Marx distinguishes the state from political life. Echoing Rousseau, it is sure here through the mediation of Hegelian language, the state is wanted to be seen as the embodiments of the general will, which can not be represented, because it can not be alienated and divided from men.

Marx as a radical revolutionary democrat: Real foundadtions of the state: The manuscripts on *Critique of the Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (Marx, 1997b) were written in 1843 and were left unpublished; but an introduction to it appeared in 1844 issue of *the French-German Yearbooks*. The book in fact meant personal introductory to *the Contribution to the Critique of the Hegel's Philosophy of Right: an Introduction*. The book criticises the state conception which Hegel developed within the general framework of ethical life that has three moments such as the family, the civil society and the state in his book. In his critique, Marx seemed to be a radical revolutionary democrat in the form of French revolutionary politics. He advocates popular sovereignty and rejects the *ancient regime* (Marx, 1997b, 44-8, 54). But, the most significant points are these:

1. Marx's argumentation is that Hegel's political philosophy is incompatible both with his methodology and with the concrete reality of state and the society in the time;
2. the state cannot represent the universal or the general interests of the society;
3. Hegel confused the subject with the predicate, but) Hegel's *ideas* and its objective moments can be *rationally* transformed, translated or reduced into the language of social reality. This is Marx's first systematic attempt to turn round Hegel's ideas and is expressed by Marx explicitly throughout the manuscripts (Marx, 1997b, 15-7, 20-1, 25, 27-9, 54, 59-60, 95 and 127- here Marx says that Hegel changes everything to its inverse, 146,

and in 154 he claims that “Hegel always falls in to the crude materialism from his politic spiritualism”;

4. Hegel’s philosophy of right is not critical but a rationalisation of the empirical reality (Marx, 1997b, 56). His logic does not explain the state but the state serves to define the logic. Hegel demonstrates the thing of the logic rather than the logic of the thing (Marx, 1997b, 29, 73, 133);
5. Marx is a democrat, humanist and an atheist (as in his previous ages). Hegel moves from the state and sees the man as a subjectification of the state; but democracy moves from the man and sees the state as an objectification of man just as he creates the religion rather than the religion creates the man. It is democracy that unites the particular and the universal (Marx, 1997b, 46-7);
6. Marx reduced the state power to its real foundation that is civil society and decentralised the state from its Hegelian status. For Marx, an analysis must begin from the civil society (*bürgerliche Gesellschaft*). He holds that Hegel himself was obliged to show that the state was not confidential and dependent reality against something different in contrast to his idea that the (political) state constitutes the highest reality of social life (objective or ethical life) in and for itself . However, It is not the real existence of civil society, but its existence underlies another sphere. The political state secures itself thanks to other spheres outside of itself. It does not have the power to realise itself, but it is an impotence that needs a foundation on which it will base. It obtains its power from its foundation. But at the same time, it must become the general foundation of its security (Marx, 1997b, 167-8).
7. Hegel rejects the democratic ideas.

Two kinds of revolution: The articles *On the Jewish Question* and *Introduction to the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* appeared in the German-French Yearbooks in 1844. They represent turning points in the evolution of Marx's thought. The former at the first time makes a division between the bourgeois political revolution and the general human emancipation. The *egoist* man of the civil society, whose good example is Jewish, is compared with the political man as described by Rousseau in *the Social Contract*. Marx approaches the question following the context developed in his 1843 manuscripts of *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* where he saw the split between the civil society and the political state as an historical result of the dissolution of the organic unity of the medieval society in which the civil society was politically organised. Throughout the modern period, the old civil society is de-politicised in favour of the emergence of the modern political state. This also means a split of the social and individual lives into two spheres such as the civil-particular and the political-universal. The membership of man to the society is differentiated from his membership to the political state. A perfect completion of this process is the French political revolution which deprives the old civil society of its political functions. Similarly, the separation of the religion from its state function is accompanied with the separation of state from religion. In this sense, Marx implies a sort of secularism in the sense that the state becomes completely indifferent to religion and religion changes into a complete individual affair.

On the Jewish Question deals with a sort of consciousness, *religion* and two sorts of subjectivity of man, *civic* and *political* man. In addition, he differentiates two kinds of revolution; political (partial) and radical (social). A political revolution is the revolution of the bourgeois-civil society and emancipates it from feudalism, whereas, as Marx suggested in the latter article (*Introduction to the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*) a radical revolution emancipates all segments of the society, that is, a popular one.

In the *Introduction to the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, Marx proclaims the end of religious criticism in Germany. The article completes the idea developed in *On the Jewish Question* that criticism must be levelled to "the human world, the state, society", which all "produce religion which is an *inverted world consciousness*, because they are an *inverted world*" (EW, 43). Here, for the first time, we see the proletariat as a revolutionary and emancipator class, which is located within the civil society although it is not a class of it.

Now I shall give a critical presentation of the articles mentioned above, which have to be read together in terms of the clear expression of Marx as a proletarian revolutionary. In addition I will show that even the Marx of the years of 1843 and 1844 is not an advocate of the bourgeois civil society in favour of either revolutionary democracy (in the sense of Jacobinism), nor any kind of liberal democracy. From his very beginning, Marx is neither a democrat in its narrow and simple senses, nor a civil societal oriented advocate of the social revolution. But, we see that in this period human emancipation is not yet formulated in terms of the socialist or communist transformation of the bourgeois-civil society and the political state. Also, it is seen that, although the characteristic of the civil society is identified with the particularising sphere of the atomistic and egoist man, that is opposed with the universality of political sphere, civil society is not formulated as the politico-economic sphere of capitalism. Nonetheless, even the so-called young Marx (as described as an amalgam of idealism, humanism, democracy, civil-socialism, *etceteras*) does not fail to see the differences between political revolution, which emancipates the civil society and establishes the equality of the men before law and the general human emancipation, which would abolish the division between the political state and the civil society, hence, between the civic man and the political man. This programme is first explained in *On the Jewish Question* and later supported by a practical weapon, the *proletariat* in the *Introduction to the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*.

The inadequacy of political emancipation is demonstrated through an examination of human rights, or civil rights presented by the French and American revolutions. Marx criticises French revolutionaries of 1793 in this context:

The matter becomes still more incomprehensible when we observe that the political liberators reduce citizenship, the *political community*, to a mere *means* of for preserving these so-called rights of man; and consequently, that the citizen is declared to be the servant of egoistic 'man', that the sphere in which man functions as a species-being is degraded to a level below the sphere where he functions as a partial being, and finally that it is man as a bourgeois and not man as a citizen who is considered the *true* and *authentic* man (EW, 26).

We should note that this result is not an unwanted result of the political theory of the revolution. It is true that the practice contradicts with the theory; but, Marx says, "practice is only the exception, while theory is the rule". This sort of revolution immediately turns against its aims and begins to violate the rights it offered. Marx asks, "why it is that in the minds of political liberators the relation is inverted, so that the end appears as the means and the means as the end?" He solves this "optical illusion of their consciousness" (EW, 27) as such:

Political emancipation is at the same time the dissolution of the old society (EW, 27),
Political revolution is a revolution of civil society,
Political revolution ... made state affairs the affairs of the people,
Political revolution ... *abolished* the *political character of civil society*,
It dissolved civil society into its basic elements, on the other hand, *individuals*, and the on the other hand the *material and cultural elements* which formed the life experience and the civil situation of these individuals (EW, 28).

For this reason, the problem is solved by Marx by demonstrating the companion processes as such: "the consummation of the idealism of the state was at the same time the consummation of the materialism of civil society". "The political emancipation was at the same time an emancipation

of civil society from politics and from even the *semblance* of a general content” (EW, 29).

If so, political revolution reveals the egoist man from its feudal context and makes him its own foundation. This “egoist man” is the “presupposition of the *political state*” and he is “recognized as such in the rights of an” (EW, 29). In this sense, for instance,

man was not liberated from religion; he received religious liberty. He was not liberated from property; he received the liberty to own property. He was not liberated from the egoism of business; he received the liberty to engage in business (EW, 29).

The *egoistic* man is the *passive, given* result of the dissolution of society”. and the political revolution has not radical and critical attitude towards this man. It “dissolves civil society into its elements without *revolution ising* these elements themselves or subjecting them to criticism”. It affirms the civil society “as the *basis of its own existence*”, “as its *natural basis*”. Accordingly, member of the civil society is recognized as “*authentic man*”. On the other hand, “*political* man is only abstract, artificial man, man as an *allegorical, moral* person”. Ironically, “man as he really is, is seen only in the form of *egoistic* man, and man in his *true* nature only in the form of the *abstract citizen*” (EW, 30).

Political emancipation (revolution) divides man’s life into civil and political spheres. It puts the citizen against his individual egoism. He concludes by going beyond Rousseau’s notion of *abstract* “political man”:

Human emancipation will only be complete when the real, individual man has absorbed into himself the abstract citizen; when as an individual man, in his everyday life, in his work, and in his relationships, he has become a *species-being*; and when he has recognized and organised his own powers (*forces propres*) as *social* powers so that he no longer separates this social power from himself as *political power* (EW, 31).

Marx separates individual man from species-being; and social power from political power; everyday life from the political life in a similar way Rousseau did. But, such emancipation is not suggested as a function of any liberator, law-giver or legislator, but as a task before all human beings. In addition, the problem is no longer to achieve a compromise between the notions of equality and freedom; rather human emancipation. But from what humanity or society emancipates itself?

The answer is given Marx at the second part of the article. Let us begin from the last sentence:

The *social* emancipation of the Jew is the *emancipation of society from Judaism* (EW, 40).

But we should note that Marx throughout the work often uses the term “*Judaism*” in a metaphorical sense. The empirical content of Judaism forms the consciousness of Jewish religion. What should be abolished is not but, this empirical content (EW, 40).

The Jew, who occupies a distinctive place in civil society, only manifests in a distinctive way the Judaism of civil society
civil society ceaselessly engenders the Jew
the basis of the Jewish religion? Practical need, egoism (EW, 36).
Practical need, egoism, is the principle of civil society
The god of practical need and self-interest is money
Money is the jealous god of Israel, beside which no other god may exist. Money abases all the gods of mankind and changes them into commodities. Money is the universal and self-sufficient *value* of all things. It has, therefore, deprived the whole world, both the human world and nature, of their own proper value. Money is the alienated essence of man’s work and existence; this essence dominates him and he worships it
The god of the Jews has been secularised and has become the god of this world. The bill of exchange is the real god of the Jew (EW, 37).

Introduction to the Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right: Marx is still in the sphere of political break although he differentiated political revolutions from the question of the general human emancipation in

On the Jewish Question. He says that “In politics, the Germans have *thought* what other nations have *done*” (EW, 51). But this is consistent with that he already saw the French’s *practical* “break” only in terms of political revolution rather than any social revolution. But the question is still this sort of practical break for Germany:

can Germany attain a practical activity *a la hauteur des principes*; that is to say, a revolution which will raise it not only to the *official level* of the modern nations, but to the *human level* which will be immediate future of those nations (EW, 52).

Revolution here implies not only achievement of the modern political level but also a jumping over the modern situation in terms of human level. So, something more than political revolution is suggested for a politically backward nation such as Germany of the time.

Theory must prove itself in the face of man’s needs if it is to be the theory of a radical revolution. This possibility is existed in Germany at least in terms of the criticism of religion, which

ends with the doctrine that *man is the supreme being for man*”, and, ends with the *categorical imperative to overthrow all those conditions* in which man is an abased, enslaved, abandoned, compatible being (EW, 52).

Nonetheless, a radical German revolution has a difficulty since, Marx says,

revolutions need a passive element, a material basis. Theory is only realized in a people so far as it fulfils the needs of the people (EW, 53).

Will theoretical needs be directly practical needs? It is not enough that thought should seek to realise itself; reality must also strive towards thought.

A radical revolution can only be a revolution of radical needs, for which the conditions and breeding ground appear to be lacking (EW, 54).

But in Germany, because of an anachronism of political situation in comparison to the advanced nations, and inequality between the level of theoretical mind and political practice, the former transcends the latter; Marx concludes that

one fine day Germany will find itself at the level of the European decadence, before ever having attained the level of European emancipation (EW, 54).

Marx thinks that Germany cannot go fast enough to join modern European level but can pass over it. For this, Germany must catch to the decadence of the modern nations. We know that here Marx use a sort of logic by seeing an energy stemming from unequal development of theory and practice. A “partial, *merely* political revolution” “leaves the pillars of the building standing”. On the other hand, “radical revolution, *universal human* emancipation” is “a Utopian dream for Germany” (EW, 55). In the former case,

a section of civil society emancipates itself and attains universal domination; a determinate class undertakes, from its *particular situation*, a general emancipation of society. This class emancipates society as a whole, but only on condition that the whole of society is in the same situation as this class; for example, that it possesses or can easily acquire money or culture (EW, 55).

Marx argues that such a partial or political emancipation is impossible in Germany since there none of the classes can be the “negative representative of society”, and none of the classes identifies itself with “the popular mind” (EW, 56). Even German middle class shares the “consciousness of being the representative of the narrow and limited mediocrity of all the other classes” (EW, 56-7). Each segment of the civil society

erects its own barrier before having destroyed the barrier which opposes it”; “each class, at the very moment when it begins its struggle against the class above it, remains involved in a struggle against the class beneath (EW, 57).

That none of the classes are so powerful that it claims its own power and that class power cannot be concentrated in a certain direction, characteristics class conflict does not lead to social or political emancipation:

the princes are in conflict with the monarch, the bureaucracy with the nobility, bourgeoisie with all of them, while the proletariat is already beginning its struggle with the bourgeoisie. The middle class hardly dares to conceive the idea of emancipation from its point of view before the development of social conditions, and the progress of political theory, show that this point of view is already antiquated, or at least disputable (EW, 57).

The level of political theory and development of the social conditions outmodes even newly emerging idea of emancipation of the middle class. German bourgeoisie is seen as being not capable of emancipating society for its own purposes even in context of political revolution. As we understand from the statement above, it is obliged to fight at every front of class conflict and cannot make alliance with any other class. Here Marx compares French revolutionary tradition with the German situation:

In France it is enough to be something in order to desire to be everything. In Germany no one has the right to be anything without first renouncing everything. In France partial emancipation is a basis for complete emancipation. In Germany complete emancipation is a *conditio sine qua non* for any partial emancipation.

“In France every class of the population is *politically idealistic* and considers itself first of all, not as a particular class, but as the representative of the general needs of society. The role of liberator can, therefore, pass successively in a dramatic movement to different classes in the population, until it finally reaches the class which achieves social freedom (EW, 57).

Here Marx implicitly mentions the progressive development of the French revolution, which swings between revolutions and counter-revolutions and refers to the role of different classes in the revolutionary process. Different sections of the bourgeoisie, peasantry and urban working classes can come together in different combinations of weight against nobility, church and monarchy. But in Germany, every class fights another and none of them

concentrates enough power. Another difficulty of partial revolution in Germany is that:

practical life is as little intellectual as intellectual life is practical, no class of civil society feels the need for, or the ability to achieve, a general emancipation, until it is forced to it by its *immediate* situation, by *material* necessity and by its *fetters themselves* (EW, 58).

Marx asks where “a *real* possibility of emancipation in Germany” is and answers in such a way: let us order each sentence in the paragraph;

A class must be formed which has *radical chains*,
a class in civil society which is not a class of civil society,
a class which is the dissolution of all classes,
a sphere of society which has a universal character because its sufferings are universal, and
which does not claim a *particular redress* because the wrong which is done to it is not a *particular wrong* but *wrong in general*.
There must be formed a sphere of society which claims no *traditional* status but only a human status,
a sphere which is not opposed to particular consequences but is totally opposed to the assumptions of the German political system;
a sphere, finally, which cannot emancipate itself without emancipating itself from all the other spheres of society, without, therefore, emancipating all these other spheres,
which is, in short, a *total loss* of humanity and
which can only redeem itself by a *total redemption of humanity*.
This dissolution of society, as a particular class, is the *proletariat* (EW, 58).

It is striking fact that proletariat Marx suggests here is “only beginning to form itself in Germany, as a result of the industrial movement”. But the dynamics which begin to produce this class is emerging there. The proletariat issues from “poverty *artificially produced*” and from “the *disintegration* of society” and “above all from the disintegration of the middle class”. And “natural poverty” and “Christian-Germanic serfdom” increase the numbers of the proletariat (EW, 58). The proletariat was the dissolution of the German past.

When the proletariat announces the *dissolution of the existing social order*, it only declares the *secret of its own existence*, for it is the *effective* dissolution of this order (EW, 58-9).

Even before its complete development, it seems that this is even not necessary; the proletariat is given a liberating function that implies simultaneous emancipation from both *modern* future of Germany and its pre-modern conditions. It is no longer a partial or political emancipation that is meaningful for Germany.

Germany will not be able to emancipate itself from the *Middle Ages* unless it emancipates itself at the same time from the *partial* victories over the Middle Ages. In Germany *no* type of enslavement can be abolished unless *all* enslavement is destroyed (EW, 59).

This is what is that the theorists of the twentieth century could call as *double* revolutionary function, a *hegemonic* one that involves an alien role. The question, if we use the language of the *On the Jewish Question*, is not the political revolution of any class in the civil society, but the emancipation of man. The role of Germany is so crucial that it “which likes to get to the bottom of things, can only make a revolution which upsets *the whole order* of things”. “The *emancipation of Germany* will be an *emancipation of man*” (EW, 59). It seems that this role is revealed from a comparative historical logic. In the advanced countries of Europe, the proletariat was the ally of the middle class, but in Germany it was “the mass resulting from the *disintegration* of society above all from the disintegration of the middle class” (EW, 58). In addition, the question of emancipation in Germany was formulated in terms of man in general not only in terms of political man. Furthermore, Marx reminds the left-Hegelian debate about the “realization of philosophy” and connects this philosophical debate to the proletariat.

The *emancipation of Germany* will be an *emancipation of man*. *Philosophy* is the *head* of this emancipation and the *proletariat* is its *heart*. Philosophy can only be realized by the abolishing of the proletariat, and the proletariat can only be abolished by the realization of philosophy (EW, 59).

The alliance between philosophy and the proletariat is formulated as an alliance of the material and intellectual weapons:

Just as philosophy finds its *material* weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its *intellectual* weapons in philosophy and once the lightning of thought has penetrated deeply into this virgin soil of the people, the *Germans* will emancipate themselves and become *men*" (EW, 59).

The suggestion of such a union of an intellectual weapon and a practical force may not seem to be a significant discovery to the contemporary revolutionaries. But, this suggested unification of theory and social force in the form of head-heart union (not head and body) was completely new in the sense that before Marx and other left Hegelians of 1830s and 1840s, any theory of philosophy had not deliberately attributed in advance to this sort of emancipator role for man in general. In the case of French revolution, Eric J. Hobsbawm observes that "French revolution, in the contemporary meaning of the concept, was not a revolution that is made or led neither by the particular party or movement nor of any men that tried to carry out a systematic programme" (Hobsbawm, 1989; 110-11).

Political Economy of Revolution and Alienation in 1844 Manuscripts: As for the coercive alternative, Marx says: "In the end, large landed property which has been kept in existence by force and has created alongside itself a formidable industry, leads more rapidly to crisis than does the division of landed property alongside which the power of industry remains in second place" (EW, 118).

Marx has explained that when the rule of the competition penetrates into the land and hence transforms the class relations in it, "the agricultural workers are ... reduced to the minimum level of subsistence" (EW, 118). But he is in a hurry to conclude that

Ultimately, the wages which have already been reduced to a minimum must be further reduced, in the face of new competition; that leads necessarily to revolution (EW, 119).

Why does the reduction of the wages lead necessarily to revolution? We are not well informed.

Marx states that “the whole revolutionary movement” founded its empirical and theoretical basis upon “the development of *private property*, and more precisely of the economic system”. This can be understood since this basis is “the material and sensuous expression of *alienated human life*”. The movement of private property manifests all previous movements of the realisation of man. It conserved “all previous production” in a wide sense:

Two kinds of Revolution Reconsidered: Critical Remarks on the Article: ‘The King of Prussia and Social Reform’: Marx wrote his economic and philosophical manuscripts in the summer 1844 and 1844 summer witness a striking event in Silesia region in Germany. The thousands of weavers in the textile industry broke the machinery that is thought to be depriving many of their work and of existing living conditions. The article *Critical Remarks on the Article: ‘The King of Prussia and Social Reform’* is a polemic, published in the *German-French Yearbooks*, in the context of Silesian events, against Arnold Ruge, who thought that in Germany social revolution can not be developed because of the insufficient political consciousness, that is the beginning of any social revolution. Marx, on the other hand, argued that political consciousness could not lead into a revolution, which would be social and anti-statist in character. Marx’s argument was based on the ideas he had developed in the works we have just exposed. Marx makes the divisions between the state and civil society as in the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, and between social and political revolution as on the Jewish Question; although therein, the former appeared in the for of social emancipation. In addition, the *manuscripts*, wrote in the same period with the article, helps Marx to incorporate the conception of alienation to the revolutionary problem

of the workers. As made before, political revolution was exemplified in the model of French revolution and social revolution now is named as the socialist revolution on the part of the workers in the name of all humanity.

Political revolution contains in itself all constraints of the political will and intelligence. The classical expression of the political intelligence, on the other hand, knows the limits of politics. This awareness is seen in the French revolution that saw the “the social defects” as “the source of political misfortune”. Robespierre recognised that social polarisation of wealth is the limit for a real democracy. But, some like Ruge does not see this fact.

For Marx, “all revolts without exception break out in the wretched isolation of man from his common essence”. This essence covers whole life for the workers while for the bourgeoisie it implies mainly a political one. The standpoint of the latter is the state, and their isolations are the isolation from “the top position in the state”. However, “the common essence from which the worker is isolated is a common essence of quite a different reality and compass from the political collectivity. This collectivity from which his own work separates him is life itself, physical and intellectual life, human morality, human activity, human enjoyment, human essence”, which is the true collectivity of man. This isolation is more universal, more unbearable and more contradictory in relation to a political collectivity. Abolition of this isolation is more comprehensive than that of the political one just as the man is more than being a citizen.

Hence, the question of whether social or political revolution is meaningless for Marx. A social revolution destroys “the old society”. A political revolution destroys “the old power”. It should be noted that Marx does not say old political power, but instead, only, “old power”. This is because he thinks that:

revolution in general- the overthrow of the existing power and dissolution of previous relationships- is a political act. Socialism cannot be realised without a revolution. But, when its organising activity

begins, when its peculiar aims, its soul, come forward, then socialism casts aside its political cloak.

Arnold Ruge's last sentence, to the degree that Marx offers us, is that: "A social revolution without a political soul (i.e. with an organising intelligence operating from the standpoint of the whole) is impossible". This sentence is met by Marx who, saying that "A social revolution, even though it be limited to a single industrial district, involves from the standpoint of the whole, because it is a human protest against a dehumanised life, because it starts from the standpoint of the single, real individual, because the collectivity against whose separation from himself he reacts is the true collectivity of man, the human essence". Ruge does not "raise himself above the narrow political standpoint" (SW; 133-7).

Historical Materialism of Revolution: The *German Ideology* is Marx and Engels' collective book which proclaimed "the premises of the materialist conception of history", in other words, *first formulas* for the general theory of "the historical materialism". The book was the last attack towards German idealism and young Hegelians. And it was the first concise explanation of the material and historical foundations of communist revolution and society. For this reason, it can be counted as the passage from young Marx to mature Marx rather than "epistemological rupture" for Marx. May be a terminological rupture can be observed from now on in Marx.

This "**alienation**" could be abolished only when two "**practical conditions**" had been already realised. This meant that the alienation had to have become a force against which a revolution was realised and "unbearable force". For this, the alienation had to have turned the masses of the men to propertyless mass completely and to a mass which was in a contradiction with the existing world of cultural and richness. These conditions presupposed "the higher stage of the development of the productive forces" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 63). This was "a practical precondition which have to be realised previously" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 64). (Meanwhile, I must

take attention to the fact that Marx and Engels expressed these preconditions for communist society, rather than communist revolution and socialist revolution before that). Otherwise, “scarcity” emerged as “a general condition” and a “civil war” followed it. The old bad affairs would be necessarily reproduced. Marx and Engels thought that “universal relations” could be established only with this “universal development of the productive forces”. This development created “simultaneously” the same propertyless masses in all countries. Each of the countries became dependent on the developments of the each of them. In addition, since this development replaced “the individuals who lived locally” with “the men who live the world history”, it was a “sine qua non practical precondition”. When this precondition was not met, “communism” could be only a “local phenomena”, “the forces of the human relations” could not be developed as “universal” forces, as “unbearable forces”, and lastly the diffusion of each changes abolished “local communism”. Marx and Engels claimed that “Communism is possible empirically only with ‘sudden’ and ‘simultaneously’ emerged movement of the sovereign, and this presupposes again the universal development of the productive force and world wide changes which are closely linked to communism” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 64). Here Marx and Engels predicted an equal development of the productive forces through the countries. In addition, they saw as a precondition of the communism previously established sovereignty of the peoples. Sovereign peoples, having an adequate level of development of the productive force, could form communism.

Marx and Engels pointed to the universal development of the productive forces, the proletariat and hence *communism* rather than *communist revolution* or a revolution with any name to lead into *communism*. Despite this, the editorial board of the *German Ideology* stated in the note 17 in the book that “proletarian revolution” as predicted by Marx and Engels was “valid” for the “pre-monopoly capitalism” and Lenin pointed to the unequal

and non-spontaneous development of the proletarian revolutions (see explanation of the note, Marx and Engels, 1987, 133-4).

Marx and Engels said that “the conception of history we have developed” offered these conclusions as such: **1)** in a certain stage of development of the productive forces, there emerges “productive forces and means of circulation” which are no longer “productive” but “destructive forces” (such as mechanisation and monetisation) in terms of “the existing relations”; as a result, there emerges “a class which has carried all burden of society without benefiting from its fruits”, “has been excluded from society”, and “is necessarily standing in the most clearest oppositional condition to all other classes”. This class covers “the majority” of the members of society. Marx and Engels continued to say: “this consciousness which is the consciousness of the necessity for a radical revolution, a communist consciousness, and surely can emerge within the other classes as well when they themselves demonstrates the condition of this class, springs up from the inside of this class” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 69). Marx and Engels had described “communist revolution” as “the abolishment of the existing condition” and “the abolishment of the private property” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 67). Here “communist consciousness” is presented similarly “the consciousness of the necessity for a radical revolution. **2)** “Some” conditions to benefit from “certain” productive forces are also “the conditions of the domination of a certain class of society”. The “social power” of this class which came from what it owned “finds its practical manifestation regularly in the type of the state peculiar to each era idealistically”. For this reason, “every revolutionary struggle” is levelled to “the class which has been sovereign up to then”. **3)** In all revolutions hitherto “the form of action” was the same and it pointed to “a new redistribution of work among the other persons”. However, “communist revolution” is levelled to “the form of action” of the past (Marx and Engels, 1987, 69). This revolution “abolishes the work” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 69-70). It “abolishes the domination of all classes with the classes themselves”. This “revolution is realised by a class which is no longer considered as a

class in the society, no longer recognised as a class in the society and a manifestation even from now on of the disappearance of all classes, all nationalities, etc, in the existing society". 4) "The creation of this communist consciousness within the masses" required "the massive transformation of the men". And this kind of transformation could be realised only "through an action in practice", "a revolution". This revolution was not only "rendered inevitable" as the only way of "overthrowing the dominant class", but also as the only way for "the class who overthrew the other" to clear the old dirty remnants and to erect "new foundations" for society (Marx and Engels, 1987, 70).

Marx and Engels saw revolution not only the precondition for a new society. Revolution was also "driving force of the religion, philosophy and other theories". The driving force was not "criticism". Degree of power of the periodically emerging revolutionary up and downs was determined by "the living conditions" the generations founded ready. A complete up and down required on the one side "material productive forces" and on the other side, "a revolutionary mass" which did revolution not only against "the special conditions of old society" but also against "the production of life" of the past itself, " 'all totality of activities' which is the foundation of this production" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 72). Here Marx and Engels have made a differentiation for the degrees of the revolutionary change. There may be revolutions from complete up and down to the ones which changed only the particular conditions of the past society. But a complete up and down required the revolutionary masses, rather than the existence of revolutionary agents only.

Marx and Engels have concerned with communist or revolutionary consciousness above. Now let me present what they suggested for "the dominant class" and "dominant consciousness". They said that: "The ideas of the dominant class are the dominant ideas as well in all eras, in other words, the class who is the dominant material force of society is also the dominant

moral force". The class who owns "the material productive forces" also owns "the mental productive forces". "Dominant ideas are nothing but the intellectual manifestation of the dominant material relations; dominant ideas are material, dominant relations which are conceived in the form of thoughts" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 79). They are "the manifestations of the relations which make a class the dominant class" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 79-80). These ideas are "the thoughts of its domination". The individuals within this class who has domination as "the producers of the thought" regulated the "production and distribution of the ideas of their own age"; "their ideas are the dominant ideas of their age". Within the dominant class, "a section" put forwarded itself "as the thinkers of the class", "the theoretical ideologues who make the formation of the hallucination of the class about itself as its main way of earning life". The other section had a "passive and adoptive" in the face of these "thoughts and hallucinations" since they had not so much time for this thoughts about themselves. Marx and Engels said that this division of labour within the class, which manifested itself in "the division of mental and physical labour", might lead into a conflict among themselves. But if the class as a whole was under attack, the contradiction among them disappeared (Marx and Engels, 1987, 80). It was also seen that the wrong idea that these ideas could have "a distinctive power" without the power of this class disappeared. Marx and Engels added that "the existence of the revolutionary ideas presumes the existence of the revolutionary class in advance" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 81).

Every dominant class had to present "its own interest as the common interest of all members of the society" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 81). It had to give a "universal form" to its interests and present these interests as "the only valid thoughts" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 81-2). For this very reason, "the revolutionary class presents itself as the representative of all society rather than as a class". At the beginning, "its interest is really still closely linked to the common interests of all other classes who are not dominant". Its interest did not develop completely under the pressure of old society into "the special

interest of a special class". For this reason, a victory for this class was also beneficial for the many members of the other classes as long as it supported their mobilisation towards the position of the dominant class. For example, Marx and Engels said that that when the bourgeoisie overthrew the aristocracy in France, it also gave the possibility for many proletarians to move towards the higher positions than the proletariat. But this meant only that they became bourgeoisies. Marx and Engels suggested that every class founded its domination over a wider base than the former dominant class. However, in each case the opposition between the dominant and the classes who were not dominant grew sharply and deeply. This meant that struggle against new dominant class had to destroy the conditions of old society more and more than the previous classes who had become dominant did (Marx and Engels, 1987, 82).

A Communist Revolutionary Politics: One of the interesting points in *Capital* is that it gives several references to the *Manifesto* apart from the *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. The manifesto is the most agitating book where Marx and Engels use clear *class language*. It is interesting but not surprising that Marx's most scientific book frequently refers to his most political book since he tries to build the scientific base of the socialist politics of the working class after 1845s.

The *Manifesto* was written in order to formulate the principles of The Communist League and published in February 1848. The final text was the product of Marx. But he benefited from materials and early drafts of Engels. It was completed in Brussels in December and January of 1847.

The *Manifesto* corresponds to a period where the roads of liberal **democracy** and communism lastly intersect. From then on, they follow the different paths.

The conception of communism towards 1848 and after in Europe sharply echoes the reactionary and oppressive periods of Turkey, especially after September 1980.

(Meanwhile, let me **compare the revolutionary periods** of France and Turkey just in order to give an inspiration. February to June of 1848 for the former seems to correspond to May of 1960 to March 1971 for the latter and 1848-1852 may model Turkey's 1971-1980 and, 1852 and after in France may imply the developments in Turkey from September 1980 onwards.

February to June of 1848 France; May 1960 to March 1971 in Turkey-**last wave** of bourgeois revolution;
1848 to 1852 of France; March 1971 to September 1980 in Turkey-class struggle, and defeat;
1852 and after in France; September 1980 and after in Turkey-**completion** of bourgeois revolution)

Revolutionary Bourgeoisie and Proletarians: The famous statement is this: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles". Struggles take the form of "hidden" or "open fight", ends with "either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes". Whatever they were, such as "Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman", but "in a word, oppressor and oppressed", "the contending classes" "stood in constant opposition to one another". Before the epoch of the bourgeoisie, the manifesto observes that there were "a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank". Nonetheless, these various orders and ranks are the classes of old societies: "In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations". These all refers to old classes, old conditions of oppression, and old forms of struggle. What "the modern bourgeois society" "has not done away with class antagonisms", "but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of

struggle in place of the old ones". The "distinctive feature" of this society underlies the fact that "it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat" (SW, 246). It should be noted that old society is based on the hierarchy of orders and ranks whereas the modern bourgeois society is based on the division, and split- up of two great classes. The latter simplifies the class antagonisms, and clearly defines the hostile camps and confrontation between the contending classes.

"The feudal system of industry" is replaced by the manufacturing system, and the "guild-masters" by "the manufacturing middle class". Manufacture also could not support new markets and demand. It is replaced by modern industry, "the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois" (SW, 247). The upper, dominant class of the modern society is the middle class of the previous transitional period (we can say that before the completion of bourgeois revolution in terms of the establishment of class power and domination, bourgeoisie appears as middle class).

Class history overlaps the economic and political histories of the bourgeoisie. The "modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange". Class history is linked here to the economic history and to the revolutions in the modes of production. In addition, the Manifesto adds political development of the bourgeoisie to this connection: "Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune; here independent urban republic..., there taxable 'third estate' of the monarchy...afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against

the nobility, and, in fact, corner-stone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of modern industry and of the world-market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie" (SW, 247).

The manifesto, the manifesto of communism and the communistic manifesto of the proletarian politics, seemingly surprising, frequently refers the *historically* revolutionary character of the bourgeoisie and we know from all studies of Marx, that history here, too, means transitional, temporary and relative revolutionary function of that class. Moreover, its role as such is limited in relation to its revolutionary position against the old forms of society and is limited with the development of its internal-contradictions:

The bourgeoisies, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his 'natural superiors', and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous 'cash payment'. It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom-Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation (SW, 247-8).

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation"

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which Reactionists so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social

conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses, his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind (SW, 248).

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed...In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations...The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature" (SW, 248-9).

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation...It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt **the bourgeois mode of production**; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image (SW, 249).

The bourgeoisie obtains a divine power, creates and transforms everything in the way it wants. The statements in the Manifesto all demonstrates that the social and economic development in the bourgeois epoch cannot be compared with any other one. This development is enthusiastically interpreted because it is seen as being the material conditions for a real development of mankind.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West (SW, 249).

The dominant thoughts in the *Manifesto* are on the one hand, urban and industrial oriented, on the other hand, advocates a sort of Euro-centred world perspective. They point to the “universal interdependence of nations” in material and intellectual production. They disregard “old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency”, “National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness”. The interesting thing is the ideas which are rather remote from the development literature, national protectionism and third worldism of the twentieth century: “To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood”. The protection of the national industry and hence national power of the bourgeoisie is an alien idea to the communist writers of the Manifesto “(in passing, let me note that an anti-imperialist politics need not be accompanied by the national leftism. Lenin is not a good support for them because he was both “anti-imperialist” and “anti-nationalist”. His ideas about the national salvation are closely related with the bourgeois revolutionary stage for the country in question and with his search for support to the Russian revolution in particular and with his strategy for the future socialist transformation of the backward countries in general).

The compliments offered by the Manifesto to the bourgeois class, which are all based on the objective historical facts, now ends: “A similar movement is going on before our own eyes” (SW, 250). “The history of industry and commerce for many a decade past is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule”. The proof is the periodical and ever more threatening commercial crises. Marx of the Manifesto seems to say that the progressive role of the bourgeois class ends with the emergence of the economic crises which show that bourgeois relations of production and the development of productive forces are no longer compatible with each other. In other words, the bourgeoisie can no longer be counted as a revolutionary class after this economic phenomenon. “In these crises a great part not only of the existing

products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of over-production. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation, has cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why?” It is because “The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them”. The Manifesto demonstrates that *Capital* would be written in order to show internal dynamics and limits of “**the bourgeois mode of production**”. The bourgeoisie’s own solution to the crises is on the one hand, “enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces”, extension of market, and “the more thorough exploitation of the old ones”. But it just pays “the way for more extensive and more destructive crises” and diminishes “the means whereby crises are prevented” (SW, 250).

When the final hour comes, says Marx:

Finally, **in times when the class struggle nears the decisive hour**, the process of **dissolution** going on **within the ruling class**, in fact within the whole range of old society, assumes such a **violent, glaring character**, that a small **section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class**, the class that holds the future in its hands. **Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie**, so now **a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat**, and in particular, **a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole**.

Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeois today, the **proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class**. **The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of Modern Industry**; the proletariat is its special and essential product (SW, 253). **The lower middle class** (“*middle strata*” in the German edition, see in the same translation, 120), **the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class**. They are therefore not revolutionary, but

conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the **wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary**, they are so only **in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat**; they thus defend not their present, but their future interests, they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariat.

The '**dangerous class**', the social scum, (for these two statements it is said "*the lumpenproletariat*" in the German edition. See in the same Turkish translation, 120) that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, **may, here and there, be swept into the movement** by a proletarian revolution; **its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue** (SW, 254).

The connection between the proletariat and communism is not a proposal but a material and real relation between the conditions of society and the conditions of that class. "In the conditions of the proletariat, those of old society at large are already virtually swamped". It has no property and has not a family familiar with the bourgeoisie. Modern industry "has stripped him of every trace of national character". The old ideas and ideologies are foreign to him: "Law, morality, religion are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests" (SW, 254). Here, the Manifesto points to the demystification effects of modern industrial labour in favour of the consciousness of the proletariat. Nationality, law, morality and religion become a field of indifference for the proletariat. This seems to be one of the optimisms of the Manifesto. But, its optimism may result from the revolutionary conditions of the time and from the clear acknowledgement of communism as a power.

For the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, the manifesto states that "we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat" (SW, 254). The "more or less veiled civil war", "open revolution", "the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie", and "the sway of the proletariat". The manifesto points to these transformations within "the most general phases of the development of the proletariat" (SW, 254). The

development of that class seems to be accompanied by the development of its struggle.

Another distinctive feature of the proletariat underlies the fact that his development does not lead into a higher level of existence in terms of its class existence. Even “The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeois, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois” (SW, 254-5). The Manifesto seems to state that the proletariat is the last dominated and subjected class, which does not have any lower strata over which he can locate its class interests. With the development of modern industry, “instead of rising” with it, the modern worker “sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class”. “He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth”. His living conditions do not develop with the development of industry. For this reason, “the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an overriding law”. The Manifesto argues that there emerges a division between the interest of society as a whole and the interests of the bourgeoisie as the ruling class. This class does not feed its slave, but its slave has to feed him. “Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society”. The incompatibility of the interest between the society and bourgeoisie necessarily corresponds to the incompatibility of the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisies. However, the ruling power of the bourgeoisie (the “essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class”) depends on the formation of capital. But, the latter is dependent on wage-labour. “Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers”. Nonetheless, with the development of industry, “whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie”, this competition, hence the “isolation of the labourers” is replaced by the “revolutionary combination” of the workers, “due to association”. The Manifesto takes all attention to the objective living conditions of the proletariat, the revolutionary

combination of the workers and to the development of industry. Miserable living conditions, geographical concentration and revolutionary combination of the workers are accompanied with the advance of industry. The condition for capital is put against the condition of wage-labourers: "What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, is its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable" (SW, 255). It is sure we can say that welfare measures against misery, decentralisation of labour processes and industry against the concentration of industry, and reactionary combinations against revolutionary combinations of labourers are the historical measures for capital's survival. But, the problem of the Manifesto is not to try to predict and theorise all possible development lines of the relationship between the conditions for capital and wage-labour. It sketches and manifests the "views", "aims" and "tendencies" of communists (SW, 246). It is a manifestation for the communist party, and a mere outline for communist political and economical theorising in a time going towards 1848 revolutions.

Objections levelled to the Communists: Nation and Country for Communists: "The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality" The reply is one of the most important contributions to the Communist politics: "The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got". The "nation" for the proletariat is meaningful only when it seized the political power and make itself "leading class": "Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to the leading class of the nation (*national class* in the German edition of 1848, see *the same Turkish translation*, 129), must constitute itself *the* nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word" (SW, 260). Acquirement of political supremacy, becoming leading class of the nation or the national class, and the re-constitution of nation are the simultaneous aspects of the *proletarian* or *non-bourgeois* meaning of "national". The Manifesto use the notions the "nation", and "national" in a sense that they refer only to the politico- geographical

constitution of the proletarian power. As for the “national difference and antagonisms between peoples”, the Manifesto continues its optimism by pointing to “the development of bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world-market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto”. In addition, they will be vanished still faster under the supremacy of proletariat. Even more, common action of “the leading civilised countries at least, are one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat” (SW, 260). Especially the last definition may surprise many when common action of so-called “leading civilised countries” moves as a reactionary alliance against a possible revolutionary action in one country. But what is meant seems to be a co-operation or partnership among the advanced countries, which will affect positively each other in terms of freedom, etc.

The objections levelled from religious, philosophical and in general ideological standpoint is met by the Manifesto by saying that “**The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class**”; “man’s ideas, views, and conceptions, in one word, **man’s consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relation, and in his social life**”; “**intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed**”. If there are **revolutionary ideas** in society, it is so since “within the old society, the elements of a new one have been created” and since “the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence” (SW, 260). The Manifesto accepts the continuity of modified forms of “religious, moral, philosophical, and juridical ideas” in history. But this continuity is related with the continuity of class society in history: “The **history of all past society** has consisted in the development of **class antagonisms, antagonisms** that assumed different forms at different epochs”. The common property of all epochs, however, is “**the exploitation of one part of society by the other**. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays,

moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms". The "**Communist revolution**" is the turning point in history, "the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas" (SW, 261).

First Measures of Revolutionary Rupture in Advanced Countries: In the revolutionary rupture of "the working class" with the past, "the first step" is "to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of **democracy**". After the seizure of the power, the "proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible". The Manifesto suggests "despotic inroads" on "the conditions of bourgeois production", on "the rights of property", and on "the old social order". These measures are unavoidable in the beginning "as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production", and "will of course be different in different countries". However, the *Manifesto* proposes some general ones for "the most advanced countries" (SW, 261).

- 1) Abolition of landed property and the use of all land rent for public purposes (SW, 261).
- 2) A heavy progressive or graduated income tax
- 3) Abolition of all rights of inheritance
- 4) Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels
- 5) Centralisation of credit under the State's national monopoly
- 6) Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State
- 7) Extension of the means of production of the State, the cultivation of wastelands, and the improvement of the soil according to a common plan

- 8) Equal liability of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially in agriculture.
- 9) Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the town-country distinction, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.
- 10) Free and public education for children. Abolition of child labour in the present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc.

These are only some measures for advanced countries which would get into the first step of revolution of the working class. They focus on taxation, property relations, credit system, public economy, means of communication and transport, the improvement of production, full employment, and free public education for children, combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries, and the abolition of the town- country distinction. They all are related with the material conditions of society, but the transformation of the material conditions as such is also a transformation in the men's consciousness. The above statements must be recalled: "man's ideas, views, and conceptions, in one word, **man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relation, and in his social life**"; "**intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed**". It will be wrong to think that consciousness changes with a change in production. Rather, man's consciousness ("man's ideas, views, and conceptions") is framed and conditioned by "**his material existence**", "**his social relation**", and "**his social life**". The measures suggested above for the advanced countries in the first step in the revolution intervenes on the development of the productive forces and the distribution relations in the society, on the relation between town and country, and on the education system. All interventions as such are interventions on the class relations and the domination of capital. It is sure that revolution is a process and develops into higher stages. The Manifesto states that

If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is **compelled**, by the force of circumstances, **to organise itself as a class, if**, by means of a **revolution**, it **makes itself the ruling class**, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, **then it will**, along with these conditions, have **swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms** and of **classes generally**, and will thereby have **abolished its own supremacy as a class** (SW, 262).

The proletariat changes itself into class is caused by the force of circumstances during its contest with the bourgeoisie. In the revolution, it makes itself the ruling class and with the development of revolution, it puts an end to the class antagonisms as long as he puts an end to the old conditions of production. At the end, with the disappearance of class antagonisms and hence classes, it also puts an end to its own supremacy as a class. The proletariat is the class which can stop the history of class societies. The Manifesto states that the classes and class antagonisms of the old bourgeois society will be replaced by **“an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all”** (SW, 262). A social revolution which will be based on and directed by the revolution of the proletariat is the historical condition for the free development of individual and his or her social life. Freedom and individualism acquires their complete meanings only in this context. **The *Manifesto* points to the social emancipation of individual man.**

The first group accuses the bourgeoisie that “under the bourgeois regime a class is being developed, which is destined to cut up root and branch the old order of society”. However, “What they upbraid the bourgeoisie with is not so much that it creates a proletariat, as that it creates a revolutionary proletariat”. This aristocratic criticism of the bourgeois society did not prevent their advocates from supporting coercive measures against the working class. It also set an alliance with Christian asceticism and clerical socialism. The Manifesto recalls “one section of the French Legitimists” and “Young England” as two examples of feudal socialism (SW, 262-4).

German or 'True' Socialism is a good example of the modified transfer of the literature that were developed in a relatively advanced country to the relatively backward one. French socialist and communist literature was developed against the French bourgeoisie who had seized the power. But it was translated into Germany where the bourgeoisie just started its struggle against feudal absolutism. But, although this literature was translated by German would-be philosophers for the conditions of Germany, "French social conditions" were absent in Germany. In this incompatibility, French literature lost its practical meanings and acquired "a purely literary aspect". The demands of the great French revolution were transformed into the language of philosophy in the form of concepts such as "Practical Reason", and the will of the French bourgeoisie as "true human Will". The French ideas were annexed with existing German philosophy through translation. This translation took place in a reverse way that "the monks wrote silly lives of Catholic Saints over the manuscripts on which the classical works of ancient heathendom had been written". Whereas French criticised the functions of money, "the German *literati*" wrote beneath it "Alienation of Humanity", and whereas French criticised the bourgeois State, it wrote beneath it "Dethronement of the Category of the General". The manifesto (Marx and Engels) also recalls Marx's earlier criticism of the left Hegelians: "The introduction of these philosophical phrases at the back of the French historical criticisms they dubbed 'Philosophy of Actions', 'True Socialism', 'German Science of Socialism', 'Philosophical Foundations of Socialism', and so on" (SW, 265).

4.2 Stages of the French bourgeois revolution, 1789 to 1871

Historical Information: Before I begin to analyse Marx's *The Class Struggles in France 1848-1850* and *18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* I will give essential historical information about French revolution, which developed through several stages. The first French revolution begins in 1787 and ends in 1799. The summit of this first revolutionary period is arrived at

1789 (*symbolically* arrived in 14 July when Parisians gained control of the Bastille prison). The revolution puts an end to the old regime and evolves into different political regimes from republic to dictatorship through imperial system of Napoleon Bonaparte.

The French revolution is the classical model of the bourgeois revolutions in Europe. The French bourgeoisie being a part of the third estate which had become economically stronger after the 14.th and 15.th century seized the political power which had been open only to the nobility and clergy till 1789. The latter two estates had had not only political power, but also land property. One-fifth of the lands belonged to the aristocracy, and six percent to the rich clericals. On the other hand, the third estate had no political and juridical privilege and its population was 24 million, 23 million of which was composed of peasants. The number of aristocrats was about 350 thousands apart from about 70 thousands of clericals, 5 to 6 thousands of which was rich ones. The peasants had some feudal obligations against the king, clericals and seniors. One-fourth of their products went to the seniors and some part of it to the clericals. For this reason, the peasantry had certain interest in the abolishment of the feudal rights and obligations.

The third estate was not only composing of the bourgeois middle class, but also of whole urban labourers, artisans, shopkeepers, lower echelons of the clericals, the peasants and the poor masses. But, the peasants were the most subordinated class in the society before the revolution. They were charged for both feudal rents and state taxes from salt and wine.

The revolution brought into the Class Assembly (Etats-Generaux) in which three estates were to be represented. The one was Tiers Etat (People's Assembly) and it was completely composed of the bourgeois representatives. The bourgeoisie would soon seize the political power with the support of the other representatives from other assemblies and of the masses whose interests was against the feudal system. But, after this political success, class interest of the bourgeoisie and of the masses would begin to contradict.

Social protests and mobilisation had significant impact on the direction of revolution. For example, the peasants' uprisings led into the abolishment of the feudal rights and obligations on August 26 of 1789. In the same day, the Constituent assembly proclaimed *the Human and Citizen Rights*, which implied the modern liberal rights, equality before law and the state of law as the main principles. This proclamation was followed with the confiscation of the church's lands and with the re-distribution of the landed property. The bourgeoisies and the small holding peasants benefited from this change the most. But the peasants without property could also get some land.

These developments affected the other countries of Europe. The Constituent assembly, meanwhile, proclaimed the *self-determination right of the people*. From this event, the political differences between Europe and France became significant and at the end, the revolution resulted into war in Europe. France proclaimed war against Austria and Prussia in 20 April of 1792. But, in August, the Austrian and Prussian armies approached to Paris. This defeat led into the uprising of the French revolutionaries and created nationalist feelings. In 20 September 1792, new assembly called the *Convention* was established. The Convention proclaimed the republic and put an end to the monarchy. The second period of the revolution would witness successes of this revolutionary assembly. France under the control of Convention's government invaded some European regions such as Belgium, Ren region, Savoie and Nice and destroyed the old feudal regimes therein.

In this revolutionary period, revolutionary groups were called *Jacobins*. They advocated *popular revolution*, republican form of the state and democracy. Before the revolution they had established the *Community of the Constitution's Friends*. This community established many branches in the country later on. The words *revolutionary* and the *Jacobin* were used to mean the same thing. The leading cadres of the Club were formed of Marat, Danton and Robespierre.

The Convention separated into two rival groups in this period when the revolution began to expand through Europe. The first group *Girondens* demanded the establishment of the bourgeois republic and wanted to expand the revolution towards the whole Europe, while the *Montagnards* (the Jacobean's representatives in the Convention) and Robespierre advocated the political and economical empowerment of the lower classes and wanted to limit the revolutionary movement with France.

The third period of the revolution followed the capital punishment of the king XVI. Louis in January of 1793 and witnessed political radicalisation. The radical wing of the revolutionaries got stronger after sequential defeats of France against the coalition of Austria, Prussia and England. The situation of the country created a good environment for the extremists. Girondens were liquidated from the Convention, and the Montagnards seized the power with the support of all republican workers, artisans, small shopkeepers, small farmers and agricultural workers. Their power would last until July 27 of 1794 when Robespierre was sentenced to capital punishment. This revolutionary period witnessed several economic and social reforms in favour of lower classes. The price increases were prevented with the *Maximum Law*. The riches were heavily taxed while poor was supported. Compulsory state education was provided. Emigrants who would not return to country were sentenced to capital punishment, and their properties were confiscated. Counter-revolutionary movement was destroyed with the forceful measures by the state. At least 300 thousands of suspicious men were arrested. More than ten thousands of them were sentenced to death penalty either with or without legal procedures. On the other hand, the Convention recruited more than one million soldiers.

The period of terror would end with the military successes, which would rule out the political reasons for the economic and social constraints. After the fall of Robespierre in 27 July of 1794, social oriented laws like Maximum law were abolished and the attempts towards economic equality were

abandoned. The period of terror under the direction of Montagnards, who were the bourgeois liberals like Girondens, was a result of a conjuncture when the defence of the country and the pressure of the republicans had called for radical, progressive and social oriented politics.

After the fall of the Robespierre's government, counter-revolutionary gained a new impetus. White Terror organised by the supporters of the old regime tried to gain control of Paris. But, in 5 October of 1795, Napoleon Bonaparte successfully defended Paris. After a short while, the Convention was dissolved.

The constitution approved by the Convention in 1795 prepared the framework to later political developments within the state apparatus. According to this constitution, the executive power belonged to the *Directorate*, and legislative power to the *Consul of the Olders* (Conseil des Anciens) and to *Consul of the Five-Hundreds* (Conseil de Cinq-Cents). The struggle between the revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries in Europe increased the contradiction between the Directorate and the legislative bodies. Disagreement between two state bodies firstly led into the coup of Fructidor in 1797 and secondly into Brumaire coup d'état of Napoleon Bonaparte in 9 November of 1799. In the first coup, the advocators of the King were liquidated from the Directorate and the legislative body, while the second coup put an end to the Directorate itself.

Before the coup d'état, under the direction of Napoleon, French armies had occupied many regions and countries in Europe such as Ren region, Flemish country, Italy and Sardinia. This military success went on. Republic was proclaimed in occupied regions and countries. Although several peace agreements were accepted between France and other European countries, revolutionary expansion continued. In the lines of Gironden tradition, the Directorate tried to expand the revolution to the other regions. Switzerland, Papacy and Napoly were occupied and put under the regime of republic.

Nevertheless, revolutionary expansion of France would meet with the coalition composed of Austria, Russia, Ottoman Empire and the Britain. The coalition got stronger and begun to push the French armies to the border areas of the country in 1799's spring and summer. Napoleon wanted to benefit from the situation and came back to France in order to abolish the Directorate. With the coup d'état in 9 November (Brumaire), he proclaimed both the regime of the Consul and the end of the revolution. But he would go on to expand the revolution to Europe. Napoleon Bonaparte became the emperor of France in 1804 and his power fell in 1815 after the defeat of Waterloo war.

With the fall of Napoleon, France got into a *restoration* period. But, in 1830, it would witness another revolution. In this period of the constitutional monarchy, the fact that liberals as the representatives of the bourgeoisie got stronger worried the Bourbons and the king X. Charles and increased the strength of the opposition which advocated the old regime. Nevertheless, economic crisis and strength of the bourgeoisie disabled the opposition in 1827. In this year, however, the elections were won by the opposition. The liberal bourgeoisie was organised under the leadership of La Fayette. The new elections led the bourgeoisie into a superior position. Nonetheless, the election results were not recognised by the king's prime minister, old aristocrat, Polignac. This was followed by the limitation of the freedoms. The liberal opposition called for the workers struggle. The barricades in Paris and the rebellion of the military forces in 28 July **1830** led into the collapse of the government. In August **1830**, the constituent assembly rejected the divine right of the kingdom. While X. Charles went to the exile to England, Louis-Philippe d'Orleans was proclaimed as the new King by the assembly.

Before 1848 workers revolution, the bourgeoisie led French revolutionary movement. The masses and the workers were the supporting forces under the leadership of the liberal bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the differential aspect of the 1848 revolution can be seen in the *workers' attempt to seize*

the economic and political power. In accordance with this development, *leading position for the mass movement passed from liberal bourgeoisie to republican democrats and socialist revolutionaries.* **1830** revolution, which was a *liberal bourgeois one, obtained the support of the workers , but was not interested in the workers ' social and economic problems.* For this reason, in **1831** November, workers upraised for minimum wages and they gained the control of Lyon. They were under the influence of Babeuf's political ideas. After these events, many underground illegal associations were formed. The most famous of them were the *Human Rights Association*, the *People's Friends*, the *Community of Families*, and the *Community of Seasons*. While the former two were republican socialist, the latter two were revolutionary socialist. Human Rights Association under the leadership of *Auguste Blanqui* started a workers movement in **1834** of Paris. 40 thousands soldiers destroyed the riot in Paris. Blanqui would lead the Community of Families and Community of Seasons later on. He prepared another workers uprising in **1839**. He was put into the jail where he stayed till 1848 revolution.

The years of **1845**, **1846**, and **1847** witnessed economic crises. The King Louis Philippe increased forceful measures against the ever growing opposition and even more, he made a secret agreement with Austria against possible internal and external danger. The *opposition was composed of liberals, radicals and socialists* against the King. This *popular front* was established in **1847** and begun its campaign for reforming election system. The king prevented the campaign. But, this measure started revolution in **21 February 1848**. The opposition called for the workers support. The national guards joined rebellions. The workers demanded republican system in the barricades. The king Philippe gave up his throne in favour of the Count of Paris. In **25 February 1848**, the workers wanted to occupy the Paris Commune in order to make red flag which the symbol of the social republic to be accepted. But Prime Minister Lamartine prevented this attempt. Nonetheless, the government accepted social reforms about the right of working and association for the workers. Louis Blanc proposed this demand

in the name of socialists. For the implementation of this measure, national workshops would be established. Three days later, the workers moved again to the Commune of Paris and could enforce the establishment of the development bank and new reforms to be accepted.

In the elections of **23 April 1848**, bourgeois liberals and social democrats were united and socialists were defeated since they were accused for being communists. 700 representatives out of 900 were moderate republican. This constituent assembly proclaimed the republic in **4 May 1848** and selected from within an executive committee of 5 members in which Louis Blanc was not accepted. The assembly rejected the establishment of the ministry of work and expressed its decision against social reforms. As a result, a group composed of socialists, the workers of the national workshops, and the National Guard occupied the constituent assembly under the leadership of Blanqui and Barbes in **15 May 1848**. Huber proclaimed the end of the assembly. Blanqui addressed to the representatives and stated that they were indebted for their positions to the workers and their function was to realise social reforms. Barbes called for a billion taxes for riches. A constituent government composing of Blanc, Blanqui and Barbes was formed. However, the old government with the support of National Guard and the guard of elites surpassed the action. Several days later, national workshops and clubs were shot down. The workers demanded for the abolishment of the assembly and the re-establishment of the national workshops in the barricades. The assembly replied with the martial law under the control of general Cavaignac. The workers uprising were destroyed in **28 June 1848**. The totally forceful measures, exiles, prosecutions and the limitation to press and association surpassed the socialist movement. But, the republic was injured from this civil war. The bourgeois and the peasants went away from the republican regime since they feared from the political turmoil. The collaboration of the liberals and socialists would be replaced with the deep resentment between them and new constitution brought into a

powerful presidency which would later on create a possibility for dictatorship (These encyclopaedic information was edited from Altay, 1991).

4.2.1 “The Civil War in France”: The revolution completed

Commune is “an urban community which governs itself (Piero, 1992; 20) The Communes of the Middle Ages have all characteristics of the states in our present day. A proclamation of a commune is to proclaim to be a state in the urban level. The municipality, in this sense, is the state of the city (Pierre, 1990; 122-50).

The communes of the middle ages were confined into the national states. It was put into the limits of the local governments. This was the beginning of the traditions so called civil society against the state. The meaning of commune was turned into an empty democratic rhetoric. The example of the Paris Commune in 1871 was the transformation of the meaning of commune from its bourgeois content to socialist content. The development of the working class and socialism during the nineteenth century charged socialist meanings over commune. After then, a proclamation of a commune was no longer implying only to want local autonomy in the urban level. It was also a class struggle. The meaning of the class struggle was to establish a new class dictatorship. The Paris Commune of 1871 was an attempt at establishing a class dictatorship. It implied a passage from bourgeois tradition to socialist tradition.

The Power of the Commune for 72 Days: The military committee which proclaimed the commune in 18 March decided the elections to be made in 26 March. Within these 8 days, Paris was liberated from bourgeois government and the bourgeois state. The martial law was abolished. The announcement of 20 March declared that the power had been seized and that the victory of the proletariat was ensured. The permanent intervention of the people in the commune affairs was demanded. The participation of all women, clubs,

association, newspapers and the general council in the commune was wanted. The neighbourhood committees and other organizations sent their delegates and proposals. In March, war councils were abolished and a political amnesty was issued. The ministers who ran away were replaced with new ones. The proclamation of 23 March announces social reforms. These reforms demanded equal return of the labour for the worker, the abolishment of capitalist profit, the organization of commerce, credit and collectivity, secular, complete and public education for all, freedom for association, organization and press, communal organization of the police and the army, rejection of any external power, permanent control of the representatives by the electors. This proclamation announced exactly that it would abolish class contradiction and establish a new order. The International announced its exact support to the commune after this proclamation had been made.

The council of the commune took some social measures to solve problems created by urban growth and urban speculation. It postponed the unpaid rents for seven months in 30 March, and appropriated the houses which had been abandoned in order to shelter the people without housing in 25 April. It also decided in 12 April that commercial debts whose terms had been completed could be paid without interest and within three years. The debts of the poor people to the security office were cleared in 7 May. In 20 April, the council abolished night working for the bakers. In 27 July, money penalties issued by the patrons over the wages of the workers were forbidden.

Among the decisions and announcements of the commune, the measure taken in 16 April and the announcement made in 19 April, addressing to all France were very important. The former was issued for the workshops and the factories which had been left or kept nonworking to be counted and to taken over by the associations of the workers. These workplaces were expropriated in return of their equivalents. The decision aimed at uniting the workplaces on the base of the association of the workers.

The announcement addressing to all France reflected the conception of the commune about political and administrative organization. The aims of the commune were announced to France and the rights of the communes were expressed. France had to be a republic to be made of the federation of the communes. This republic would not be a centralist state. Each commune would approve its own budget, have right over its own properties and elect or select through exams their own public servants. Individual freedoms, freedoms of commercial and working would be protected. The National Guard would be organized through election. Behind this announcement was the blames of Versailles's government for dictatorship towards the commune. The commune rejected arbitrary and expensive despotic centralism dictated by the kingdom, the emperorship and the republic to France. After this announcement was made, some representatives were sent to the provinces. In 28 April, the commune addressed to the rural labourers and promised the abolishment of the heavy taxation over labour, the division between the rich and poor peasants, and the provision of land for the peasants and the means of production for the workers. The commune had hopes about the support of the rural France to Paris.

The most important democratic measures of the commune was the principle for recalling the elected representatives, election of all higher echelons of the public servants, the frequent and regular elections, and the most importantly the abolishment of the regular army and its replacement with armed people. As I have mentioned above, the commune had proclaimed the rights and the autonomy of the communes in 19 April. These measures and attempts demonstrate that the commune wanted to elevate democracy into the highest level. However, the experience of the commune also demonstrates that an advanced democracy required socialist measures as well. The measures which tried to change property relations and the capital-labour relations pointed to the socialist side of the commune. The socialist measures were seen in the abolishment of night work, patrons' rights of penalty over the workers, the determination of minimum age, the organization of work

searching bureaus, the abolishment of security offices, and giving up of the abandoned workplaces to the associations of the workers. In addition, the commune abolished the division, which had been established according to bourgeois legality and ethic, between legitimate and illegitimate children and marriages (Piero, 1992; 14-32; Lenin, 1992; 35-41; 42-5; *The Encyclopedia of Socialism and Social Struggle*, 2.Band; 346-82).

Commune is “an urban community which governs itself (Piero, 1992; 20) The Communes of the Middle Ages has all characteristics of the states in our present day. A proclamation of a commune is to proclaim to be a state in the urban level. The municipality, in this sense, is the state of the city (Pierre, 1990; 122-50).

French working class got stronger in parallel with the economic development after the second half of the nineteenth century. The agricultural crisis of 1847-50 increased the migration from villages to the cities. The crises of 1857 and 1867 encouraged the militancy of the working class. In 1866, the 442 thousands of the 1850000 of the Paris population were the workers. After 1862, especially after 1869-1870 years the strikes rapidly increased. The workers established various organizations for resistance and solidarity among themselves. The International which had been established in 1864 began to organize in France in the beginning of 1865. When we came to 1870 June, the French section of the International had 300 thousands workers. Piero says that even before the Franco-German war which would begin in 19 July 1870, a social revolution of the proletariat was predicated (1992; 15-7).

The Development of the Events: France opened war to Prussia in 19 July 1870. But in 2 September the emperor Louis Bonaparte was a prisoner of war. National Defense Government was established in France in 4 September. But a rebellion took place in 31 October to establish a new government for a real defense. In December, Paris was bombarded. In 18 January 1871, The

German Empire was proclaimed in France. In 22 January, a new rebellion was organized against the Paris Municipality or Paris Commune. In 28 January, Paris was given up to the enemy with a treaty. Paris' troops would be given up to the Germans and a large amount of war compensations would be paid. However, the weapons of the National Guard which had been established to defence Paris during the war were not taken since it was feared from Parisian people.

The assembly of France was made of the royalists in main. 400 royalists in total 630 members were elected in 8 February elections. It wanted a peace agreement with the Prussians in order to fight against the Parisian people. It made its meeting first in Bordeaux and then in Versailles. In 3 March, the troops of Bismarck went into Paris. In 4 March, the Central Committee of the Republican Federation of the National Guard was elected. In 11 March, the assembly of Bordeaux decided death penalty for the leaders of the rebellions of 31 October. It banned the republican newspapers. In addition, it appointed Bonapartist persons for the National Guard and the police organization. On the other hand, the Parisian people who were republican demanded the formal proclamation of the republican regime, elected assembly as in the other communes and the abolishment of anti-social measures. The composition, ideological preferences and the peace agreement with Prussians of the national assembly meant betrayal to the country in the eyes of the Parisians. Tension and polarization was ready to become a fight. Finally, in 18 March the government of Versailles wanted to disarmament of Paris. 400 cannons were wanted to be taken over from the National Guard. But the people rebelled spontaneously.

The Central Committee of the National Guard and the Republican Central Committee of 20 districts which was linked to the International's branch in Paris and had been established in 5 September in 1890 settled down in Paris Municipal Hall and proclaimed the commune (Piero, 1992; 14-32; Lenin,

1992; 35-41; 42-5; The Encyclopedia of Socialism and Social Struggle, 2.Band; 346-82). The republic was liberated, but France was set apart.

The Power of the Commune for 72 Days: The military committee which proclaimed the commune in 18 March decided the elections to be made in 26 March. Within these 8 days, Paris was liberated from bourgeois government and the bourgeois state. The martial law was abolished. The announcement of 20 March declared that the power had been seized and that the victory of the proletariat was ensured. The permanent intervention of the people in the commune affairs was demanded. The participation of all women, clubs, association, newspapers and the general council in the commune was wanted. The neighbourhood committees and other organizations sent their delegates and proposals. In March, war councils were abolished and a political amnesty was issued. The ministers who ran away were replaced with new ones. The proclamation of 23 March announces social reforms. These reforms demanded equal return of the labour for the worker, the abolishment of capitalist profit, the organization of commerce, credit and collectivity, secular, complete and public education for all, freedom for association, organization and press, communal organization of the police and the army, rejection of any external power, permanent control of the representatives by the electors. This proclamation announced exactly that it would abolish class contradiction and establish a new order. The International announced its exact support to the commune after this proclamation had been made.

Of the 485 registered voters, 229 participated in the elections of 26 March. The difference was the result of the war lost and the persons who had ran away from Paris after the revolution to Versailles. In addition, rich neighbourhoods participated less. The central committee gave up its authority to the council of the commune which was made of 90 members in 28 March.

The council of the commune can be divided as the majority and the minority. The **minority** was made of 25 workers which were in the **Proudhonian** wing of the International. They were artisan workers. They were not homogenous group. Only three among them were close to Marx. Only **Leo Frankel** had information about the thoughts of Marx. They had political experiences. But they were interested much more in social problems than political problems. They did not have unanimous behaviour. In the **majority** group, **petty and middle bourgeoisies** who had participated in the **Republican** Party's fronts during the period of Louis Bonaparte were witnessed. Many of them were the persons who had professions like public servant, teacher, judge, and journalist. The **Jacobins** who had participated in 1848 revolution were seen in the side of the majority. In addition, 12 **Blanquists** and 30 **independent revolutionaries** were among the majority.

The council of the commune took some social measures to solve problems created by urban growth and urban speculation. It postponed the unpaid rents for seven months in 30 March, and appropriated the houses which had been abandoned in order to shelter the people without housing in 25 April. It also decided in 12 April that commercial debts whose terms had been completed could be paid without interest and within three years. The debts of the poor people to the security office were cleared in 7 May. In 20 April, the council abolished night working for the bakers. In 27 July, money penalties issued by the patrons over the wages of the workers were forbidden.

Among the decisions and announcements of the commune, the measure taken in 16 April and the announcement made in 19 April, addressing to all France were very important. The former was issued for the workshops and the factories which had been left or kept nonworking to be counted and to taken over by the associations of the workers. These workplaces were expropriated in return of their equivalents. The decision aimed at uniting the workplaces on the base of the association of the workers.

The announcement addressing to all France reflected the conception of the commune about political and administrative organization. The aims of the commune were announced to France and the rights of the communes were expressed. France had to be a republic to be made of the federation of the communes. This republic would not be a centralist state. Each commune would approve its own budget, have right over its own properties and elect or select through exams their own public servants. Individual freedoms, freedoms of commercial and working would be protected. The National Guard would be organized through election. Behind this announcement was the blames of Versailles's government for dictatorship towards the commune. The commune rejected arbitrary and expensive despotic centralism dictated by the kingdom, the emperorship and the republic to France. After this announcement was made, some representatives were sent to the provinces. In 28 April, the commune addressed to the rural labourers and promised the abolishment of the heavy taxation over labour, the division between the rich and poor peasants, and the provision of land for the peasants and the means of production for the workers. The commune had hopes about the support of the rural France to Paris.

In the other cities, although some rebellions took place and the communes were proclaimed with the effect of the 18 March revolution, these movements were either weak or oppressed through force by the Versailles government. The radical elements who took power in the providential cities suffered from political perspective, like their Parisian counterparts. Patriotism, republicanism, and the demands for municipal freedoms occupied the first place. They were far away from the conception of class struggle and keeping the political power in hand. Paris sent messages to the other big cities in 15 May again. Some echoes came but not support.

The commune went beyond the limits of a municipality in terms of its decisions, and actions. It had to be interested in all social problems and public services. It had to be organized as a state. However, the fame of the

Paris Commune would come from not its successes but its attempts. The commune was in power between 18 March and 28 May in Paris. These 72 days meant that the Commune of Paris was the elevation of the bourgeois revolution of one hundred years to the highest point, the completion of the democratic revolution and an attempt for establishing first socialist power as well.

The commune followed an anti-religious, anti-church policy. It closed the schools of the religious sects and divisions. It introduced compulsory secular public education. It opened vocational schools for girls, wanted to increase the salaries of the teachers of the primary schools. Free legal service and the election of the judges were approved in the council. But these latter decisions were not implemented. Notaryship was turned into public service.

The most important democratic measures of the commune was to recalling the elected representatives, election of all higher echelons of the public servants, the frequent and regular elections, and the most importantly the abolishment of the regular army and its replacement with armed people. As I have mentioned above, the commune had proclaimed the rights and the autonomy of the communes in 19 April. These measures and attempts demonstrate that the commune wanted to elevate democracy into the highest level. However, the experience of the commune also demonstrates that an advanced democracy required socialist measures as well. The measures which tried to change property relations and the capital-labour relations pointed to the socialist side of the commune. The socialist measures were seen in the abolishment of night work, patrons' rights of penalty over the workers, the determination of minimum age, the organization of work searching bureaus, the abolishment of security offices, and giving up of the abandoned workplaces to the associations of the workers. In addition, the commune abolished the division, which had been established according to bourgeois legality and ethic, between legitimate and illegitimate children and

marriages (Piero, 1992; 14-32; Lenin, 1992; 35-41; 42-5; *The Encyclopedia of Socialism and Social Struggle*, 2.Band; 346-82).

Defeat: As the revolution took place in 18 March, the government of the National Defense ran away to Versailles. But with the government, the religious men, the Bonapartists and the gendarme also left from Paris. The Versailles began to open fire to Paris after 2 April. 60 thousands French prisoners of war in the hands of Germans were freed to support Versailles against Paris. After 11 April, Paris was begun to be bombarded. The commune sufficed with defence and had no military strategy. It lived a bloody day in 21 May and was destroyed in 28 May when the Versailles took power in Paris. 20 thousands of men were killed and 15 thousands were sent to exile. The courts would be operated for years.

Marxists criticized the experience of the Paris Commune in terms of its organization and political consciousness. The commune had to follow the troops which ran away to Versailles in 18 March and presented to its enemy a possibility for regeneration. The military command was multi-headed. Besides the council of the commune, the central committee of the National Guard and the Public Health Committee to be established later on by the Jacobians weakened the military commanding and led into undisciplined and adventurous attitudes. The commune lost confidence towards its own military delegates. In addition, although the civil war began, some organization which searched in compromise with Versailles weakened the defensive capability of the commune. Moreover, increment of the numbers of the committees and the commissions gave an anarchist characteristic to the commune.

The political consciousness for keeping the power in hand was weak. The French Bank was the most important institution of the French bourgeoisie. But, the commune did not nationalize it, did not expropriate its reserves. Even more, it borrowed money from this bank (Piero, 1992; 14-32; Lenin,

1992; 35-41; 42-5; *The Encyclopedia of Socialism and Social Struggle*, 2.Band; 346-82).

The Commune in Marx, Engels and Lenin: The most dictatorial characteristic of the commune was its abolishment of the bureaucracy and the permanent army. The commune was formed of the workers or the delegates of the workers. Its decisions were in the proletarian direction (Engels, 1991; 14). It abolished the division between legislation and execution. The council of the commune took a decision that the jurisdiction would be the work of the public servant who was to be elected by the people. However, this decision among the many others could not be implemented since Paris was encircled and the only consideration after the beginning of May was the war (Engels, 1991; 14).

It can be argued that the clearest and sharp evaluation of the experience of the Paris Commune in Marxist literature can be found in Lenin. He studied this experience theoretically and benefited from it in the Russian Revolution. The most distinctive features of Lenin's system were the proletarian dictatorship and anti-parliamentary. Lenin valued the positive and negative aspects of the Commune experience for the Russian Revolution. A transition from capitalism to communism had to surpass the socialist phase, which was nothing but the proletarian dictatorship. This transitional period would necessarily witness the sharpest and powerful class struggle that history had ever seen. It was a state which would be democratic in the sense that it took the side of the proletarians and the property's classes, and be dictatorial in the sense that it opposed the bourgeoisie (Lenin, 1994; 43). A forward movement towards communism could be realized through the proletarian dictatorship. This was necessary because there was "no class and instrument" which would eliminate "the *resistance* of the exploiter capitalists". Democracy would be firstly for poor and the people, not for the rich. The proletarian dictatorship extends democracy in this sense, but puts various constraints for the capitalists (Lenin, 1994; 98). It was "the democracy for the

people” and “the dictatorship for the capitalist class”. It would liquidate the capitalist class during socialism. It was “the struggle of the proletariat which is organized as the state”. According to the “instrumentalist” conception of the state and the proletarian dictatorship in Lenin, the commune tried to replace bureaucratic, parliamentary, militarist and parasitic state machine with the state which would implement the proletarian dictatorship. The commune of Paris was a new state form. He suggested that this form could be realized in the urban and national levels by applying the principle of “democratic centralism”, which involved both a central republic and the local administrative autonomy within it (Gorbunov and Yeremina, 1996; 224). Lenin suggested that “in the base, the settlement areas”, there had to be “complete administrative autonomy”, “at the top”, there had to be “direct power of the armed proletariat, its dictatorship” (Gorbunov and Yeremina, 1996; 225). Lenin interpreted Engels’ conception of the centralism. He stated that the centralism according to Engels did not exclude “local administrative autonomy” which would abolish bureaucratism and all arbitrary top down command as long as “the communes” and the regions voluntarily advocated the unity of the state. Here I must add the commune replaced not only with the state but also with the national state and I must recall that **for Lenin, the Commune of Paris struggled not for local or national purpose but for the emancipation of all labourers and lower classes** (Gorbunov and Yeremina, 1996; 226).

In the *Preface to German edition of 1872 of the Manifesto*, Marx and Engels stated that “One thing was especially proved by the Commune, viz., that ‘the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes’ ” (SW; 604, and in Turkish, 1993; 83). In the same pages, Marx and Engels pointed to the changing conditions and the rising experience of the working class and working class movement since the Manifesto of 1848. They said that “In view of the gigantic strides of Modern Industry in the last twenty- five years, and of the accompanying improved and extended party organization of the working class, in view of the practical

experience gained, first in the February revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details become antiquated". The experiences which changed some "details" which had been valid before 1848 February were firstly the revolution of February 1848 and then the most importantly of 18 March 1871. The state had to be seized and then immediately turned into the socialist state, the proletarian dictatorship which required a new state form and content.

Marx analyzed the development and the end of the Paris Commune in his "Civil War in France". He saw the commune as an anti-thesis of the empire and as an extension of the 1848 February revolution of the proletariat and the demand for "social republic" of the proletariat (Marx, 1991bb; 57). For Marx, demand for "social republic" of the working class which appeared in the scene of history with 1848 revolution was elevated into a higher level with 1871 revolution was turned into an attempt at abolishing classes and hence the working class transcended itself. The revolution was a significant moment for the history of class struggle.

The commune was not a parliamentary organization. It was obliged to be both executive and legislative organization. It realized not only the operations of the municipality but also all works which had been hitherto realized by the state. The justice was to be deprived from its artificial autonomy and all judges were to be elected, responsible and to be able to be recalled (Marx, 1991b; 58).

Marx rejects the interpretation of the commune in terms of civil society-the state dichotomy in favour of the civil society. He said that "In this new commune, too, which broke down the contemporary state power, a vitalization of the communes of the Middle Age, which preceded to this state power and then formed its foundation were wanted to be seen. The dichotomy of the commune and the state power were wanted to be seen,

without right, as an extremist form of the old struggle against the extremist centralism” (Marx, 1991b; 59-60). However, “the commune really provided the foundation of democratic institutions for the republic. It was a move backward but a move forward. The real secret of the commune was the fact that it was “the government of the working class”, “a result of struggle which the class of producers realized against the class of appropriators”, “political form” which ensured “the economic liberation of Labour” (Marx, 1991b; 61). That the commune is seen as an example of a municipal freedom is different from that it is seen as the first example of the socialist revolution and the proletarian state. The commune was not responsible with the vitalization of the old bourgeois tradition but “with the clearance of the obstacles before the elements of new society which the bourgeois society that was collapsing carries in itself” (Marx, 1991b; 62).

Friedrich Engels described the Paris Commune as “the proletarian dictatorship” in his introduction, in 1891, to Marx’s “Civil War in France”. He made this definition for social democrats that were afraid of even the words “proletarian dictatorship” (Engels, 1991; 20). Even though the Paris Commune cannot be a perfect example for the proletarian dictatorship, it is nevertheless first attempt at this direction. It did not show courage for applying to civil war and hence it could not protect the state power. This weakness weakened its dictatorial characteristic. In addition, it had no possibility of establishing hegemony over the crude and uneducated rural France. The Commune of Paris suffered from the support of the peasants. Its hegemonic characteristic was weak. However, excluding the big bourgeoisie, all Parisians supported the commune. Marx said that “this was the first revolution in which the working class was acknowledged as the only class which was capable of social initiative by even the large part of the middle class of Paris- shopkeepers, tradesmen, merchants- the rich capitalists alone excepted” (Marx, 1991b; 63). That the commune concerned with the debts and payments demonstrated that it was also existed for the other sections of

the working class. These sections were injured in the imperial period in terms of material reasons and national sensations.

Lenin stated that “although the bourgeois democratic revolution started in 1789 in France it was *completed* only in 1871” (Gorbunov and Yeremina, 1996; 196). Consequently, by following the observations of Marx and Lenin, I can say that the commune’s revolution was a “double revolution”. It had to be democratic since the bourgeoisie was not capable of completing its own bourgeois revolution.

As for the social background or class identities of the communards, we see that a proletarian revolution is not made only by the proletarians and not only for the liquidation of the capitalist class. About this subject, Lenin’s explanation is very beneficent: He stated that at the beginning the movement was uncertain and complex. Patriots hoped that the commune would make war against Germans to the successful end. They participated in the commune’s movement for this reason. The indebted merchants supported the commune. The bourgeois republicans supported the commune since they feared from the possible attempts of the reactionary national Assembly for reintroduction of the Kingdom. But it was sure that the leading role in the development of the events was played by the workers (particularly Parisian artisans) among whom an effective socialist propaganda was realised in the last years of the second empire of Louis Bonaparte and many of whom were the member of the International.

However, despite the participation in and support of the other sections and the classes of society to the commune, “Only the workers became faithful to the Commune to the end”. The bourgeois republicans and the petty bourgeoisies left from the proletariat short time later. This occurred when the formers saw that the movement feared from “the socialist and revolutionary, proletarian characteristic” and the latter group saw that the movement would be destroyed. The commune was supported to the end only by the

proletarians. The commune was left by its allies of yesterday and stood alone. Its defeat was inevitable. "The all bourgeoisie, all big landowners, all stock-exchange, all factory owners, all small or big thefts, all exploiters united against it" (Lenin, 1992; 58-9).

I can say that local autonomy forms a part of socialist revolution which has to complete the democratic development in its bourgeois sense. In addition, none of the socialist revolution can be rural in main. The working class is an urban class. It demands and searches for the support of the rural proletarians and of the socialist intellectuals. The other sections of society, as in the case of the Paris Commune, go into the hegemony of the proletariat due to the pressures of the conjuncture. Many of them leave from the movement when they lose their hopes and interests in the movement. However, such a phenomenon refers to the socialist characteristic of the revolution. They also reduce the revolution to the democratic and civil socialist levels in terms of historical perspective and the social purposes.

As Lenin said, the conditions of a successful social revolution were the highly developed productive forces and highly prepared proletariat. He said that each of these conditions were absent in 1871 of France. "French capitalism was less developed and France was especially a petty bourgeois (artisans, peasants, shopkeepers, etc.) country. The proletariat had neither a serious political organization nor mass trade unions or cooperative unions" (Lenin, 1992; 59-60).

Lenin's contributive evaluation about the Paris Commune was the fact that he attributed a name of socialist revolution to the commune because this form of the proletarian dictatorship completed the era of the bourgeois revolutions. In addition, the development of the bourgeois reforms was completed also with the commune. After 1871, a new bourgeois revolution lost its necessity. The agenda was the socialist revolution from then on (Gorbunov and Yeremina, 1996; 196-7). Here the socialist revolution is determined historically. The

commune is defined as the first socialist revolution since it completed the period of “the democratic revolution”. Its bourgeois and proletarian characteristic was related with the fact that the revolution of the bourgeoisie could be moved forward to the end only by the proletariat.

4.3 The Stages of Revolution in Turkey

Both the circles of the NDR, which covered the 27 May groups, the Yön circle of Avcıoğlu, and *the Aydınlık* circle of Mihri Belli and other socialist groups saw the development of the bourgeois revolution, or democratic revolution in Turkey as a process beginning from 1908 Young Turk Revolution, to 1920s of the Kemalist reforms, and then 27 May 1960. However, among all, NDR circles only, as in our case, *the Aydınlık*, see the period between 1946 and 27 May 1960 as a counter-revolution and 27 May 1960 as a new possibility for NDR. However, the advocates of the socialist revolution thesis argued that 27 May 1960 was the end of the bourgeois revolution in Turkey and pointed to a new period for socialist struggle rather than the NDR struggle. These different views are presented below.

4.3.1 The National Liberation Struggle

The nationalist thought in some sections of the petty bourgeois intellectuals after the proclamation of the Second Constitution in 1908 was developed and against this background, the national liberation war through numerous “Society for the Protection of Rights” after the occupation of the country was organised. “**Leading cadres**” of the liberation struggle was ***the petty bourgeois bureaucracy*** which originated from the tradition of the Young Turks. It is sure that the “physical force of the struggle” was formed by “the **workers**” as in all national liberation struggles. However, “***the Anatolian workers did not participate in the Liberation War with their independent class organisations and aims based their own ideologies***” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 19).

The enemies of our liberation struggle were the imperialist states, their manservant Greek armies, the Caliph, the Galatia Bankers which were the partners of the imperialism in Turkey and the other non-Muslim comprador bourgeoisie, a section of feudality which tried to organise people around the religious ideology against the national struggle. That is, the enemies in our ***Second National Liberation*** struggle today (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 19).

İzmir Economic Congress held in 4 March of 1923 determines the economic policy of the state. It also reveals the contradictions between the farmers, the merchants and the industrialists and their easily emerged alliance against the proletariat. The congress accepted the private entrepreneurship as the economic policy and the growing-up policy of the national bourgeoisie. *The Aydınlık* observes that “the government of the national state in the name of the interests of the native bourgeoisie was necessary” in the conditions where the capitalist system was powerful in economic terms and where politically unconscious labourers went to workshops leaving their arms after the war. Afterwards, because of the weakness of the local bourgeoisie in terms of its organisation, economic power and ideas, and with the necessities of the world economic crisis in 1930s, the state had to extend its economic activity in order to support and organise the private entrepreneurs in the country. The weak and un-organised bourgeoisie raised its cooperation and solidarity with the bureaucracy who made all economic decisions about public services, credits, quotas, permissions, thunders, et cetera. This close relationship between the upper stratum of the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie also resulted in the conversion of the significant portions of the upper stratum of the bureaucracy into industrialists. *The Aydınlık* observes that the origin of the many industrialists is the public servant (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 22).

The Aydınlık does not appreciate the private entrepreneurship and the growth of the national bourgeoisie as the economic policy of the new state in neither for the early period nor the later one, despite observing the objective and conjunctural conditions of the world and Turkey and does not attribute to

the etatist period a popular left characteristic as will be seen in the left circles in Turkey after. Class base of the economic policy was anti-proletarian.

Therefore, we have a “**reactionary alliance**” opposed to all national and democratic movement, and used the reactionary forces against the national classes and tried to prevent the development of the consciousness and organisation of the labouring classes and the emergence of the advantageous conditions through which the labouring classes could become the foundational force of the national movement. Immediately **after the transition to multi-party system**, newly formed socialist parties (those of Şefik Hüsnü Değmer and Esat Adil) were closed, its constitutive members were arrested, anti-imperialist publications were silenced, and the worker trade unions faced pressure from the state. The penalties determined by 141 and 142. Articles of the Code of Penalties, which had been imported previously from Fascist Italy in order to prevent communist and proletarian movement, were aggravated (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 23).

Since the anti-imperialist movement was oppressed by “the imperialism and its compradors”, says *the Aydınlık*, “the political struggle took place between the Republican People’s Party (hereafter briefly RPP) and the DP between the years 1946 and 1950”. Afterwards, the petty bourgeoisie characterises the RPP while “the comprador alliance” determines the DP and the Justice Party (hereafter briefly the JP) and led into a polarisation between them. With the rising of the influence of the imperialism in the country, **comprador character of the DP increased** and the party liquidated its existing intellectual and democrat wing within itself. On the other side, the RPP’s opposition “pruned” its existing “comprador-feudal wing” within itself after developments in 1956 and 1965 and turned into a party which “**represents the interests and the reformism of the petty bourgeoisie**” more than before (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 23).

The yoke of the imperialism over the country manifested itself in the ***inflationist*** and the ***dependent*** economic policy in foreign capital, developed the ***comprador bourgeoisie*** and the ***big land owners*** which made agricultural production, and raised the polarisation in the land distribution. Rapid mechanisation of agriculture improved the capitalisation of agriculture which had already begun in the 19th century and developed “wage labour”, that is “agricultural labouring” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 23). **It is interesting that Aydınlık shifts the emphasis from “the feudality” to “big land owners” which makes agricultural products.**

The imperialism also facilitated its exploitation with ***capital exportation*** besides its commodity exports. National market, and the resources were taken over, and an extensive ***profit transfers*** were realised through the investments in ***montage industry and the consumption industry***. In addition to the means of exploitation through some ***institution and aid programmes***, the comprador government entered ***NATO*** which was established against ***socialism and national democratic movements*** by the imperialist system. Opposition against the involvement in the ***Korean War*** and all attempts for ***socialism*** and for the establishment of the ***proletarian-peasant alliance*** were oppressed (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 24).

4.3.2 “The Kemalist Reforms Period”

What occurred between 1918 and 1922 was described with the terms “struggle”, “war” rather than “revolution”. Similarly, Kemalist period was described as a “reformist period” rather than revolutionary one. This phenomenon is explained with the impossibilities and incoherent ideology of the leading petty bourgeois bureaucracy. In the Ottoman society, petty bourgeois bureaucracy tried to limit the feudal state in the name of liberties. But in the absence of the national industrial bourgeoisie there has no attempt at a coherent anti-imperialist struggle and could not realise a national democratic alliance with the labouring classes (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:20-1). On

the other hand, the national liberation victory empowered the petty bourgeois bureaucracy which led the struggle (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:20), and its struggle in the same line with the labouring masses of the people against the imperialism “in the first time” took it to “a coherent national line”. However, ***the urban and rural labourers were not organised and were politically and ideologically unconscious***. For this reason they could not participate in the “national state power” after the war. ***“The petty bourgeois bureaucracy which had to ally with one of the main classes*** (it is said “ana sınıflardan biriyle”) was obliged to ***“cooperate with and protect the interests of weak Turk bourgeois ie”*** which had never so much power as to compete with and resist against the imperialism. After the labourers went to their workshops when the war ended, the conditions of the capitalism in the time affected the acceptance of the petty bourgeois bureaucracy of ***a programme of development through the growing up of national bourgeois ie and private entrepreneurship***. The capitalist system was in a powerful period, and new socialism had many economic problems. In such conditions, *the Aydınlık* stated that “the petty bourgeoisie which had ***not an ideology peculiar to itself***” and affected by the world conditions could not apply to ***“a etatist economic policy in favour of the labouring classes”***. On the other side, the labouring masses were not organised and conscious, and could not force the petty bourgeoisie in this direction (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:21).

The cooperation which emerged after the petty bourgeoisie adopted the growing-up process of the national bourgeoisie could not acquire an anti-feudal characteristic. The republic (as new state’s regime proclaimed in 29 October 1923) was “established through the participation of ***the upper stratum of the petty bourgeois bureaucracy, undeveloped bourgeois ie and the feudality in a little degree, as alliance against the labouring classes***”. ***Right wing of the alliance*** was occupied by “the commercial bourgeoisie and the feudality” tended to cooperate in its nature with the imperialism. On the other side, ***“the progressive and reformist wing”***, the petty bourgeois bureaucracy could not eliminate the right wing of the alliance

through a relationship to be set with the urban and rural labourers and could not lead into “an anti-feudal revolution” and not went forward towards “the democratic revolution”. *The Aydınlik* states that this situation was related with the characteristics of the unindustrialised countries in the age of the imperialism. It is argued that “the petty bourgeoisie whose interest compromises with the labouring classes against the feudalism and the imperialism cannot lead the anti-feudal revolution until the emergence of an effective socialist movement which will make it to enter the national democratic activity line” (*the Aydınlik*, 1968:21). Interest of the petty bourgeoisie coincides with the interest of the labouring classes “against the feudalism and the imperialism”. There is a limited coincidence. In addition, only the socialist movement can create the conditions of the anti-feudal revolution and the national democratic attitude of the petty bourgeoisie. In addition, “The petty bourgeoisie, on the side of the urban and rural proletariat, which leads it in the action, can follow only a coherent national democratic activity line to the end” (*the Aydınlik*, 1968:21).

For the petty bourgeoisie to follow a coherent national democratic line, it must take its place on the side of the proletariat which lead the action. But what does the proletariat make action for? In addition, why should the petty bourgeois bureaucracy place itself to the side of the proletariat for “its” national democratic revolution? If we have a socialist movement and the proletariat which can achieve to a leadership in action (it is said so above), does this not mean that socialist and proletarian movements acquire an independent *political* power. Moreover, the dominant class alliance, which is the ruling classes, of the new state, the republic, demonstrates a clear class “alliance against the labouring classes”. There can be intra-class struggle among the sections of the ruling classes and each of them can search for an alliance to itself within the *ruled classes*. We face **a bourgeois revolution in the establishment of the republic** of “**the upper stratum of the petty bourgeois bureaucracy, undeveloped bourgeois ie and the feudality in a little degree**”. And, the characteristics of the bourgeois revolution and of the

resultant state are given by the characteristics of the ruling classes, their fractions, their bureaucratic *instrument*, the autonomy of the bureaucracy, and the balance of power between them. The bourgeois character of the revolution is also most clear in its establishment “**as alliance against the labouring classes**”. The other point is about “the **feudality**”. I wonder whether *the Aydınlik* mean only the big land owners rather than the support and the base of the republic in the rural areas. **Smallholders** are also another *base* of the new bourgeois republic (meanwhile small holders are a historical category which is not limited to feudalism, or Asiatic mode of production. Acceptation of its domination does not depend on the debate about whether the Ottoman society is feudal or Asiatic, or a mixture of them). Another question is whether the support of the feudality in a little degree to the republic (the revolution) is related only with the feudal interests or with the interests of the big land ownership in the new bourgeois republic? These are the most controversial points which *the Aydınlik* deal with throughout its other issues.

After the liberation (completed with the military victory over the Greeks in 1922 and with other international treaties with the enemy countries of the first world war till 1923) “struggles between the petty bourgeois bureaucracy which has a secularist and national characteristics, undeveloped bourgeoisie and the feudality, and the imperialism’s aims of the extension of its own the world-wide domination determines our history”. “The progressive petty bourgeois bureaucracy represented in the personality of Mustafa Kemal” attempted some “secularist-democratic” reforms in the superstructure and succeeded in its attempt to a large degree. These reforms were levelled against the feudal superstructure in the ideological, political and cultural spheres (*the Aydınlik*, 1968:21). However, the fact that a land reform was not realised and in relation with this that powerful attempts were not made for a national industrial development, the reforms in the superstructure “**did not base on its economic foundation and could not acquire a revolution ary character**” (*the Aydınlik*, 1968:21-2). It should be noted that *the Aydınlik*

uses the term “**reform**” not “**revolution**” as in widely used terms as “Kemalist revolution” in Turkey. *The Aydınlık* appreciates Kemalist reforms and the position of the petty bourgeois bureaucracy as the left wing of the ruling alliance of the new state **rather than** the Kemalist period in terms of revolutionary success and the ruling class alliances.

“Kemalist revolution is an uncompleted national democratic revolution”. It did not destroy the big landed property which was the source of the feudal big land owners. It did not nationalise the exportation and the importation upon which the imperialism was based. It tried to create “the national bourgeoisie” through capitalist policy of development “in the age of imperialism”. However, the Kemalist revolution whose armed struggle was the National Liberation war defeated the enemies through armed struggle within the national border, abolished the feudal state and established the republic. It struggled with the ideological bases of the feudal state, and nationalised the workshops of the foreign capital (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 289). Erdost and Kaymak argue that the imperialism could create a comprador class which was composed of the Muslim Turkish bourgeoisie through commodity and capital exportation. The export and import had to be nationalised. In addition, a radical land reform had to be realised. After then, “a socialist formation” had to be aimed. “In the imperialist age”, an unindustrialised agricultural society which was open to capitalist development and to the world capitalism could not protect its independency (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 290). Erdost and Kaymak sees a socialist direction for Turkey of 1930s provided that the economic base of the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal big land owners was able to be abolished.

In the period of Kemalist revolution, a national bourgeoisie which could lead the national democratic revolution was absent. Erdost and Kaymak quotes from Şefik Hüsnü Değmer who observed that in 1923, the 90 percent of the commercial activity belonged to the foreigners. Erdost and Kaymak says that according to the industrial statistics of 1915, there were 264 workshops which

employed 10 and above workers. 179 workshops belonged to the non-Muslim employees. Only roughly 40 firms were operated by the Muslims. 22 firms belonged to the state. There were no national bourgeoisie which could call for a national market. Erdost and Kaymak state that in the absence of the national industrial bourgeoisie there could not be any national commercial bourgeoisie. Commercial capital can be capitalist commercial capital only when it shares the surplus product which is produced in capitalist production. In the absence of the national industrial bourgeoisie, the commercial bourgeoisie can be only an agent of the foreign capital, or alternatively “a usurer-wholesale trader” as a pre-capitalist category (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 290).

The first mission of the democratic revolution is to abolish the big landed property. Kemalist revolution did not fulfil this work. Democratic revolution was not realised in terms of the relations of production. It implemented a gendarme force over the feudal land owners, the peasants, the artisans and the small shopkeepers which were based on the old technology in the single party regime. “The Kemalist revolution was based on the petty bourgeoisie, the working class, the peasantry which were the base forces and the leading cadres of the revolution represented not the working class ideologically but the petty bourgeois radicals” Erdost and Kaymak now seem to apply **Marx’s observations** about the class formation and the representation of the peasantry in the *18. Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* to the petty bourgeois radicals of the Kemalist revolution:

The petty bourgeoisie is a weak class in proportion to the bourgeoisie in economic terms, are dispersed by its nature, spreads over the various work places, unorganised. Since it is a dispersed, unorganised class, the power in the hands of the petty bourgeois radicals, though reflecting the ideological hopes of this class, becomes an independent power which cannot be influenced and controlled by this class and **bureaucratised** (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 291).

Here it should be noted that the writers distinguish the petty bourgeoisie in general and the petty bourgeois radicals. They continue to say that

in a country which is open to capitalism, the petty bourgeoisie with its very small portion is prone to the embourgeoisment and with its large portion to the proletarianisation. As one section of the petty bourgeoisie becomes bourgeois, this change reflects over the views of the bureaucratic estate which takes the power in its hand. For this reason, the bourgeois democratic revolution under the leadership of the petty bourgeoisie is obliged to be uncompleted. The petty bourgeoisie cannot complete the democratic revolution (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 291).

Erdost and Kaymak argue that, claims about the completeness of the democratic revolution in Turkey after the proclamation of the republic and the transformation into the multi-party system after the second war which led into the Democrat Party's government is, wrong. They also state that multi-party system brought with itself "an antidemocratic" life which was "closed to the left" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 290-1). In addition, in the age of imperialism, these developments do not rule out the fact that "the nation is kept under the pressure". The imperialism has "a reactionary tendency" and implements pressure over the nations and allies with the reactionary tendencies and forces whatever the political system is (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 291). Political system is not adequate for the completion of the democratic revolution. In addition, the counter-revolution which seized the political power cannot be counted as "democracy" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 291).

Erdost and Kaymak observe that in the industrial statistics of 1964, there were 3012 workshops which employed more than 10 workers. 2645 within this figure belonged to "local private capital" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 297). They suggest that many of them form "the middle bourgeoisie" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 299). "As it is the fact that the bourgeoisie is not the dominant class, it has lost the leading class characteristic of the revolution in the ages of the national democratic revolutions, as it was formerly the case in the age of the bourgeois democratic revolutions" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 298). *The Aydınlık* and Erdost, and Erdost and Kaymak here never attribute a revolutionary leadership to the national bourgeoisie during the national democratic revolution in the age of imperialism. The argument is that the

national bourgeoisie is not a target for the revolutionary forces since it is not the sovereign class. In addition, “within the imperialist world system”, “the national section of the local bourgeoisie (the section which is interested in the national independency): 1) contradicts with the monopoly capital- since the national bourgeoisie has a complete development possibility only in a independent country; on the other hand, the monopoly bourgeoisie represents the cosmopolite capital, the dependency of the exploited countries and the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie contradict; 2) contradicts with the pre-capitalist relations of production and the reactionism- since all pre-capitalist relations, the reactionism prevent the development of capitalism, the overspending and the concentration of the markets; 3) contradicts with the proletariat- since the proletariat points to the socialist relations of production which means the negation of the capitalism within the bosom of the bourgeois relations of production” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 298). The national section of the local bourgeoisie contradicts with the foreign capital, with the pre-capitalist relations and with the proletariat. Which contradiction is the most important is contingent on the political struggle and the development of the national democratic revolution. Erdost and Kaymak argue that “the national bourgeoisie” “could not reach in the political consciousness of its own class and has not struggled politically in this direction in its history”. The revolutionary struggle of the masses is more dangerous than the reactionism in its eyes. The proletarian ideology is more dangerous than the ideology of the monopoly bourgeoisie in its eyes. “Its fear from socialism moves it to the armful of the comprador classes”. Nevertheless, Erdost and Kaymak do not lose their hopes: “For this reason, the national section of the local bourgeoisie (that section which should have an interest in the conditions where Turkey is independent and democratic country) will remember its nationality only in the moment of a great revolutionary rising and will leave the comprador bourgeoisie in order not to live its fate”. However, this is valid for “the stage of the national democratic revolution”. It is “in the stage of the socialist revolution” that “the national bourgeoisie as a class will stand opposed to the revolution” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 298).

The national section of the local bourgeoisie seems to be the weakest point of the ruling classes just like the Russia which was the weakest link in the imperialist system in the time of Lenin. It also seems to be the petty bourgeoisie which moves towards the proletariat in the time of revolution. Even though this class fears socialism, it can be won by the national democratic revolutionary uprising. It can remember its national origin and can leave the comprador bourgeoisie if it does not want to be liquidated by the revolutionary forces.

We can ask some questions: should we neglect the national bourgeoisie as a target in the revolution simply as it is weak? Can it leave the comprador bourgeoisie in the revolutionary uprising? Is it correct to define "the national bourgeoisie" as such: "it is the bourgeoisie which the local industrial capital forms, whose activity essentially limits the dependency of the country's economy on the imperialism to a certain degree, which has a positive impact over the balance-sheet of the foreign commerce and hence can prevent the imperialist exploitation to a certain degree, and the commercial bourgeoisie which is located in the sphere of this bourgeoisie". I think that as Erdost and Kaymak have observed the national bourgeoisie was rather aware of the socialist threat and that it therefore tended to the reactionary forces against the mass movement, the national bourgeoisie shall possibly adopt a capitalist attitude against the revolutionary movement. As for its isolation from the comprador classes, it can be said that this is possible only when its single domination existed as a possibility. Let me say that so called national bourgeoisie can liquidate the foreign capital and its extensions only for its single domination. But this can be an international class conflict of the bourgeoisies as in the case of the imperialist wars and as for the definition of "the national bourgeoisie", we see that the criteria is its capability of limiting "the dependency of the country's economy on the imperialism", having "a positive impact over the balance-sheet of the foreign commerce" to "prevent the imperialist exploitation". The bourgeoisie is "national" when it can prevent and limit the imperialist exploitation thanks to an independent and strong

national economy in front of the imperialism. I think that these definitions all are related with the power and capabilities of the national bourgeoisie rather than the definition of the national bourgeoisie. Since Marx has not such a definition, I can just say that what is decisive for the identification and personification of capital as such can be simply the national origins of the capitalists. Geographical space of production, circulation and realisation of individual capitals is not necessarily fixed but is restructured through the movements of capitals. We can talk about “a capitalist Turkish citizen” who employs “Turkish wage-labourers”, but we do not talk about “Turkish surplus-value”, “Turkish necessary labour” or “Turkish commodity”, etc. But we can talk about “the national income”, “the national production”, “the national community”, “the national state”, “the national army”, “the national tariff barriers”, “the national legal system”, “the national foreign policy”, “the national education”, and “the national culture”. However, the classes which form the modern bourgeois society or “a national society” cannot be defined with their cultural and citizenship identifications. Leaving aside capital and capitalist, the working class, however, needs a relatively fixed spatial framework for its reproduction. For this reason, the place for the worker to work and live is more fixed than the place of capital which circulates and moves from one place to another. Only for this reason, the working class is more “national”. When Marx talks about the class which can elevate itself to the national scale, he means that this class can have the opportunity to represent and lead the national community and hence the national state. However, this “nationality” is related with the hegemony of a class which forms itself as a dominant class in the national community. Only if *the Aydınlık*, Erdost, and Erdost and Kaymak point to the absence of the national hegemony of the national section of the local bourgeoisie, we can say that the question is the bourgeois hegemony over the national community rather than the national composition of the bourgeois rulers. It can be asked whether even the most “national” bourgeoisie faces with the struggle of the proletariat or with the socialist threat will remember its “national” characteristic whatever it is.

Erdost and Kaymak state that the ideas that “the local capitalism cannot be distinguished, abstracted from the imperialism and that the imperialism and the local capital are merged, i.e. that there is no contradiction between them, that without touching the one the other cannot be touched” are wrong (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 298-9). They say that the laws such as “the general law of the capitalist accumulation”, and “the law of surplus-value”, “the law of competition and anarchy in production” maintain their validity in the imperialism. However, “The fact that the imperialism is a stage of the capitalism is something different and the fact that the contradictions between the imperialism and the dependent country are something different”. For example, “the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation” may struggle against “the bourgeoisie of the dominating nation”, i.e. a capitalist country may struggle for its own dependency against another capitalist country although both of them are subjected to the same capitalist laws (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 299). “The fact that the imperialism is subjected to the economic laws of capitalism does not abolish the contradictions between the countries which are subjected to the laws of capitalism”. The imperialism is the last and the highest stage of capitalism. But they ask: “Does this mean that an imperialist state and the capitalist of the exploited country is the extension and the result of each other!” These ideas conceal the difference between the countries which export capital and the countries which pay tribute to the owner of capital and are outside “the scientific socialism”. They state that “the basic contradiction in a capitalist society is the contradiction between labour and capital. Leninism points to main three contradictions in the imperialism: 1) the contradiction between labour and capital in the metropolis; 2) the contradiction between the imperialist states themselves; 3) the contradiction between the exploiter and exploited countries, between several civilised ‘nation’ and the colonised peoples and the dependent nations”. The capitalist camp is divided into the owners of financial capital and exploiter imperialist force and “the oppressed and the exploited colonised and dependent countries’ peoples which form the majority”. For this reason, they say that Leninism distinguishes “the proletarian revolution” and “the liberation

movement of the oppressed peoples” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 299). However, all of them are “revolutionary movements” against the common enemy, the imperialism. Leninism suggests the proletarian revolution for the developed countries, and national liberation movements for the colonised and dependent countries. Erdost and Kaymak conclude that “Yes the imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism, it is true; but the imperialism which made the country into a semi-dependent condition is not a stage of capitalism in the semi-dependent country” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 300). But I must **firstly** ask whether this imperialism which created dependency is not the future of the capitalism in the semi-dependent country and **secondly**, is the colonised condition the alternative for the dependent condition? “Colonial period” collapsed in the decades after the Second World War. and “dependency” seems to be used for the lower echelons of the capitalist countries. Thirdly, whether it in the context of Leninism or not, but we must ask whether “national liberation movement” can be abstracted from class contradictions and capitalist development. National liberation movements are also led by a class or a section of a class which represent the nation. These movements are led and organised by the petty bourgeois democrats or the national bourgeoisie in the backward regions of capitalist economy. They aim to liberate the country from direct occupation or threat. Liberation always requires an enemy. American colonies fight against the British rule. Greeks fight against the Ottoman Empire. Turkish nationalists fight against the Greek occupation in the Western Anatolia, for instance. African and Asian countries fight against the European imperialists which were the direct colonial forces in these continents. Vietnamese fight against France and the USA. China faced with direct Japanese threat. France organised a national front against the Nazis. Palestine is still fighting against the Israeli’s occupation in Palestine. National liberation of a country always occurs in the conditions where the country or a people are under the occupation or a control of alien state force. The important aspect of these movements in the view of Engels is the fact that they clear the obstacles before the development of the bourgeois sovereignty and the international existence of the proletarian

movement. National liberation of a country implies the bourgeois sovereignty. Engels stated in his preface to the 1893's Italian translation of the *Manifesto*: "in any country, unless there is national independency, the sovereignty of the bourgeoisie is impossible" (*Turkish translation*, 1993; 103). This was important because the bourgeoisie had not been the sovereign class. Again Engels stated in his preface to the 1892's Polish translation of the *Manifesto*: "The aristocracy could neither protect the independency of **Poland** nor obtain it again; as for today, this independency is at least unimportant for the bourgeoisie. However, this is necessary for the concordant cooperation of the European nations. This can be obtained only by the young **Polish** proletariat and stand secure only in these hands. This is because the **remaining workers of the Europe need the independency of Poland as much as Polish workers**" (*Turkish translation*, 1993; 100-1). National liberation clears the obstacles before the development of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, in other words, the obstacles of old society. Marx, Engels and Lenin support the most progressive elements of a society against the elements which advocated the old relations. They support the bourgeois development against the feudal forces and relations. However, they also support the proletarian development against the bourgeois forces and relations.

4.3.3 Anti-Kemalist Counter-Revolution of dominant classes

In the age of the imperialism in the societies which have not completed its democratic revolution, the contradiction between the readily comprador bourgeoisie and the feudality and the petty bourgeoisie becomes a hostile contradiction with the imperialism that put the undeveloped economy under its yoke (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:22).

The imperialism "divides the national and non-national from each other" in the countries it exploits. After the world war, the imperialism invaded Turkey economically. On the other hand, the *bourgeoisie* had developed during the war as results of the speculative activities and the protection of the state. This bourgeoisie cooperated with the *international monopolies* in order to increase its exploitation of the Turkish labourers. This alliance found in its

side as an ally “**the landlords** (toprak ağaları) which had become powerful with the policy of high agricultural prices during the war period and the **religious and reactionary** waves controlled by them”. After 1947, the imperialism penetrated into Turkey in the form of economic and military aid of Truman doctrine and Marshall Plan. It immediately begun to control economy and exerted its political influence. The bourgeoisie, which became rich during the war, allied with the imperialism and begun to see the protection and support of the state, which had been provided by giving some share to **the bureaucracy, as a barrier and superfluous before its development after 1946** (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:22). Although the state intervention into economy was a support to the development of capitalism, it also limited the bourgeoisie and its liberties because of the influence of the secularist-national forces in the state (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:22-3). The **progressive Kemalist wing of the state power had seen the etatism in content that he controlled the bourgeoisie and made the feudality move backward**. Attempts for the land reform and the Village Institutes were the proofs of this attitude. Because of the conflicts among the classes in the state power, and according to a change of power balance among themselves the etatism was used in order to protect, to support and to control these classes till 1946. For *the Aydınlık*, in the state power, **there were two broad lines**, the one was the state which could not realise the land reform and support the private entrepreneurship, the other was the state which made reforms and tried to stay in the national line. “**The alliance of the imperialism + the comprador bourgeoisie + feudality of 1946 went towards seizing the state in a more clear form and to eliminate all sort of national characteristics**” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:23).

It is interesting that although the petty bourgeois bureaucracy objectively needs an alliance with the labouring classes, or a mass support in its power search, *the Aydınlık* presents a revolutionary duty to the petty bourgeois bureaucracy by suggesting that it should make a national democratic struggle by cooperating with the socialist movement which represents the interests of

the proletariat. What is proposed is the establishment of an alliance with the labouring classes which the petty bourgeoisie could not, or did not; do in the early period of the republic. What *the Aydınlık* seems to be preparing and presenting is a revolution strategy to the petty bourgeois bureaucracy (civil and military) since it has never a coherent and clear revolutionary ideology and strategy. But we know from *the Aydınlık* that “the petty bourgeois bureaucracy ... carries the nationalist-reformist line of Kemalism in its tradition”. If its ideology and struggle line is not coherent and clear, this does not mean that it has not an ideology, tradition and struggle line.

What happened happens and after 1961, the petty bourgeois bureaucracy who could not ally with the proletariat and could not step in this direction could not make a revolutionary struggle against the imperialism and the feudality (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:24). **THIS OCCURS TWICE**. The petty bourgeois bureaucracy did not ally with the proletariat again. In the 19th century Europe, the bourgeoisie allies with the proletariat against the feudality. After the overthrow of the feudality, only the section of the bourgeoisie which is excluded from the ruling alliance in the state power allies with the proletariat for its involvement to the ruling alliance (for instance new industrial bourgeoisie or other new section). The situation is described and analysed by **Marx** in his *Class Struggles in France* towards and during 1848 revolutions.

“The fact that the national-democratic alliance could not be established”, argues *the Aydınlık*, “can be explained with the level of the consciousness and organisation of the urban and rural proletariat in 1961 and with the absence of an effective movement which represented the ideology and the interest of the proletariat” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:24-5). **THIS OCCURS TWICE, TOO**. From this, do we have to understand that for the petty bourgeois bureaucracy to enter into a national-democratic line, must the proletariat have been organised around its class ideology and targets? Or we can wonder whether the action of the petty bourgeois bureaucracy in 1960 May

had different strategy and aspirations than “national and democratic” revolution strategy of *the Aydınlik*? Or we can ask if what the petty bourgeois bureaucracy who made 27 May intervention wanted to utilise was the discontentment and dissatisfaction of the masses? I think we face a typical mass mobilisation which was to be utilised by the petty bourgeois bureaucracy (and the most organised section of it, the military bureaucracy) in order to change the hegemonic position in the ruling class alliance in 1960 May.

For *the Aydınlik*, after the May 1960, the petty bourgeois bureaucracy who brought about “a democratic constitution” having “a social content” **“GAVE ITS NECESSARILY TEMPORARY POWER** to the absolute sovereignty of the forces which cooperated with the imperialism” (*the Aydınlik*, 1968:25). We understand that 27 May did not alter the ruling forces (“the forces which cooperated with the imperialism”). 27 May movement is “a significant **stage in the democratic development** process of Turkey” and the resultant constitution. Despite the continuity of fascist laws and the limitations over consciousness, socialist organisation and socialist thought could not be prevented. “This situation is an expression of the line in which **a BALANCE is formed between the dominant alliance and the national forces**. The struggle between the fascist forces under the control of the imperialism and the national democratic forces will determine whether the balance is to be established in a more fascist or a more democratic line”. *The Aydınlik* hopes that the struggle will determine the future of Turkey and absolutely end with “the victory of the national forces against the imperialism, with the NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION” (*the Aydınlik*, 1968:25). Again **we can wonder whether there is a balance** in a condition where the petty bourgeois bureaucracy which introduced “a democratic constitution” having “a social content” **“GAVE ITS NECESSARILY TEMPORARY POWER** to the absolute sovereignty of the forces which cooperated with the imperialism” and when there emerges **A FASCISM PROBLEM** (which assumes a proletarian threat from below towards the bourgeois domination and also

assumes the completion of any democratic stage of the bourgeois revolution).

Erdost's article "The Place of the Petty Bourgeoisie in the revolution" explains the exact position of classes in Turkey in terms of their revolutionary and counter-revolutionary characteristics. Counter-revolutionary classes are "dominant classes". Revolutionary classes are all "national classes". They are "national bourgeoisie", "petty bourgeoisie", and "the proletariat". Class analysis is accompanied with the analysis of revolution and counter-revolution in Turkey. The latter analysis is in fact based on the national democratic revolution strategy. Class, revolution and strategy are three foundations of *the Aydınlık's* argumentation. Even though this trinity is the most powerful aspect of *the Aydınlık*, it is also the weakest characteristic. Analysis of the revolutionary development of Turkey is deduced from the strategy which is presupposed to be correct in advance, and then class analyses are made. Revolutionary debate is followed by class analysis. This is one of the methodological defects of *the Aydınlık*. On the other hand, its merit is to try to see the classes in a revolutionary and strategic perspective. Classes are not seen only in terms of their economic development and their appearances.

After the national liberation war, the imperialist enemy is defeated, feudal state is overthrow, feudal ideologies are discouraged, and foreign capital is begun to be nationalised under the leadership of "revolutionary petty bourgeois intellectuals". In this period, large part of the population is composed of "urban and rural petty bourgeoisie", whose ideology, "independence and democracy" is "represented by the revolutionary petty bourgeois democrats" who are "the leaders of the victorious army". Above and over this petty bourgeoisie there is not any "national bourgeoisie which can be sovereign over it". "National state" is clearly opposed to "foreign capital". "Feudal big landowners" (feudal müteğallibe) has not an adequate power to influence the state power (Erdost, 1970a:248). Political and legal

superstructure represented “the class ideology” of the “urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie”. However, the link between this superstructure and this class is “extremely weak” since “small firms are diffused and unorganised”. “The petty bourgeois intellectuals became a power which was disconnected from the class which it represented and became sovereign due to central command which was provided by military control”. However, this sovereignty was ended after economic development of “the counter-revolutionary forces” (Erdost, 1970a:249).

This analysis follows Marx’s relative autonomy thesis in the context of first and second imperial period of France. But Marx would not say that this relative autonomy was replaced with counter-revolution. The first empire was replaced by restoration, rather than counter-revolution in strict sense. The second empire replaced the republic after subsequent defeats of the proletariat (red republic), the petty-bourgeois democracy or republic (the Montagne) and the royalist bourgeoisie. Neither the proletariat nor the bourgeoisie in all kinds could govern the state. Louis Bonaparte could govern it since the bourgeoisie could not. Erdost had to say that the sovereignty of the petty bourgeoisie was being replaced with the bourgeoisie which had accumulated power.

Erdost says that as Lenin stated, the purpose of the bourgeois revolution was to eliminate the fetters of old society. But in Turkey, the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie did not eliminate the old society and did not touch “the foundations of the backward property relations” on which feudal superstructure was erected. Even though after 1928 the foreign firms were begun to be nationalised, foreign commerce continued to be the activity of the foreign agents. But this was a condition for independence, as Atatürk had previously pointed to. Foreign commerce thereby strengthened the comprador bourgeoisie. Integration to the capitalist system prepared the condition of indebtedness and “national state” became again “semi-dependent” in the face of the imperialist states. On the other hand, capitalist

development strengthened the bourgeoisie, and each democratic attempt towards the agricultural structure was opposed by the feudal landowners, and multi-party system increased their influence over the political power (Erdost, 1970a:249). The classes above and over the petty bourgeoisie increased their economic power and hence the change in the economic base as such ended the sovereignty of the petty bourgeois democrats. Afterwards, “democratic and at the same time national state which was based on the sovereignty of the petty bourgeois intellectuals” was replaced by “the domination of the imperialism- the comprador bourgeoisie- the feudal landowners” and by their “counter-revolution” (Erdost, 1970a:249). Erdost argues that “bourgeois democratic revolution” was therefore not completed. “As long as the revolution is not completed, the struggle between the revolution and counter-revolution goes on; as counter-revolution takes strength, it seizes the sovereignty” (Erdost, 1970:249).

“The basic problem of revolution is the problem of power”, says and adds Erdost correctly; “a correct revolution strategy” and struggle requires knowing which classes have to be overthrow (Erdost, 1970a:249). **Interests of foreign capital**, its extensions, its local agents and big landowners in feudal or capitalist sense are surely dominant class interests in Turkey. However, the national origin of capital is very important for *the Aydınlık* since it determines the distribution of wealth produced in Turkey, the state and the class relations in the country. Foreign capital is not only capital but also the imperialism. Big landed property is not only landed interest, but also a factor which determines the composition of ruling class alliance and class balance in the country. However, must these “dominant classes” be necessarily presented as “counter-revolutionary”? I think that they can be “counter-revolutionary” only against the working classes. The fact that so called “national bourgeoisie” can confront with the foreign bourgeoisie, the imperialist states, and the imperialist capitals does not necessarily mean that the interests of the national bourgeoisie always contradicts with the interests of the foreign capital. Rather, the size and the share of the local capitals in

international economic relations, instead of its nationality and geographical position, can make the national bourgeoisie a weak rival or partner of the foreign capital of the imperialism. Here we observe that objectively weak local bourgeoisie is in a position of the petty bourgeoisie in front of the powerful foreign capital. The relatively small local capital sees the foreign capital as rival and enemy to itself. Definition of dominant classes of *the Aydınlık* (in its name, here Erdost) is shadowed by national identifications. Here, *the Aydınlık* goes away from Marxian theory in which class analysis follows the categories of capital and different capitals are defined in terms of production, circulation and realisation of surplus labour, surplus-value, and the national context is only the framework of local capital or local mode of production and the framework of spatially defined class relations. The state defines the spatial framework of the local capitalist mode of production. For this reason, the state is presented as the political, legal and geographical framework of the local modes of capitalist production. When Marx says “German bourgeoisie”, for instance, he means the bourgeoisie in Germany, capitalist mode of production in Germany, spatially defined bourgeois class. The bourgeois class (capitalist class) is a universal category which manifests itself by capital rather than by nationality even though this manifestation always requires spatial, legal and cultural contexts as products of the history of local capital in general and of the society it dominates. Nationality of capitals and the bourgeoisies are related with their spatial formations, competitions, and monopolies in and between themselves. For Marx, the state rather than the national state, and similarly the capitalist class rather than national bourgeoisie is substantial and conceptual. Even a war between two national states is dealt with by Marx in terms of the confrontation of the rival capitals and classes in and between themselves. Inner problems of spatially defined capital are caused on the one hand, by the class struggle or class war and on the other hand, by accumulation and reproduction problems of capital. The fact that Marx abolishes the distinction between home politics and foreign politics for a country is in fact caused by the universality of capital. In this universality, “nationality” is not a substantial characteristic of

capital. In Marx's *Capital*, it should be noted, the spatial framework of capital is not at all "national state" just as the personification of capital, the capitalist, is not at all "the national bourgeoisie". But the framework is the capital as a universal category and its mode of production.

Last to mention is a quotation made by Erdost from Engels (*The Communist Manifesto*). This quotation is from Engels' 1893 Preface to Italian translation of the Manifesto (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 103): "In any country the domination of the bourgeoisie is impossible as long as there is not national independence" (Erdost, 1970a:253). **Here Engels stated** that only the Parisian workers attempted to overthrow the bourgeois order in the 1848 revolutions. Italian, German and Austrian workers, on the other hand, did nothing but brought the bourgeoisie to the power from the beginning. "But in any country as long as national independence does not exist, the domination of the bourgeoisie is impossible" (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 103). But Engels pointed to the situations of Italy and Germany before 1848 revolutions. The former had been dependent on the Austrian Empire, and the latter had been indirectly but effectively under the yoke of the Russia (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 102). The 1848 revolutions brought the bourgeoisie into the power at the expense of the monarchical classes and interests. In addition, What Engels referred to is "the domination of the bourgeoisie" in the context of the 1848 revolutions which tried to lead into a bourgeois democratic order against the feudal states, monarchies, kingdoms, etc. Moreover, he is concerned with the bourgeois domination par excellence rather than "the domination of the national bourgeoisie". Furthermore, "dependence" meant "the subjection to the foreign sovereignty" (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 102). As far as I know, Turkey lived such a dependent condition only during the years after the end of the First World War (National Liberation Struggle).

The alliance of the feudal landowner (ağa) with the imperialism and the comprador capital: One of the counter-revolutionary classes of *the Aydınlık*

is the feudal landowner. "Feudal big landowners are the bastions extending into the villages of the counter-revolution" (Erdost, 1970a:253). The "revolutionary petty bourgeoisie", "the leaders of the revolution", says Erdost, wanted the distribution of land into the farmers having no land and the expropriation of the excess lands of the landowner. They issued a law for this purpose in 1937. This law demonstrated their victory over the big landowners. However, in 1945, a debate over a law in same kind divided the single party of the time, i.e. the RPP, and led into a formation of group which represented the interests of the big land owners. This group, "whose essence was composed of the big landowners" would form "the nucleus" of the party which governed the state after 1950. "That is to say, the big landowners came into dominant position in the political power" (Erdost, 1970a:254). We understand that "the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie" is overthrow by "the big landowners" who are the ally of the comprador bourgeoisie and the imperialist capital. However, the big landowners are the "nucleus" of the governing political party according to Erdost. The problem was about "the feudal big landowners". But it has now turned into the question of "the big landowners".

The big landowners in all kind oppose both socialist and national democratic revolution. National democratic revolution abolishes not only feudal and semi-feudal elements but also capitalist big landownership and support the nationalisation of land for capitalist development. The big landowner is "counter revolutionary" and allies with the imperialism and the comprador capital in the same direction against "the revolutionary movement of the masses". After the establishment of the multi-party system, the elements like ağa, müteğallibe, head of aşiret, seyhs, which all control the voting power of the peasants and obtain their power from "the economic dependency" and "the feudal ideologies" became the pillars of "the reactionary parties" in the peasantry and hence these elements increase their influence over these parties and as a result they "became one of the dominant classes" (Erdost, 1970a:255). Here what are meant by "the reactionary parties" are Democrat

Party between 1946 and 1960 and its extension after 1960, Justice Party, among the other religious parties and even fascist Nationalist Movement Party. Erdost had to call these “reactionary” parties, “the bourgeois” parties in all sorts, representing the sections of the bourgeoisie from the industrial capitalists to the rural bourgeoisie, from the bankers to the petty bourgeoisie. The fact that he calls the parties of the bourgeoisie, “reactionary” simply implies that the bourgeois revolution faces its own “diggers”, which are nothing but rising proletariat, poor peasantry with the intellectual and active support of the petty bourgeois intellectuals, the youth, and even the military officers tending to the left. Several years after the 27 may movement, the bourgeoisie begins to fear from the communism (see Buğra, 1997)

Feudal ideologies bandage the labouring masses to the dominant classes: “The wide popular masses which are staying in the backward relations in Turkey has been standing far away from the revolutionary development through the mediation of the counter-revolutionary superstructure’s institutions and have been the pillars much more of the reactionary classes” (Erdost, 1970a:255). **Here the integration** of the labouring masses to the dominant classes is presented as being realised through the reactionary ideologies. As far as I think of Marxian theory, the fact that the material conditions of the masses form the consciousness of the masses has a priority over the ideology of the dominant classes for the formation of the popular ideologies. The determination of superstructure as such is exaggerated. Erdost (*the Aydınlık*) points to the religious sects such as Nurculuk, Süleymancılık, and Nakşibendilik. These sects played an important role for the integration of masses of the peasant and shopkeepers which were faithful to the traditions to the counter-revolutionary classes. “In other words, the reactionary ideologies have played an effective role in the consolidation of the counter-revolution by connecting the wide labouring masses contradicting with the dominant classes to these dominant classes” (Erdost, 1970a:256). These institutions which had been in a conflict with “the power of the revolution” in “the period of Kemalist revolution” were now more

developed and even implicitly encouraged by the present government. Such a situation meant that there was a close relationship between these institutions and “the reactionary parties” (Erdost, 1970a:256).

4.4 27 May Movement

The advantages of the Korean War for the agricultural products begun to end and negative results of “the inflationist policy of the imperialist exploitation” over the labourers, wages and salaries emerged in the period of the DP government. The government also moved forward to destroy even “**the formal democracy**” and the basic requirements for all sort of opposition. The “sever reaction” emerged within “the petty bourgeois bureaucracy which was **faithful to Kemalist tradition**”. The imperialism’s economic policy and the results of the **economic crisis** produced “a **misery**” for the labouring classes and the petty bourgeoisie, **unemployment** and **high price rates** as the income rates fall. On the other side, “the comprador alliance which want to continue its power” begun to use the **reactionary and religious forces** in its already anti-Kemalist road. The result was the overthrow of the government by “**the military-civil petty bourgeois bureaucracy**” in 27 May 1960 (*the Aydınlık*, 1968 24).

We have seen above that **the ruling alliance of the republic** in its formation was divided into a left and right wing. **Left wing** represented by the Kemalist petty bourgeoisie originated from the democratic movement of the petty bourgeois movement in 1908’s Young Turk movement. It is the secularist, reformist and progressive wing of the **constitutive alliance of the state**. It also represents far more “controlled” (in terms of the bourgeoisie) and “national” orientation (in terms of the national bourgeoisie) and framework for etatism in economy. This wing was the **hegemonic section of the ruling class alliance** in the government of the state until the end of the Second World War. As *the Aydınlık* observed above, after the liberation war, hegemonic position of the left wing of the ruling alliance came from both the

weakness of the labouring classes and the weakness of the bourgeoisie and this hegemony was established within and over the ruling classes. But this hegemony is also accompanied with the domination of the ruling class alliance over the labourers and the proletariat:

The urban and rural labourers were not organised and did not have political and ideologically unconscious. For this reason they could not participate in the “national state power” after the war.

“The petty bourgeois bureaucracy which had to ally with one of the main classes (it is said “ana sınıflardan biriyle”)” was obliged to “cooperate with and protect the interests of weak Turk bourgeoisie” which had never so much power as to compete with and resist against the imperialism.

The capitalist system was in a powerful period, and newly organised socialism had many economic problems. In such conditions, “the petty bourgeoisie which had not an ideology peculiar to itself” and affected by the world conditions could not apply to “an etatist economic policy in favour of the labouring classes”.

On the other side, the labouring masses were not organised and conscious, and could not force the petty bourgeoisie in this direction (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 21).

Hegemony of the petty bourgeoisie went to the other sections of the ruling class alliance which had been configured in the early republic. In 27 May 1960, it went back to the petty bourgeoisie due to the crisis in economy and political life. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie was no longer “weak” and “undeveloped” as the proletariat lacked political consciousness and was unorganised as in the early years of the republic. In addition, the petty bourgeoisie was no longer the one which had not an ideology peculiar to it, and was no longer lonely in the front of the masses as in the beginning of the

republic. Moreover, the socialism, and social democracy was no longer weak as in the formation period of the state. Labouring masses were newly organising and newly having their own class consciousness. Turkey was turning into a modern economy and was demanding a new political and legal framework. Both the ruling classes and the ruled classes had changed. The balance between the classes also had changed. Hegemonic section of the ruling alliance had also to be handed over.

The petty bourgeois bureaucracy which, has not a coherent ideology and a political struggle line, and **carries the nationalist-reformist line of Kemalism in its tradition**, had the opposed tendencies of the anti-national and fascist characters of the dominant alliance (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 24).

We understand from the statements of *the Aydınlık*, the difference between the Kemalist petty bourgeoisie and the dominant alliance, which it overthrew in 27 May, is related *here* with the **political ideology** and with the **sectional interests within the ruling class** as a whole. *The Aydınlık* points to the difference: “The petty bourgeois bureaucracy is economically and politically more powerful in a Turkey where the imperialism is got back and the feudality is liquidated” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 24). It is powerful since in the conditions stated above, control over the national production and the distribution goes back to the petty bourgeois bureaucracy more and more. In addition, “the interest of the petty bourgeoisie in the realisation of the independency and democracy coincides with the labouring classes” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 24). This coincidence in the interest in democracy expresses the **mass support** which the petty bourgeoisie can gain from the labouring classes in **its search for hegemony**, which implies a transformation of the intra-class struggle among the ruling alliance into a class struggle between the classes (A similar development of class struggles is exemplified in **Marx’s** *Class Struggles in France*. Let me make just an analogy: 27 May 1960 in Turkey resembles the February 1848 in France despite the existence of all differences between France and Turkey).

However, despite the existence of its interest in democracy and independency, for the petty bourgeoisie to enter to “the ***national democratic struggle***” in a “coherent” and clear way, it must ally with “***the socialist movement***” which represents the interest of the urban and rural proletariat”. This alliance is necessary when seen “the domination of the imperialism”, “the mode of production” and related “class contradictions” in Turkey (*the Aydınlık*, 1968, 24).

(What was overthrow in 27 May 1960’s military intervention was the bourgeois rule through the means of Democrat Party. A party and a form of politics making were overthrow by the military intervention. The DP had lost its governing power and legitimacy in and outside the country. A party that would replace it immediately was absent. Its rival RPP could not establish a power, which would be created by the military in its own way even though it would be able to win the elections which was held in October 1961. The class content of the state was still bourgeois. But the petty bourgeois radicalism of the military obtained a relative autonomy in and after 1960 May.)

4.5 The National Democratic Revolution

The Aydınlık argues that the world conditions, the contradiction of the imperialism-dominated peoples and the class structure of Turkey determines the fronts; against the dominant alliance of the imperialism and its compradors, the national front formed by all national classes. The allies of the national classes in the world are the other national liberation struggles, the socialist states and the proletariat of the imperialist states. (Here *the Aydınlık* proposes a three-world system and it does not use the general division between socialism and capitalism. The countries which struggle for “national liberation” is third category) “The collapse of the imperialist system”, “the overthrow of capitalism” will open the path of socialism to the people of the world and Turkey. In Turkey “which is under the hegemony of the imperialism and where the feudal relations of production is dominant in some

places”, “the revolutionary struggle before us is the national democratic revolutionary struggle” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:25). The leading force of the imperialism is the **USA** and **its partners** in Turkey, “**the comprador bourgeoisie**” and “**the remnants of the feudality**” are “**the forces which resist against the independency and democracy struggle of our people**”. “The interest of the industrial and agricultural **proletariat**, the **peasant s** which are bound to the land with feudal relations, the **petty bourgeoisie** and the **bourgeoisie** with the military-civil bureaucracy, the shopkeepers and the artisans, and the **middle and small land holder peasant s**, that is the interest of **all national classes and stratum** contradict with the imperialism” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:26).

“The national democratic revolutionary struggle is class struggle; the struggle of the national classes against the imperialism and the comprador classes which are outside of our national community”. We understand that so many different class and stratum are put together under the names of “national classes” and “our national community”. Unity of the national classes and the stratum in fact forms a **popular front, rather than a class alliance**. What is presented to us is actually a popular frontal struggle **against a common enemy** which is perceived by each element in the front in the same direction and **against a common threat** which make all elements in the front forget at least for a while the differences among themselves. For this popular frontal struggle, **a class** can possibly elevate itself into **a hegemonic position**. These phenomena can be exemplified by **the anti-fascist popular front** and also by the **nationalist mobilisation in Turkey after the Greek’s penetration** into Anatolia in 1919. Even more, **the conditions of France** in 1871 and the resultant proclamation of Commune demonstrates a tension between a popular front and the class struggle. **The popular front in fact implies delaying class struggle in order to eliminate common enemy which treats the community as a whole**. But for this, there must be a common enemy. *The Aydınlık* counts so many classes and stratum within the national front against the imperialism and their partners that **I wonder**

whether each of them contradict with the imperialism. Bureaucratic instrument of the bourgeois state, land holder peasants, poor peasants, shopkeepers, artisans, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat! **WE HAVE CAPITALIST CLASSES BUT NOT CAPITALISM. We are dominated by the imperialism but the imperialism is presented as if it is not a stage of capitalism** (if *the Aydınlık's* Leninism is concerned). The imperialism exists as the capitalism exists and it changes the country where it penetrates into. In addition, I think that it has not only an amount of local partners. It gets into relation with all classes in different degrees in a capitalist manner, i.e. it makes many become its own partner. The artisan, shopkeeper, land holders and “national bourgeoisie” try to benefit from the relations established with the imperialist capital. The imperialist is in the last analysis a form of capital, a foreign capital in its origination. For this reason, many of the inner elements of so-called “national classes” do not always and necessarily contradict with the imperialism.

The Aydınlık suggests that the socialists have to combine all national classes against the international monopoly capital and its partners which count little. “National democratic revolution is a democratic popular movement which is based on masses”. It will lead into a complete liquidation of the imperialism and the feudality. In this movement, each national class tries to impose its mode of property. “In the national democratic revolutionary economy, the forms of property of these classes, the collective property of the proletariat, the small property of the petty bourgeoisie and the private property of the national bourgeoisie” would coexist. The realisation of the national democratic revolution eliminates the barriers in front of socialism and “the revolutionary struggle of the ***proletariat which is the foundational force of*** the national democratic revolution with the labouring peasants will necessarily lead into socialism”. ***Socialism***, “as being different from the ***national democratic revolution***, is the revolutionary power of ***the working class*** and the fact that the collective form of property dominates economy” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:26).

Exportation of Ideology by the Imperialism: The imperialism and its compradors try to prevent the national liberation by applying to religious conservatism for **the peasants**, and by imposing “an American sort of the yellow syndicalism” for **the working class** in order to prevent the development of class consciousness in it and its duty of the leadership in the national democratic revolution, and by injecting American culture and artistic forms into **the petty bourgeoisie** in order to put it into the jail of “individualism” in order to prevent its access in to “the consciousness of national liberation” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:26-7). “The thinking ability of **our people** is narcotised” through pulp fictions, “killing” stories, soap operas. “The Army Aide Institution (OYAK) is made a member of the imperialism in order to “dull the national consciousness of the **officers of the army which made first national liberation war in history**”. “The weapon of **anti-communism** is used to decrease the status of the national movements in the eyes of the unconscious people”. Even more, the imperialism supports the opportunism in order to direct and manipulate the socialist movement and to divide the national forces. Moreover, the imperialism tries to help the spread over of thoughts of some such as “**Marcuse** who rejects socialism in the margin of socialism” in order to prevent the effect of “the science of socialism” over practice and imposes hostility against the socialist theory, its leaders, its victories and its important politicians. In order to eliminate “**the ideological domination of the imperialism** over all classes and stratum of our people”, the **SOCIALISTS** must bring **socialist consciousness to the industrial and agricultural proletariat**, to explain **the duty** which is “dictated by this consciousness” to us of “participating and leading the national democratic revolution”; of “**giving the anti-imperialist consciousness to the other national classes**” and of “**making the people adopt** the national democratic revolution”, and of “**educating the leaders and the militants** of this struggle” (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:27). Socialist consciousness dictates national democratic revolution. It is brought to the proletariat by socialists. The other national classes are given an anti-imperialist consciousness. The proletariat is given a socialist consciousness

in order for it to participate and lead the national democratic revolution. The other national classes, which are given anti-imperialist consciousness, are said that they should follow the socialist proletariat in the national democratic revolution. This is a revolution in which each section of the national classes finds the realisation of its own interest. It is a popular struggle, popular front, popular war against the imperialism and the feudality.

“The bourgeois democratic revolution is not the revolution of the bourgeois class but of bourgeois society. It is the revolution of all classes which contradict with the feudal relations of production” (Erdost, 1970:256). Here Erdost makes the bourgeois revolution a popular revolution. It is a revolution of “the bourgeois society- the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, the proletariat”, “the labouring peasant masses”, and “small and middle peasantry” (Erdost, 1970:256). This is true in the sense that these classes and sections of society participates in the revolution. But he forgets that this revolution is a class revolution, a “partial”, a “political” revolution as **Marx** defined it. It is not a “social revolution” as socialist one, as again defined by **Marx**. Mass support, mass mobilisation and massive participation in a revolution do not suffice for us to define it for example as “the revolution of bourgeois society”. **Marx** also excludes the proletariat from the bourgeois society or bourgeois civil society in his “*On the Jewish Question*”. The bourgeois revolution, be it democratic or dictatorial, is the revolution of bourgeois civil society for the aim of taking over the feudal state power by bourgeoisie. And the last point is the composition of popular mass before and after the bourgeois revolution. Before the bourgeois revolution, the bourgeoisie was included to the popular mass. However, after the bourgeois revolution, the people, the popular mass was composed of only the working class and the (poor) peasantry. This different composition of “the people” was also emphasised by Lenin.

Let me continue:

In the imperialist era, in the national democratic revolution, all national classes and strata have a revolutionary characteristic. The bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, the proletariat and all labouring peasant masses which are *either exploited or oppressed* within the pre-capitalist relations has a revolutionary potential (Erdost, 1970:256).

If there is such a revolution, which is national and democratic, we can hope that nearly all classes of society, excluding an amount of the comprador, the imperialist and the big landowner, participate in the revolution. But what makes these numerous and different classes struggle in the same front against the same enemy? Only is the one which treats nearly all society. I think that if there is any national democratic revolution, it can be realised only in “national democratic revolutionary condition” such as the war in which classes can postpone their own class interests and internal conflicts. Such a condition can also emerge in a colony or a semi-colonised country. The other alternative condition may be the feudal monarchy which is completely alien to new social structure. But this last example is related with all revolutionary changes through which new productive forces of society begins to contradict with the existing property relations, as defined by **Marx** in the contexts of the bourgeois revolutions and possible socialist revolution.

Erdost's and *the Aydınlık's* revolutionary model follows on the one side, the post-colonial conditions in Asia, and Africa, and on the other side, Chinese, Vietnamese and Cuban revolutions. Turkey has never confronted with direct imperialist intervention or war since 1922 when the invading Greek armies (which are accepted as the instrument of the imperialist Britain) were driven off from the Anatolia. Economic and military existence of the United States of America among the other imperialist countries in Turkey after the Second World War has been predominantly concerned with the Soviet Union and with a possible communist threat. Turkey was a remote bastion against the communism for NATO, America and the Europe. But this sort of imperialist existence in the country did create anti-imperialist attitudes only among the intellectuals, the youth and a section of the working class, rather than the

peasantry and the bourgeoisie. This is because the existence of the imperialism in Turkey is related with communism rather than national democratic revolution. In addition, economic interests of the imperialist countries can be satisfied through credits, capital exportation and direct capital investments in the main. These economic instruments can never be conceived as an imperialist threat levelled towards the country.

The revolutionary potential of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie explained on the Leninist base. For example, Erdost refers to Lenin who observed that in Asia of 1910s there were still a bourgeoisie who could lead democracy, and enlightenment. It was the western bourgeoisie who lost its vitality and was opposed to the proletariat. He also pointed to the weak and funny situation of the petty bourgeoisie in the 1848 revolutions. The petty bourgeoisie in Russia between 1917 and 1921 played a reactionary role and Stalin pointed to the revolutionary and anti-imperialist characteristics of the petty bourgeoisie in Turkey in the same period (Erdost, 1970:256). **It should be noted** that revolutionary attribute made by Lenin to the bourgeoisie is the dates of 1912s of Asia and revolutionary attribute made by Stalin to the petty bourgeoisie is the dates of national liberation war in Turkey. Do these periods correspond to Turkey after 1960? For the bourgeoisie it does not. For the petty bourgeoisie, it may do partially. This is because the petty bourgeoisie is not only composed of the intellectuals, bureaucrats and youth.

Leadership of the Proletariat: The proletariat is the revolutionary class to the end by its class nature, says Erdost. However, “a worker *stratum*”, within the uniquely revolutionary class the proletariat, which is “bought by the imperialists” is also known to be having “a counter-revolutionary role” (Erdost, 1970:255-6). Erdost quotes from Lenin: “The *worker stratum* or ‘the worker aristocracy’, which carries completely the petty bourgeois characteristic in terms of its life style, its wages and its world views and has been embourgeoisied ... takes the side of the bourgeoisie in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie” (*Erdost’s emphasis*, Erdost, 1970:257).

Despite this observation, Erdost says that “classes (excepting the proletariat) can be revolutionary or counter-revolutionary by their class nature in certain revolutions or can take their positions between them”. The workers aristocracy is not included to the proletariat, and only the proletariat is assumed to be having a certain and definite revolutionary position. I think there is here **an idealist presupposition**. As Erdost himself has suggested previously, if counter-revolutionary ideologies are influential among the proletariat, this class can be a pillar of the dominant classes and counter-revolution. On the other side, the fact that the proletariat is the only class that is revolutionary to the end means only that socialism and socialist revolution can be a product of the proletariat. Marx defines the revolutionary character of the proletariat one the one hand in the context of the socialist revolution and struggle and on the other hand in the context of the historical role and tasks of the proletariat. If these contexts do not exist, the proletariat can be merely an opposition against the bourgeois society and in such a situation; we will go away from Marxian socialism and move towards the other versions of socialism that can be followed before and after **Marx**.

The *Communist Manifesto* explains the mission of the proletariat in terms of its historically distinctive character. The historically distinctive character of the proletariat form all ideas behind the missions attributed to the proletariat. However, this mission is historically defined and embedded in the political and economic movement of that class: “All the preceding classes that got the upper hand, sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property”. This class represents the society in a real manner in this phase of history. Its emancipation can be possible only with the emancipation of society. It has no de facto status which has not yet been

acknowledged by the society. In addition, its economic emancipation is not possible because it “cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation” (SW, 254).

The leadership of the proletariat in the national democratic revolutionary struggle is the most controversial point in the circle of *the Aydınlık*. We will see the debates about this subject when its some contributors who leave the circle during 1969 and late 1970. *The Aydınlık* as the original circle of NDR advocates states that the proletariat is “the most progressive class”, “whose interest contradicts the most with the imperialism”, which is “the inheritor of all objective developments”, and which is “the most coherent and the most confidential force in the struggle against the imperialism”. Nonetheless, despite the acceptance of the leadership of the proletariat, it is said that “socialists” have a “leading” role in the “struggle” of the national democratic revolution since they “represent the interest of the proletariat” and since they have “true revolutionary theory”. The power of the proletariat at the beginning of the struggle is its “vanguard cadres” which advocate its ideology. Anti-imperialist struggle will strengthen and expand “the revolutionary, vanguard cadres of the proletariat”. The sections of “the labourers” which have ideological conscious through struggle will demonstrate its historical role “under the direction of the pioneer cadre”. Today, the significant part of the forces that participate in anti-imperialist struggle is the petty bourgeois bureaucrats and intellectuals who have a revolutionary tradition. However, they are not a force enough for a complete victory. Throughout the struggle, the urban and rural proletariat, which will have more and more autonomous class organisations, will both change the power balance among the national classes and become the most important force for the victory of democracy and independency (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:27). In sum, the leading socialist cadres represent the objective interest and role of the proletariat. The anti-imperialist struggle will strengthen the cadres and revolutionary consciousness is brought to the most progressive sections of the proletariat

under the direction of the vanguard cadres. With the development of the struggle, the proletariat in the rural and urban areas will participate in the struggle through their increasingly autonomous class organisations and will change the power balance among the national classes and become the most important force for democracy and independency.

The statements of *the Aydınlık* echo Leninist notion “**consciousness from without**”, which was put forward against the economism (includes both syndicalism, the bourgeois tendency of the worker aristocracy and the idea of spontaneity of the revolutionary development) and reformism in Europe and the Mensheviks in Russia at the beginning of 1900s. For *the Aydınlık*, these problems which Lenin tried to eliminate for the Russian proletariat, demonstrate itself in Turkey in the ideologies imposed and manipulated by the imperialism we pointed to above: religious conservatism for **the peasants**, “an American sort of the yellow syndicalism” for **the working class**, American culture and artistic forms for **the petty bourgeoisie**, pulp fictions, “killing” stories, soap operas for **the people**, “The Army Aide Institution (OYAK) for the **officers of the army which made first national liberation war in history**”, “the weapon of **anti-communism**” for “the unconscious people”, “the opportunism” in the socialist movement, the spread over of thoughts of some such as “**Marcuse** who rejects socialism in the margin of socialism” and *the Aydınlık* suggests bringing **socialist consciousness to the industrial and agricultural proletariat, “the anti-imperialist consciousness to the other national classes”**. But socialist consciousness dictated a national democratic revolution and it would be brought to the proletariat by the socialists. The other national classes were given an anti-imperialist consciousness and should follow the socialist proletariat in the national democratic revolution. This was a revolution of the national classes and required a popular struggle, popular front, popular war against the imperialism and the feudality.

The relation of *the Aydınlık* with Lenin is a mere semblance. However, the experience of anti-fascist popular fronts in the period of Stalinist Comintern and Mao's revolution strategy, his idea of dominant contradiction and the Chinese revolution echo in the words of *the Aydınlık* more and more than Lenin. Popular fronts of Stalin and popular revolution of Mao is utilised for the completion of the national liberation struggle of Mustafa Kemal. *the Aydınlık* observes that the exploitation rises, and the ones which centre around the national liberation front increase because "the national values" which originated from the emancipator and independency struggle of the people were tramped down, and the comprador forces put into action some counter-measures in order to divide and rule the people by giving the role some part of people of "kuvvayı inzibatiye" (military forces of the Sultan and Caliph of the Ottoman Empire) against the other part which is in the role of "kuvvayı milliyeye" (national forces of Mustafa Kemal). The religious feelings of the people are exploited and the religious sections of the people are tried to be mobilised as "the crude force of fascism through the bigots which are the residue of the feudality". Reactionary forces are organised in accordance with the imperialist policy of CIA and the Pentagon through religious schools and the acts against communism. *The Aydınlık* observes that the rising threat of fascism and the measures of the imperialism and its compradors required a struggle against the divisions among the people which are a product of parliamentarism and the opportunism. National forces have to be united as in the liberation struggle under the direction of Mustafa Kemal. For this reason, *the Aydınlık* argues that as "the science of socialism" dictates, the slogans which are not appropriate before independency and which divide "the national-democratic front" have to be given up, and "the nationalist forces has to be concentrated around the slogan of 'the active struggle of the democratic forces against fascism' ". Crude force of the imperialism will necessarily increase as the anti-imperialist struggle become stronger. "The role of the revolutionary" is "to lead the democratic forces" against the repressive measures of the imperialism (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:28).

In the decade after the 27 May 1960, we see that not only the left movement but also reactionary and fascist threat and mobilisation rise. This demonstrates that anti-imperialist struggle of left also have an anti-capitalist character. This is so because anti-imperialism *alone* can not create that type of fascist mobilisation as a reaction against itself. We also have to have a left struggle which threatens capital and property and the bourgeois society itself. We know that the imperialism tries to protect monopoly capitalist system (it is sure a tautology to say that the imperialism tries to protect itself). But, in Turkey after the half of the 1960s, there is not only the slogan of “**independent and truly democratic Turkey**”, but also the slogan of “**Socialist Turkey**”. (Meanwhile, the latter does not exclude independency and real democracy) Although many socialists have a national democratic revolution strategy in that time, **the dominant classes perceive this strategy as a strategy for socialism at the end**. It is already this perception which **places a distance between the petty bourgeois bureaucracy and the national democratic revolutionaries**. It is already for a short period in and after 27 May, which petty bourgeois bureaucracy moves towards a national democratic revolutionary line as exemplified in the resultant constitution of 1961. The rise of the socialist movement after 1965 is a *communist threat* to the capitalist system in Turkey and seen in this direction by **the ruling classes and their bureaucratic instrument** (as for the bourgeois awareness about this threat, see Buğra, 1997). The military intervention in 12 March 1971 is made directly against the so called “Marxist Leninist terrorist centres” (see *official* “Beyaz Kitap”, 1973). The nationalist, fascist forces and religious reactionaries are mobilised against the anti-religious, “Moscow’s communists” rather than the national front of the national classes. Nationalism rises again in Turkey against the communists (other reasons put aside) and religious mobilisation under the direction of fascist forces find its enemy in communism.

Revolutionary Problems of Turkey: Erdost and Kaymak’ s study “*On the Present Problems of Our Revolution*” was originally prepared for II.

Revolutionary Education Council which was held by the Teachers' Union of Turkey (briefly TUT). However, instead of this study, the addressing which was prepared by Atilla Sönmez, Feyzullah Coşkun, Oya Sencer, İlhan Tekeli, Ergin Günçe and Sedat Özkol was confirmed by the Preparation Commission of the trade union. The preceding were required to present the "economic structure", "the relations of production", "the political structure", "counter-revolution", and "the influences of the imperialism", and possible theoretical and practical solutions and finally the problems of education in the country (note in Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 286). Throughout this presentation Erdost and Kaymak try to put together the problems of history, theory, class and revolution in the context of Turkey. It is indeed a summary of the ideas of the core of the circle of *the Aydınlık* in the words of Erdost and Kaymak. But many ideas were developed and advocated by Erdost and the editorial writings which appeared in each issue of the journal. However, the scientific and historical infrastructure of the arguments was developed mainly by Erdost in the former articles published in the journal, leaving aside the other studies published in *Türk Solu*. Nevertheless, the theoretical and ideological framework were firstly developed by Mihri Belli after the early years of 1960 against the historical background of the CPT and the parties and figures which benefited from that. From Erdost and Kaymak's study, I will expose only new and different ideas and the formulations which had not been expressed in a clear way before. In the study, the sequence of the subjects also demonstrates the general schema of the argumentation. This schema is based on the structure which is sequentially erected upon the concepts, historical transformation, contradictions, revolutionary classes, the form of the revolution before Turkey and the form of the revolutionary party organisation. These are as such:

Firstly, the preceding deals with the concepts of the forces of production, the mode of production, the relations of production, the political and legal superstructure, revolution and counter-revolution. **Secondly**, it concerns the transformation of the Ottoman State as a feudal-central state into a semi-

colonised country and its division between and occupation by the imperialist states. **Thirdly**, the problem is followed by the Kemalist revolution. **Fourthly**, anti-Kemalist counter-revolution is presented. **Fifthly**, the relationship between the army and the counter-revolution is concerned. **Sixthly**, Erdost and Kaymak present the dominant contradiction between the imperialism and the nation. **Seventhly**, Feudal and semi-feudal forces are presented as the main obstacles to the development of the productive forces. **Eighthly**, the revolutionary classes are categorised. **Ninthly**, the Kurdish question is dealt with in terms of the self-determination right of the peoples. **Tenthly**, the national democratic revolution is suggested as being the revolutionary agenda of Turkey. After the summary, **twelfth** question is the revolution which is to be realised under the leadership of the proletarian revolutionary party. **Thirteenth** problem is the problems of the university youth. **Fourteenth** title is on the place of the education and the teachers in the revolution. Erdost and Kaymak finally present us the main sources they benefit. Among them, we see Engels' "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of the Classical German Philosophy", Stalin's "Marxism and the National Question", "Dialectical and Historical materialism", "Last Writings, 1950-1953", Marx's *Capital's Volume 1*, "The Preface to the Contribution of the Critique of the Political Economy", Mao's "Theory and Practice", Belli's "Writings, 1965-1970", Nikitin's "Political Economy", Lenin's "The Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism", "The Self-determination Right of the Nations". All these studies were translated into Turkish between 1966 and 1970. Mainly **Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao** and **Belli** come together within Erdost and Kaymak's proceeding. I can say that such a synthesis is tried to be made throughout *the Aydınlık*.

The forces of production, the mode of production, the relations of production, the political and legal superstructure, revolution and counter-revolution: "The means of production in themselves cannot create a material value". It is followed that "we call all the means of production, the human labour and the production experience as **the forces of production**"

(Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 284). I think that this is a good formula for “the conditions of labour” in general. It adds the “experience” to the forces of production. In addition, counting “the human labour” among the forces implies that the forces of production are not only material objects of the production. I think that the forces of production need to be developed far more than Marx and here *the Aydınlık* suggests. I can suggest that the social division of labour and the social capital itself also appear as the forces for a new capitalist entrepreneurship. But this may be a superfluous extension of the meaning of the term.

Erdost and Kaymak state that “the relations of production are born, develop within the previous relations of production and create within that newer and superior relations of production than itself”. However,

when the relations of production become the fetter of the development of the forces of production, **the age of revolution** begins; a conflict emerge between the forces of production and the relations of production. The change in the economic foundation turns the superstructure upside down. We call the replacement of the relations of production by the new and superior relations of production which correspond to the developing forces of production as the **revolution**, that the revolutionary class (or the revolutionary classes) realises this by seizing the political power (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 285).

We must ask to Erdost and Kaymak whether this model of revolutionary change corresponds to French bourgeois revolution, for example, or whether it corresponds to only socialist revolution of the proletariat. I think that Erdost and Kaymak confuse the contradiction within the economic foundation of the society with the contradiction between the economic base and the superstructure. In addition, they confuse the economic revolution and the political revolution. Moreover, in Marx after “*On the Jewish Question*” there are two kinds of revolution, the one is “the **partial**”, “**political revolution**”, and the other “**social revolution**”.

Erdost and Kaymak say that “during the upside down of the superstructure does not immediately put away the old classes which have lost their sovereignty but still exist”. “These counter-revolutionary forces resist for a long time” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 285). Unless a mere seizure of political power is supported by the transformation in the forms of property and the property relations, in the economic foundation, the counter-revolutionary classes still have a capability of regeneration for sovereignty. Although the relations of production have changed, the old dominant classes have still material wealth, and some elements of superstructure which “has become a material force” play the main forces of the counter-revolution (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 285-6). “The revolution has not yet been completed after the political and legal superstructure has been turned upside down and the relations of production has been transformed, the revolution is completed with the cultural revolution which will destroy the elements of superstructure (ideology, culture, habits, etc.) which is the reflection of the forms of the old society” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 286). Here **Mao’s “Cultural revolution”** echoes. What is meant here is the socialist revolution which can move backward to what it destroys. Again here **Mao** echoes. Unless the revolution is completed, the counter-revolution continues its threat. It can collect political and economic force and then seize the power again (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 286). Meanwhile I must say in passing that Mao’s idea of “Cultural revolution” and the possibility of backward moving of the socialist revolution is related with **Althusser’s and his students’** emphasis over **the relative autonomy of the state** in general.

4.6 The Permanent Revolution in Marx

The progress of the revolution, said Marx, makes all sorts of reformism and “the modest demands of the middle classes” move into the circles of red party. There is much socialism for different sections of the party of anarchy (Marx, 1996, 128). Nonetheless, despite their differences, says Marx, all sections share the idea that “socialism is the means of the emancipation of

the proletariat” and that “the emancipation of the proletariat is the aim of socialism” (Marx, 1996, 128-9). Some deceive the others; some deceive themselves and sees the realisation of their interest as the realisation of all revolutionary demands. In addition, “behind the general socialist words”, the “socialism of the National, the Presse and Siécle” was hidden. Their socialism only meant the emancipation of commerce and industry, and the overthrow of the domination of the financial aristocracy. “This is the socialism of industry, commerce and agriculture”. Unlike this “**bourgeois socialism**” which “collects some parts of the workers and the petty bourgeoisies as in the case of every socialisms, “**the petty bourgeois socialism**”. **The petty bourgeoisie demands measures from the state, such as** “credit institutions”, partnerships, the progressive tax, “the limitation of the property transfer”, “the realisation of the large scale works by itself” and “the *forceful prevention of the growth of capita*”. It wants “its own socialism” in a peaceful way and sees the development of history as the “implementation” of the ideas of “social thinkers”. The petty bourgeoisie, for this reason, becomes the advocators of “**the doctrinier socialism**” or of a mixture of “the existing socialist systems” when the proletariat is yet not free, mature and independent historical power (Marx, 1996, 129). This **doctrinier socialism** replaces individual intellectual activity with collective production, and above all, it is a “utopia which takes away from the scene “the revolutionary struggle of classes and its requirements in the imaginative level of the little tricks and great sensations”. But, while the *proletariat* leaves this socialism to the petty bourgeoisie, it “gradually gathers around the **revolutionary socialism**, that is, around **communism** which the bourgeoisie labelled as **Blanqui**”. Here Marx summarises his theory of revolutionary transition in relation to the general theory of historical materialism: **Class divisions** are based on the **relations of production**. **Social relations** correspond to the relations of production. The **ideas** have origins in the social relations. In order to arrive at “the revolutionary socialism”, “communism” requires the *permanent revolution* through the *class dictatorship* of the proletariat until the formation of communism, or until the elimination of the bourgeois relations of

production and bourgeois modes of thinking. The interesting point is that the permanent revolution is located by Marx to the interval between the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and the emergence of communist relations. As we use the division which will be made by Marx in the critique of the *Gotha Programme*, the permanent revolution is located within the context of socialist transition towards communism. It means the progressive development of socialist society from initial stage to mature one that is the beginning of communism. Another usage of the term *permanent revolution* refers to the putting forward the *bourgeois democratic revolution* towards the socialist revolution. Therefore, we have **two stages for the permanent revolution for socialist politics**. The one relates to the period before socialist revolution in which the socialists try to develop and complete the democratic revolutionary change in favour of socialist revolution in future, the other refers to the period through which the proletarian dictatorship fulfils its task of transition towards communism. **Here, Marx refers to the permanent revolution in the era of the proletarian dictatorship, i.e. socialist transition of society.**

This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations” (*for translation, see www.Marxists.org/archive/marx, in Turkish, Marx, 1996, 130*).

This significant subject was left aside by Marx, who said that “the place which was kept for this subject does not permit us to develop it further” (Marx, 1996, 130). As we will see, Marx will deal with the *permanent revolution* and the problem of *socialist transition* in his *18 Brumaire, The Paris Commune* of 1871 and the *critique of the Gotha Programme* in 1875. Marx concerned the permanent revolution in the context of an agrarian capitalist society which was still completing its bourgeois revolution, and whose social conditions were still prior to the socialist revolution. But, although the transition after

socialist revolution into communism will be completely the problem of the proletarian dictatorship, even in the context of France of 1850s, Marx implies a permanent revolution with and through a proletarian dictatorship. However, the question of how the weak proletariat of France could establish its own class dictatorship seem to have been answered by Marx against the background that the proletariat begun to develop its own ideological and political independence by going a way from the petty bourgeois democracy and petty bourgeois socialism. Material weakness of the proletariat, which was a result of the weakness of the industrial capital, was compensated by its ideological and political strength. In addition, the proletariat won the **leadership in the revolutionary movement** (in February 1848, the leadership of the revolutionary coalition was under the bourgeoisie) and became the leading section of “the anarchy party”, while “the order’s party” was led by “the financial aristocracy” (Marx, 1996, 130). Moreover, the fact that the proletariat abandoned its alliance with the petty bourgeois democrats, it had also been abandoned the programmatic difference between the bourgeois democratic and the social demands. The completion of bourgeois democratic revolution was no longer a stage before socialist revolution which the proletariat had to pass from since it was clearly seen that the bourgeoisie could not move forward, putting aside moving backward. The completion of the democratic revolution (*let us call* it “**revolutionary democracy**” in the meaning of that the leading proletariat with its alliances completes the democratic revolution) could be possible only under the *rule* of the proletariat. But the *rule* of the proletariat meant a socialist revolution. For this reason, the permanent revolution was defined as a process moving towards communism, rather than only towards socialism through the completion of the democratic revolution. The *meaning of democratic revolution* also changed after the defeat of Junes of 1848 and 1849. The **bourgeois meaning of democracy** gave its place to the socialist meaning for the proletariat and its many allies (proletarian democracy for revolutionary masses in both bourgeois and socialist eras, and proletarian dictatorship, *including* proletarian democracy, against counter-revolutionary forces in

socialism). The former June meant the defeat of the proletariat while the latter June meant the defeat of the idea of the petty bourgeois democracy. We can conclude that Marx from now on, does not differentiate socialist revolution from the completion of the democratic revolution. The permanent revolution meant socialist revolution under the proletarian dictatorship.

4.7 Mao's revolutionary strategy for Backward Countries

Mao put forward the Chinese revolution as the model of the backward countries of the East, while he saw the Russian revolution as the model only for the more advanced capitalist countries. He made this division in 1940s, in his "On New Democracy" (1940). He said that "new democratic republic" was established in China. It was different from "the bourgeois dictatorship" in the capitalist countries (the imperialist countries), and from the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union. The new democratic republic was a transitional form in the revolutions of the colonial and semi-colonial countries (Zagoria, 1963; 16-7). The October revolution as a model fit the imperialist countries, while the his model fit the colonial and semi-colonial ones (Zagoria, 1963; 17)

Mao rejected "a tactical alliance with the national bourgeoisie until his 'revolution from below' had achieved control over the whole 'four-class alliance' of national bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, and proletariat" (Zagoria, 1963; 41). Revolution would develop through stages. "Once the class enemy of that particular revolutionary phase had been disposed of and Communist power consolidated, the least 'revolutionary' class of the coalition- or the most reactionary class- was assumed to have 'gone over' to the imperialists and was treated accordingly". According to this strategy, "the imperialists, feudal elements (landlords), and bureaucratic capitalists (compradors included) were eliminated first, and then the national bourgeoisie-having 'betrayed the revolution'-were put under attack, and after them, at appropriate stages, the petty bourgeoisie and the rich peasants"

(Zagoria, 1963;42).The Chinese communists emphasised the importance of armed struggles and “especially” “ ‘wars of national liberation’ by the oppressed peoples against the imperialists with tight Party control over tactical alliances with the bourgeoisie” (Zagoria, 1963;42).

Donald Zagoria said that “the Russia of 1917 was underdeveloped only by the standards of the advanced European countries. China of 1949 was underdeveloped by any standards” (Zagoria, 1963; 20).

National Democratic Revolution Suggested as Peasant Revolution:

Ahmet Kardam defined “the national democratic revolution as “peasant revolution” in his “National Democratic revolution and the Peasant Question” (Milli Demokratik Devrim ve Köylü Meselesi) (Kardam, 1970a). In this article, Kardam said that the peasant question was a question of alliance with the peasantry for the working class of the Europe in the beginning of the twentieth century in order to overthrow the bourgeoisie and to establish socialism. But for the proletariat of the semi-colonised and semi-feudal countries of our age, “the first issue is the question of alliance with the peasantry not for the establishment of socialism in this stage but for being able to make a peasant revolution”. Kardam addressed to both “old opportunists” of the WPT and to new opportunists of the PRA. He said that the opportunism demonstrated itself in the peasant question. The former type of opportunists in Turkey argued that the ideology of the peasants was socialism and the revolutionary step before us was “socialist revolution”. The second type of opportunists claimed that the peasants were “petty bourgeois” and the working class had not been “proletarianised” completely and hence the step before us was “national democratic movements”. Both opportunist wings tried to cover the fact that the revolutionary step before us was the national democratic revolution and to turn the proletarian revolutionary movement into “a petty bourgeois socialist movement” (Kardam, 1970a, 449).

Kaymak referred to Engels (The Peasant Question in France and Germany) who said that socialist party had firstly to go from the cities to the villages and to be a force in the rural areas in order to seize the power. Many contributors of the *Aydınlık* applied this reference. Engels said this even for the Western Europe of the 1890s. In the semi-dependent, colonised countries of the imperialist age, the peasant question was a vital one for socialist struggle. The working class had to make “a stage of peasant revolution (national democratic revolution)” to be able to reach in socialism which was his own liberation (Kardam, 1970a, 448). The working class of Turkey had to ally with the peasantry and to make “**peasant revolution** under its own leadership”. For this revolution, it had to “start from rural areas”, and then “siege the cities which were the bastion of the imperialism” and “stop the power of the imperialism- the comprador bourgeoisie-feudalism trio” (Kardam, 1970a, 448).

Ahmet Kardam’s position in *the Aydınlık* was the position of the embryo of the PLPT-PLFT to be established by Mahir Çayan and his friends several months later. A socialist struggle could not be achieved in the cities, which were the “police offices” of the imperialism, independently from the wide peasant masses. The working class, as the most organised and disciplined force of the society, had to take over the leadership of the peasants’ struggle, and had to organise the peasants. The alliance of the worker-peasant did not cover only the small peasants but also even the richest parts of the middle peasantry since the sections which contradicted with the imperialism and the feudals were not only small peasants. The revolutionary stage before Turkey would stop the imperialist exploitation, destroy the feudals and the compradors, and distribute land to the peasants who had not land or had insufficient land. Its social content was “bourgeois democratic”. But its leader would be the working class and socialist revolution would be “its extension without discontinuity”. For this reason, this revolution was “a part of socialist revolutions”. The national democratic revolution, in other words, the peasant revolution, would not solve only the problem of the peasants. But “the base

force of the revolution is the peasants which form the 70 percent of the population". The revolution would be realised under "the leadership of the working class". It would be based on the allying base to be established with "**all sections** of the peasants". It would "start in the rural regions"; then it would "siege the cities which are the bastions of the imperialism". It would achieve to its victory at the end of "people's war" which would put an end to the power of the imperialism, feudalism and the comprador bourgeoisie. For this reason "**national democratic revolution was in its essence nothing but a peasant revolution which is realised under the leadership of the working class**" (Kardam, 1970a, 476).

According to Ahmet Kardam, the new opportunism, the PRA, argued that In Turkey there was "a finance capital which unite banking capital and industrial capital, that is, monopoly capital"; that Turkey like "the economies of the developed capitalist countries" was subjected to the laws such as "falling rate of profit" and "crises of reproduction"; that the 75-80 percent of the peasant population was exploited by "usurer-merchant" who realise "primitive capitalist exploitation"; and that Turkey was "a primitive capitalist country" since it was also exploited by " 'developed' monopoly bourgeoisie". Again according to Ahmet Kardam, the old opportunism, Emek journal and Boran oriented wing of the WPT argued that Turkey was "a capitalist country" and it was "also" exploited by the imperialism and hence it could not "develop". For this reason according to the old opportunism, there was no peasant question different from the one which could be solved by socialist revolution. In addition, satisfaction of the land demands of the peasants from the big landowners who moved towards capitalist agriculture was not a progressive policy. A struggle against the usurer-merchant would be an "anti-capitalist struggle" rather than anti-feudal" since the usurer-merchants were "bourgeoisies" who realised "primitive capitalist exploitation". Ahmet Kardam argued that since both opportunisms claimed that Turkey could not develop because it was "also" exploited by the imperialism, the new opportunism (PRA) ha to have advocated "socialist revolution thesis" by saying that the

anti-imperialist struggle and socialist struggle were the same. As for the difference between the old and new opportunism, Kardam asked whether they differed from each other in the sense that while the new opportunism called “national democratic revolution the anti-imperialist struggle which was isolated from anti-feudal struggle, the old opportunism called it “socialist revolution”. Was the disagreement caused by merely a disagreement about the terms? Kardam said that; the new opportunism had rejected that national democratic revolution was a peasant revolution, argued that “the base force” would be the proletariat, and claimed that a party in which the workers were not in majority could not be a socialist party. New opportunism in its essence rejected the national democratic revolution. And the last point was the explanation given about that Mao Tse-tung “developed” “the national democratic revolution thesis”. This information had been given previously by Mahir Çayan in the article “On the Characteristic of New Opportunism” (Çayan, 1970). Kardam said that new opportunists could not explicitly reject Mao’s thesis since they seemed to be “rigid Maoist”. They could already not be coherent, too (Kardam, 1970a, 477).

Revolution in Peasant Societies: When Marx read Bakunin’s *State and Anarchy* he made some marginal jottings about the revolution, the coercion and the proletariat. He said that when the proletariat seized the power, or when it is the “ruling class”, since there still capitalist class in particular, and the enemies and the old society still maintained itself, “it must use coercive means, hence governmental means; it is still a class and the economic conditions on which the class struggle and the existence of classes depend, have not yet disappeared and must be removed by force, or transformed and their process of transformation speeded up by force (SW, 606).

As for the revolutionary prospect for the countries where “the mass of the peasants are still owners of private property, where they even form a more or less important majority of the population, as they do in the states of the Western European continent, where they have not yet disappeared and been

replaced by agricultural wage labourers, as in England”, Marx suggested the alternatives as such: the peasantry could prevent the workers’ revolution, as in the case of France up till then; the proletariat had to implement some measures to improve the situation of the peasant and win him for the revolution. This was necessary because “the landowning peasant does not belong to the proletariat and even when his own position causes him to belong to it, he does not think he belongs to it”. However, the measures which would improve the situation of the peasants aimed for a transition from private land property to collective land property. The proletariat, Marx suggested, had not to confront with the peasantry directly, for example by talking about the abolishment of property. This abolition was “only possible where the capitalist landlord has expropriated the peasants and the real worker of the land is just as much a proletarian wage labourer as the city worker, and thus has directly the same interest” (SW; 607). Let me recall that Marx envisaged these alternatives for the situation where “the proletariat is the ruling class”.

Marx’s material conception of history eliminates adventurism and voluntarism in the revolution. This conception predicted that a revolutionary change depended on a certain level of the economic and historical development of the classes. This development was necessary both for the seizure of the power and its maintenance by the proletariat. Marx used this conception he had developed and said that “A radical social revolution is tied to certain historical conditions of economic development; these are its prerequisites”. This “radical social revolution”, “is only possible where, with capitalist production, the industrial proletariat occupies at least a significant position among the mass of the people”. For a victory, the proletariat had to do for the peasants immediately what the bourgeoisie had done for them in its revolution (SW; 607).

Marx stated that Bakunin did not know anything about “social revolution”, “only the political phrases about it”. The economic conditions of this

revolution did not exist for him, said Marx. Bakunin thought that in all economic forms, “developed or undeveloped”, which “include the servitude of the worker”, the revolution as such was possible. Even more, Marx said that Bakunin also wanted “European social revolution, founded on the economic basis of capitalist production, to take place at the level of the Russian or Slav agricultural and pastoral people”. According to the information given by Marx, Bakunin seems not to have any material conception of a revolution. “Will, not economic conditions, is the foundation of his social revolution (SW; 607).

Organisation of the proletariat into ruling class meant that “the proletariat” “has obtained enough strength and organisation to use general means of forcibly expressing itself in this struggle”. However, Marx suggested that “it can only use economic means which abolish its own character as wage-labourers, that is as a class”. The victory of the proletariat meant that its domination stopped since “its character as a class has disappeared” (SW; 607).

About the composition of the government under the rule of the proletariat, Bakunin asked whether the whole of the proletariat headed the government, Marx replied that “In a trade union, for example, is the executive committee composed of the whole of the union?” Marx saw in this example, a division of labour and different functions, and asked to Bakunin that “will everyone be at the top?” In a larger scale, he asked: “Will all members of the Commune manage the common interests of the enterprise at the same time?” Bakunin asked “There are about 40 million Germans. Will, for example, all the forty million be members of the government?” Marx’s answer was positive: “For the thing begins with the self-government of the Commune” (SW; 607). It should be noted here that Marx used the term “the Commune” in the case of the “self-government”.

Bakunin then asked if so, there would be no body to be governed since everybody would govern (SW; 607) And Marx answered that in this

statement it was assumed that “when a man rules himself, he does not rule himself; since he is only himself and no one else”. Marx seemed to have said that the self-government was also a government which needed a state. and, it seems to be that Bakunin wanted to say that if everyone ruled, there would be no need for the state under the rule of the proletariat, in other words, no need for “*the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*” in the first phase of the communist society, which would be mentioned by Marx in *the Critique of the Gotha Programme*. It was already Bakunin who asked that if so There will be no government, no State, but if there is a State in existence there will also be governors and slaves”. Marx answered that this meant that “when the class rule disappeared, there will no longer be any state in the present political sense of the word...” The statement was “democratic verbiage, political drivel!” He said that “as soon as the functions” of the state “have ceased to be political, then there exists 1) no governmental function; 2) the distribution of general functions has become a business matter which does not afford any room for domination, 3) the election has non of its present political character” (SW; 608). Marx seemed to say that in communism, the politics would disappear since the state would be deprived of from its governmental and domination functions alongside with the disappearance of the classes.

Bakunin saw “the despotism of a governing minority”, this minority “as the expression of the so-called people’s will” behind the idea of the “universal suffrage” of “the whole people of representatives and rulers of the State”. This idea was, to him, was advocated by “the Marxists” and “the democratic school”. Bakunin seemed to have criticised Marx for *authoritarianism* and *Jacobinism*. But, Marx replied that “Under collective property, the so-called will of the people disappears in order to make way for the real will of the co-operative”. According to Bakunin, this leading minority was composed of the workers, for Marxists, but when they became the representatives of the people, they ceased to be workers. They would be “ex-workers”. But Marx said that “No more than a manufacturer today ceases to be a capitalist when

he becomes a member of the municipal council". AS for the alienation of the representatives through state power, Marx said that such a situation was not different from the manager's position in the workers' co-operative and asked him "what form can administrative functions assume on the basis of that workers' state" (SW; 608).

4.8 WPT and National Democratic Revolution

The Workers Party of Turkey: According to Atalay behind the progressive movements of 1960 there were the rising influence of the communist parties after 1945s, "anti-imperialist popular revolutions and movements" developed far more than before in 1960s, and the thoughts and movements which developed among the intellectuals and the youth, which reached in their summit in 1968 mass movements, particularly in Europe (www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts).

In Turkey, the productive forces rapidly developed after 1950s and led into clear class conflicts and divisions. This was also followed by a change in the power balance within the state, society and economy. Old hegemonic forces began to become secondary, and vice versa and class struggle went beyond the old struggle between the JP and the RPP. Different classes wanted to manifest their demands through their own organizations. This development enriched the political life. The main political forces of the early 1960s, the JP, the RPP, the military and bureaucracy, intensified their struggle to increase their political power. The fact that traditional forces struggled within each other also contributed to the development of a democratic environment between 1960 and 1970. The WPT grew in such conditions.

The designers of the 27 May have thought that the followers of the DP against whom they made coup d'état could not take power in the elections. However, the RPP, they leaned to, did not become successful in the elections of 1961, 1963 and 1965 despite all support. The JP restored the

base of the DP and came to power with great majority. On the other side, the RPP did not follow the line of the designers of 27 May in the coalition government it established till 1965. Rather, it acted in many respects against the spirit of the 27 May and did not escape from the reactionary leadership. Consequently, “the workers, the intellectuals, the teachers, the youth”, “who began to conceive that their interest lies behind the spread over of radical democratic transformations and the development of democracy” understood that they would not be able to reach in their aims with the RPP. These massive searches created the movement of Yön and the Turkey Workers’ Party”. Behind the establishment of the WPT, there lied “the need of the various social sections for a new party”. Such “an objective condition” put together “the trade unionist”, “the worker”, “the teacher”, the intellectual, “the artist”, “the peasants” and “the Kurdish democrats” within the party. These masses gave the WPT dynamism. Before 1960, the progressive and democrat elements of society developed within various classes in isolated way due to the oppression. The most active elements of them entered the party. The first attempt to establish a new party came from “the trade unionists of Istanbul which form the radical wing of the trade union movement”. The trade unionist movement understood intuitively that the rights of strike, and total bargain, the law of labour were the problems which could be concerned and solved within the political framework, for instance. However, there was not a party in existence, which could concern with these questions and the problems of the working class in general. Consequently, they wanted to establish a party. After a year which passed inactively, the founders of the WPT invited the intellectuals to their party in order to increase the influence of the party. They invited socialist intellectuals to the party despite anti-communist prejudices of the people of Turkey.

The Announcement of Yön published in 1961 influenced the activity and though formation of the progressive movements. The announcement maintained the elitist intellectual, estatist view which could be tracked backed to Tanzimat and then Kemalist movement. However, the WPT escaped from

this traditional view and rejected the treaties the state had signed till then. These treaties contradicted with the conditions of the wide masses. Atalay attributed the main reason behind this success of the WPT to “the power of Marxist thought”. He said that although the party did not refer explicitly to “Marxism” and “Scientific Socialism”, it had been under the influence of Marxism after 1962. In the party there was little number of members who knew Marxism. Even more, some anti-Marxist ideas were sometimes seen in the line of the party. Nevertheless, **the party program of 1964 was a “product of one year labour of the Marxist intellectuals”**. The program explained the history of the country and political questions in such terms of “class struggle”, the state as the sphere of domination of the classes, “exploitation”, “dependency”, and “the role of the masses in the social transformation”. The existing order was criticized systematically and demanded radical transformations in society and economy. However, Atalay observed that “The conception of the Marxist Theory of Revolution by the WPT was rather weak in its all life” (Atalay, www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts).

Revolutionary stages in 1964 Program of the WPT: The party program of 1964 was a “product of one year labour of the Marxist intellectuals”. The program explained the history of the country and political questions in such terms of “class struggle”, and the state as the sphere of domination of the classes, of “exploitation”, “dependency”, and “the role of the masses in the social transformation”. The existing order was criticized systematically and demanded radical transformations in society and economy. However, Atalay observed that “The conception of the Marxist Theory of revolution by the WPT was rather weak in its all life”.

As said by Atalay, the WPT’s program of 1964 was prepared by the contributions of Marxist intellectuals. However, the party’s program seems to be a program for a social democratic workers’ party, rather than a socialist or communist party in the strict sense of the terms. In addition, the striking

aspect of the program was its implicit democratic, popular and national strategy for the democratic seizure of the power, which would be developed from the bottom to the top. The program covered a Marxist perspective and a class language in some places, but it was in fact a program which would fit a social democratic labour party established by the trade unionists. I will deal with Perinçek's analysis of the WPT's members in terms of their class positions. Perinçek will argue that the class structure of the party members is the proof that the Turkey Workers' Party is not revolutionary socialist party. I must add here that the program of the party demonstrates that the party is a product of social democrat compromise, inspired by Marxist class analysis and language. Let me follow how the party program presented the question of revolution in Turkey:

Despite Marxist contributions, the program was somehow a compromise between socialists and the democrats, between the socialist intellectuals and the social democrat labour leaders, between social republic and democratic republic. The difference between the social-democratic platform of the 1848 in France and the WPT is that in the former the workers represented the red, social republic while the petty bourgeois radicals represented the democratic republic whose memory went back to Rousseau and Robespierre, and that in the latter the intellectuals, petty bourgeois radicals, represented socialist and even Marxist ideas, while the workers represented a consciousness of a kind of left Kemalism or a social-democratic interpretation of Kemalist revolution in the new welfare-state conditions.

The program stated that among the intellectuals who played an important role in social development, some intellectual waves which represented "socialist thought" after the second constitutional period emerged (it is meant, after 1908 when the Young Turk's revolution took place). The "socialist thought" which had got stronger under the constitutional security after 27 May movement undoubtedly shed lights over the solutions of the country. It is seen that the program saw "socialist thought" as an enlightening tool for the

solution of the problems of the country and this instrumentalisation of socialist thought (and Marxism) demonstrated that the program of the WPT was beyond a compromise between the socialists and the democrats but a social-democratic interpretation of the early Kemalist Turkey with the “theoretical” colours of socialist class analysis.

The WPT saw the state as oppressive rather than liberator as Yön group did. The latter observed that the popular movement of the country was weak, and the country had no time to realize its development. This work could be realized under the leadership of the bureaucrat-military and intellectual sections. The WPT criticised Kemalism and argued that socialism was not only related with a method of development, but also with “the reorganization of society according to the values which fit the interests of the masses”. This could be realized with the involvement of the masses to the movement more and more in time. Atalay quoted in this attitude from Behice Boran: “There is no shortcut. The democratic path and making the masses awake must be first handled; the reforms can be realized with the awakening and the organization of the classes who have interests in the radical changes”. Boran, said Atalay, thought that the duty of the WPT was to prepare the masses to advocate their own interests in the political environment of the country. Atalay said that the WPT maintained this path even to the end of 1970s.

The WPT advocated “National Democratic Front” for all sections of society who had interest in democracy. This democratic front would be based on democratic and anti-imperialist struggle. The party focused on the parliamentary studies and campaigned for the abolition of the laws which contradicted with the 1961 constitution. This campaign became influential and attracted almost all progressive sections of society. The party became the example of the party for the human rights and democracy. It was already very interested in the rights of the working class and the problems of the trade unions due to its very origin. It supported the struggles in the factories

in order to correct the laws for strikes, total bargaining and the laws for trade unions and proposed laws to the parliament. The party held meetings, made announcements and applied the court of the constitution. It advocated civil rights of the Kurdish people and *Alevi*s and opposed to the oppressions they suffered.

There is no difference between what the program of Mehmet Ali Aybar's WPT understood from terms "popular" or "people" and what Mihri Belli understood from the terms "nation" and "national". Popular class and stratum of the so-called socialist revolutionaries are the national class and stratum of the national democratic revolutionaries. The target of political struggle is democracy, social justice and independence in both of them.

The other progressive waves besides the WPT after 1960 were the Yön movement, the NDR movement which developed after 1968, the youth movement basing on the "spirit of 1968", the CPT, although it worked abroad and the left of centre movement which began to develop within the RPP. Atalay said that the WPT did not establish healthy relationships with these movements and waves and it entered "conflicting relations". The first conflict emerged in the first congress in 1964 and developed in the second one in 1966. However, the relationship between the WPT and the CPT were exception. The CPT saw the WPT and legal working as an opportunity for the development of socialist thoughts in the country. For this reason, it limited its operations in favour of the WPT and worked in foreign countries within the youth and the working class. This relationship continued till 1974 without problem.

The fact that in 1968 the law for elections was changed had negative impacts over the party since it did not have an alternative form of opposition. The result of 1969 elections in which the party lost 37 percent of the vote in comparison to 1965 election created destructive moral influence over the party. Significant portion of the party circles moved toward "the movements

suggesting new forms of struggle". The party leadership was divided. New team did not and already could not objectively turn back the fall and dissolution. New party leadership lost their "theoretical-political common sense", too. Atalay said that the new team began to "**develop responding theories in sequence**" ("tepki teorileri"). Against the priority of the struggle for independence, the unity of the struggle for the independence and socialism was advocated. The leadership of the working class were debated so much but without content, said Atalay. the WPT advocated the "socialist revolutionary thesis" when we came to 1969 and 1970. Atalay said that how this thesis had been developed was explained best by Behice Boran "again": It was quoted from **Boran: "the Thesis of socialist revolution emerged as a result"**. Atalay said that, however, this result was "a result which the reaction created" (for İbrahim Atalay's presentation of the WPT see www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts).

NDR in Behice Boran: Boran stated that this formula (NDR) seemed to be given up then for practical failures in newly independent Asian and African countries for which it was proposed. The bourgeoisie and "the intermediary stratum" of the underdeveloped countries did not develop the internal market and accomplish industrialisation. They also feared from the awakening of the labouring masses and socialist mobilisation. For this reason they tended to cooperate with the foreign capital. They did not want to realise democratic reforms and especially land reform (Boran, 1970, 254).

In this phase, "the struggle for the national independence" was also "struggle for socialism". It was the socialist struggle because the struggle tried to make the working-worker classes the leader and the driving force of the movement and take the working-worker class party to the power. It was the socialist struggle because it wanted the realisation of "complete independence", "a real land reform", "a complete realisation of the constitutional rights and freedoms", nationalisation of foreign commerce, banking and insurances, the extension of the public sector and a fill this "state capitalism" with "socialist

content". All these tasks could be realised only with the party of the working-workers' socialist party in the power. "Saying **first** anti-imperialist struggle and **then** socialism" and ignoring the improvement of socialist struggle, and the organisation of the working-worker classes and bringing consciousness to them, and the preparation of the conditions for socialism from now on and attributing to it a secondary role, by taking into the first position the cooperation with "all progressive forces" and giving the weight centre of the movement to the cooperation, by taking attention to the bourgeoisie and the intermediary stratum would lead into a condition where "anti-imperialist struggle" would be followed by "power vacuum" which would be possibly filled by "the petty bourgeoisie" and "the national bourgeoisie". Boran suggested that what was to be done was "to strengthen the socialist movement" by winning intellectuals as much as possible and driving its remaining parts with the progressive parts of the bourgeoisie, "if any" to the alliance of socialist movement (Boran, 1970, 255).

The agenda of the WPT as "the political organisation of Turkish socialist movement", said Boran, could be summarised in its main slogans; "the complete and perfect implementation of the constitution", "complete national independence", "the abolishment of the bilateral treaties, American bases, getting outside NATO", "2. National Liberation War under the leadership of the labouring classes". She said that the question of the day was the constitution and the contradictory characteristics of the existing order in the face of the constitution. IN addition, "national independence" became the another subject matter of the day since how the independency and the sovereignty of the country had been injured and constrained has been revealed more and more (Boran, 1970, 257).

Boran said that the first alternative or suggestion was "the view of and the political line of the WPT". The second one was "the view of some socialists outside the party". The first view was explicitly explained by the WPT. The second one was not explained explicitly to the degree she did (Boran, 1970,

258). A possible reply which would suggest that the leadership would belong to the class which could acquire de facto leadership, and this problem could not be solved through discussion could not be accepted, says Boran (Boran, 1970, 258). She said that the selection of one of these two alternatives would determine the political line of the socialist movement. The second view would lead into giving up the socialist struggle for then on, and the leadership of the working and labouring classes. According to this alternative, the leadership of the working-labouring classes would not be realised “even if the objective conditions are suitable” due to this view. The space would be occupied by “the intermediary classes which are the spokesmen of the bourgeoisie”, putting away the socialist movement to the secondary position (Boran, 1970, 259).

The movement, said Boran, was already taking place in this direction. The bilateral treaties, American bases, NATO, Cyprus were the subjects the WPT dealt with the most explicitly and coherently. The exact implementation of the constitution was similarly the subject the WPT concerned the most. The WPT tried to reveal “the inner logic of the constitution” and to turn it to “a living legal system”. In addition, the WPT was making the labouring classes into “a political force which is the foundation of Turkish democracy” by organising and encouraging them for democratic rights and freedoms. In this movement, there were emerging cooperation between the party and the other circles and forces outside the party.

As for “the unity of the all democratic, anti-imperialist organisations, forces, persons for the minimum common programme in the form the frontal movement”, Boran observed that “the condition of Turkey today are not suitable” for such a united front although the WPT did never reject it. However, she added that “The progressive elements of the Turkish bourgeoisie and intermediary class and stratum that do not go away from bourgeois ideology are rather conscious about the class position, and even though they want to take side on the constitution, independence so much,

they are uncomfortable for socialist movement". Their class interests are decisive in the first degree and they did not want to see "the worker- working classes" "a political force", which had acquired rights and freedoms (Boran, 1970, 260). These classes were not coherent and determined for the subjects of independency and the constitution and did not want so much the cooperation with the socialists (Boran, 1970, 261).

Boran concluded that "Today, in Turkey the movement of democracy and independence is gradually turning into the socialist movement. In this bi-directed movement, the party of the worker-working classes the WPT demonstrates the most progressive, the most courageous, the most coherent and the most patient behaviour. **The struggle for independence is uniting with simultaneously the struggle for socialism in Turkey**" (Boran, 1970, 261).

Thesis of Socialist Revolution in Behice Boran: Behice Boran said in her "Turkey and the Problems of Socialism" that when it came to power, the WPT would prepare the preconditions of socialism. This stage was "the stage for the transition to socialism" (Boran, 1970, 252-3). This stage was not "national revolution" or "democratic revolution", which was mentioned "in socialist the literature" and advocated by "some circles outside the party". In Turkey, "democratic revolution" was done with the abolishment of "the autocracy", "the establishment of the republic" and "Atatürk revolutions". This revolution was "continued" and "improved" with the transition to the multi-party system, 27 May movement. The universal suffrage with secret voting, eight hours' working day, establishments of the trade unions, the acts for strike and collective bargain were recognised as rights and also implemented. The other "democratic rights" were introduced. A form of land reform, the distribution of the state lands was attempted. "The order which was the residual of the feudalism was liquidated and turned into capitalist farming in the West of the country. This liquidation and transformation as such began to appear in the East and South Eastern Anatolia. All of these could have been

done as much as a weak bourgeoisie could do in an underdeveloped country. This class could not complete the task of industrialisation, and the complete liquidation of “the land *ağas*” which had been the remnants of the feudal order and then wanted the support of the foreign capital and credits. But despite these deficiencies, Turkey was rather different from other underdeveloped countries and new independent countries of Asia and Africa. Turkey had never been colonised and lost its independent state position despite all foreign interventions. It had a long state tradition and its people were “proud” of being the citizen of this state and “very sensitive about the subject of independency”. Turkey was different from Latin American countries. These old colonised countries confronted with the pressure and intervention of USA after they had won political independence. American capital was enormous in these countries, unlike Turkey and the extent that their economies were dependent on America could not be compared with that of Turkey. The “dominant classes-their oligarchies” cooperated much more than Turkey with the capitalist circles of USA. Their armies were “the instrument of oppression and terror” of these oligarchies (Boran, 1970, 253).

The form of power predicted in the WPT government was also not stage of “the national democratic revolution” suggested especially for the countries which had won their independency after the Second World War. Boran observed that this “formula has been put forward for the countries which did not have working class or very small, and hence did not have working class party”. She said that this formula predicted that “intermediary classes, intellectual-bureaucratic stratum, urban petty bourgeoisie, in the form of a collation with rural urban labourers took the power and then ensured the national independence and development through non-capitalist path” (Boran, 1970, 253-4). They then would follow a “state capitalism” in the form of “estatism” for independence, industrialisation and development. The existing socialist movements and circles would support “this collation movement” (Boran, 1970, 254).

Boran argued that the formula of “the national democratic revolution” was not valid also for Turkey where “democratic revolution” passed through “state capitalism” “under the leadership and the power of intermediary strata, the bourgeoisie” for nearly fifty years. However, although national liberation war brought with it “political economic independence”, it could not complete its development and did not complete its independence with this and then entered into the sides of the imperialism. The reason behind this was “the fact that National Liberation War and the revolutions after that- i.e. the National Democratic revolution- was executed under the leadership of the petty bourgeois civil-military cadres and in the framework of the bourgeois ideology” (Boran, 1970, 254).

As a reply to the formula of the national democratic revolution *before* socialist revolution, Boran asked “if so what are the things that have been done for a half century”. For her, the national liberation war and the republican period were nothing but a period of “the National Democratic revolution”. and Boran said as for the *incompleteness* of the national democratic revolution that in any country, “bourgeois democratic revolution” was not completed in terms of the democratic rights and freedoms for the labouring masses. The bourgeois democratic revolutions which had been done in the nineteenth century did not present “**complete**” freedom, equality and rights for “the worker-working classes”. The western countries put constraints over rights and freedoms when they saw necessity. Fascism was also seen in those countries (Boran, 1970, 254). Boran seemed to see Turkey as an ultimate test of the formula of the NDR. She said that in the underdeveloped countries, this revolution could be realised by “the intermediary strata” only to the extent that Turkey had been able to do (Boran, 1970, 254-5). The decreasing level of the national independence in time was already caused by the bourgeois characteristics of the governments and the movement in the country. Similarly, the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa after the Second World War passed in the same direction of Turkey and tended to cooperate with the imperialism due to their weak and incapable bourgeois classes and petty bourgeois ruling

classes in terms of development purposes. In Turkey and in these sorts of countries, national democratic revolution and national liberation movements had to turn into “socialist movement” absolutely in order to consolidate “national independence”. Boran said that Turkey was in such a transitory phase (Boran, 1970, 255).

To Boran, the advocates of the NDR did not say anything different from the words mentioned in the programme of the WPT. They mentioned the questions such as independency, the democratic rights, land reform and the nationalisation of the economy. Boran said that the advocates of the NDR formula did not explained “the class content” in the stage the national democratic revolution. If the power would belong to the coalition of the petty bourgeoisie, “national bourgeoisie” and the “worker-working classes”, to whom the control of this coalition belonged? In addition, in “Fully independent and truly democratic Turkey”, in such a country they demanded, what kind of economic system would be? She asked whether the capitalist relations of production would be maintained (Boran, 1970, 256).

Boran suggested that the purpose had to be “the power of the worker-working classes and their socialist party”. Only such a power could realise “complete independence, real democracy and radical transformations”. The petty bourgeoisie and the national wing of the local bourgeoisie, “if any”, which had “not yet appeared”, could be only “ally forces” “in a certain degree”. The public sector had to be extended through new nationalisation and liberated from “state capitalism under the service and control of the bourgeoisie” and turned into “an estatism under the service and control of the labouring people”. This sector had to be filled with “socialist content” by “taking away from the capitalist relations”. This “state sector” would be the dominant, and ruling and regulating one for the national economy (Boran, 1970, 256). Boran stated that she called this stage “development through socialist path” which would prepare “the conditions of a complete socialist order”, “even the first stage of the formation of socialism” but not “national

democratic revolutionary stage". She added that to eliminate the confusions of mind, she meant by the term "National Democratic revolution" a revolution in which "petty bourgeois and local bourgeois classes" realised through incoherent attitudes, "under the leadership of the progressive petty bourgeois intellectual stratum" by winning the support of "the labouring masses" to a certain degree. This revolution was "national" to the extent that they were anti-imperialist and advocated national independence; "democratic" to the extent that they presented the democratic rights and freedoms; and "revolutionary" to the extent that they liquidated the traditional order, and feudal, and tribal remnants (Boran, 1970, 256). The slogan of "National Democratic revolution" had been already suggested for new independent underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa. The formula was designed to solve the problem of the development and the development stages towards socialism of these sorts of countries (Boran, 1970, 256-7).

As for the problems of the constitution and the national independency, Boran said that there were two suggestions for the socialist party of the labouring classes to follow. The first alternative suggests that "struggle for National independence and socialism could be realised together, these are two inward and outward looking faces, of the same movement". The second alternative was based on the observations that the socialist movement and its party is weak due to the small and weak working class and insufficient consciousness and activity of the workers as well as other labourers, the "intermediary classes" had a revolutionary tradition tracing back to the liberation war and the struggle for independency was given by these classes more than the other classes, the party of these classes- "the Left of Centre's RPP" was a powerful organisation, the main problem of Turkey was independence. This alternative made these observations and suggested that "socialist had to support the struggle for independency of these classes and also "the left of centre". The slogan had to be "Struggle **first** for independence, **then** socialism". A simultaneous struggle of independence and socialism excludes the elements which advocated national

independence but were not socialist. But independency could be realised through the struggle of all nation. It was already the fact that socialism would follow the national democratic revolution in which intermediary classes and the revolutionary bourgeoisie played a significant role. Boran said that although the advocates of this alternative did not express explicitly, but in their minds, the leadership and the power” belonged to these classes. The labouring classes and their party would play a secondary, supportive role (Boran, 1970, 258).

4.9 Military Warning against “Marxist-Leninist” uprising

In an official book prepared by the order of the prime ministry in 1973 (*White Book*, 1973) stated that the official reason behind the 12 march military warning was to stop the Marxist Leninist movements which aimed at establishing a communist order like the Soviet system. However, it will be seen below, *the Aydınlık* saw neither such an official reason nor socialism as a threat in Turkey. The fact that this semi-fascisan development could not be conceived is related with the fact that *the Aydınlık* did not apply modern class phenomena to the conditions of Turkey. It is ironical that fascism was seen as a threat to the socialist movement after 1962, but any changes in the analysis of the concert political situation in the framework of modern class relations were not made by it. Below it will be seen that how a movement were going into destruction without a central party organization and without the theoretical equipment of the Marxist theory of class and revolution.

“We are strong enough to defeat fascism”: *The Aydınlık* said that “In the dependent country which is under the tutelage of the imperialism, the political order is either open fascism or Philippines kind of artificial democracy” (“Let Us Fulfil the Job for Organisation”, *the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 193). *The Aydınlık* added that Turkey faced with the attempts of transforming the latter into the former. All parliamentary leaders of the time such as İnönü, Demirel, the President of the Republic, Feyzioğlu cooperated to defeat “ultra extremes”

through police force. There were attempts to suppress revolutionary youth through fascist measures. But the debate was upon whether these measures would be taken with or without Demirel's governments. For example, İnönü suggested fascist measures without Demirel (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 245).

The politicians who pointed to "ultra extremes" concealed the reality that the conditions of conflict were created by the comprador government by attacking revolutionary students. "Ultra right" was in fact Demirel's government. Ultra-left did not exist in Turkey. "Real left" was the working class, the poor peasants, that is the majority of the country, the intellectuals which represented the masses. The middle peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie were also on the side of the left for independent and democratic Turkey. Left of Turkey is "Turkey's people" excluding a group of parasites. The left of Turkey aimed to realise democratic and independent Turkey in the direction of socialism. It aimed for National Democratic revolution. The "left sectarian" actions were not "ultra left" actions but "right opportunism" seeming left (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 247).

The Aydınlık indeed talked about a reality which influences the revolutionary movement of the workers, the students and the intellectuals after the beginning of 1960. The state and the politicians of the state have labelled all sort of left opposition as "anarchist", "ultra left", "tool of foreign centres", "communist", and "divisionist". The revolutionary youth which has been in a forward position in the left movement contributed to the formation of such an "image" of the left in general. After the late 1960s, the revolutionary youth also began to organise armed struggle. Doğu Perinçek's Revolutionary Workers-Peasants Party of Turkey (briefly RWPPT), Deniz Gezmiş's THKO People's Liberation Army of Turkey (briefly PLAP), Mahir Çayan's PLPT-PLFT were established within two years before military warning of 12 March 1971. Legal parliamentary socialist struggle of the WPT could not control and lead the revolutionary youth. The youth left the WPT when the FRYA

became the centre of the national democratic revolutionary youth under the influence of Mihri Belli.

The term “ultra left” after the early 1960s was used for the definition of the revolutionary youth and students. *The Aydınlık* asked what “the revolutionary student” who was labelled as “ultra left” by “reactionary propaganda” wanted: He wanted university autonomy, real scientists and real scientific education. He wanted the possibility of learning “scientific socialism which is the science of the sciences” and of obtaining theoretical formation. He wanted to participate in the struggle for independence and democracy (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 247). He wanted to access to the workers and the peasants in a revolutionary responsibility (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 247-8). He wanted to help the workers and the peasants in political and economic struggle. He wanted to contribute to the consciousness and organisation of the labouring masses. He wanted to close the gap between the revolutionary intellectual and the labouring people. This gap was produced by the reactionary forces. He wanted to struggle with other “nation-ist” forces (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 248).

The Aydınlık asked what the revolutionary youth did not want: He did not want police trappings, shootings, torture. He did not want armament for self-protection because of the lack of confidence which was created consciously by the comprador government. He did not want to spend his limited money which could be used for revolutionary education and action for armament. He did not want to become watchman in his dormitory and faculty because of fascist attacks (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 248). But he had to do what he did not want because of the lack of confidence which was created by the government. He had to take “legitimate” measures for self-protection (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 248).

The Aydınlık in the January 1971 two months before 12 March’s military warning pointed to a reality which was valid after the rise of the revolutionary movement after the half of the 1960s. This reality was the chaotic conditions

which were created by the fascist militants registered in Ülkü Ocakları (fascist youth organisations, “ocak” means fireplace, bed, source, growing bed. “Ülkü” means claim, condition idealised, target) which were controlled by National Action party (hereafter briefly NAP). Among the other examples of the fascist attacks, *the Aydınlık* pointed to several fascist criminals who killed a revolutionary young. In the murdering, the fascists were financed by a businessperson who was also brother of Süleyman Demirel, the prime minister. *The Aydınlık* also referred to a sentence used by Demirel: “nationalists who struggle against communism” (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 248-9).

What could be done against open fascism? The government (of Demirel, the JP) was directly the creator of these circumstances. The opposition (of İnönü, the RPP) indirectly supported the government. It was nominal opposition. *The Aydınlık* suggested that firstly all national classes and estates had to put forward their resistance. Secondly, a democratic government had to be established and this truly democratic government had to be supported in the direction of national democratic revolution. After then, the state institutions, the most importantly the police forces had to be eliminated from the influence of the imperialism and its compradors. Political or personal criminals had to be judged. All fascist, religious institutions had to be liquidated. Counter-revolution had to be oppressed and national democratic revolution had to be put into a dominant position (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 249). The first reaction against the open fascist aims came from 350 scholars of the Middle East Technical University (METU) (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 249-50). *The Aydınlık* hoped that this first reaction would be followed by the reactions of the workers, peasants and the youth. What had to be done was nothing but the “minimum programme of National Democratic revolution” with the support of all democratic forces for a democratic government.

The Aydınlık had a polemic with İsmet İnönü who was the second man of the Kemalist revolution, the second president of the republic after 1938 when Mustafa Kemal Atatürk died and the general president of the RPP. He was

portrayed as a counter-revolutionary by *the Aydınlık* before 12 March 1971. Previously, *the Aydınlık* did not make any negative reference to the RPP and İnönü. İnönü criticized revolutionary youth. The youth demanded independency. But for İnönü, Turkey was not a dependent country. American-Turkish relations were relationships of two ally countries. America stayed in Turkey due to bilateral agreements. *The Aydınlık* replied that existence of American soldiers in the country meant an existence of a foreign military force in like an occupied country. The agreements and treaties also did not create legitimacy since the Sevres had been also a treaty signed by the state of the time (Sevres Treaty was signed by the last Ottoman Empire. It was rejected by new nationalist power in Anatolia. This treaty predicated the reverse of the national state of Mustafa Kemal which would be built through Kemalist revolutions after 1923). İnönü and his party were in the same side with the government in the context of the murdering of the revolutionary youths. They also supported the police intervention to the universities. *The Aydınlık* observed that İnönü changed its oppositional characteristic which had been seen in the period of Democrat party. This was because he and his party was no longer the single opposition. There were a legal revolutionary opposition now. The youth was a part of the revolutionary opposition. İnönü no longer reacted to torture and pressure. But he reacted to legitimate self-protection of the youth (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 250-2). More interesting point of the time was that in his last addressing, Cevdet Sunay supported the commandos of Ülkü Ocakları and pointed to the Maoists as a target (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 252).

The new game of the imperialism was to support “right opportunism”, that is, socialism officially recognised and sectarian left which seemed to be on the left side of the proletarian revolutionary movement. *The Aydınlık* said that the real revolutionary movements followed Castro and Guevara in South and Central America. But some sectarian groups which called themselves “Maoist” were put forward against these movements. They were indirectly supported by American imperialism and its compradors (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a,

252). But in Vietnam, some Maoist groups supported and worked in the same party with the other proletarian revolutionaries who did not supported their line (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 252-3). *The Aydınlık* claimed that this game in Turkey was played by putting forward left sectarian provocations in the name of “Maoist-ism” after the defeat of the opportunist clique on the top of the WPT. *The Aydınlık* argued that the line of “White **Aydınlık**” would lead into internal division and isolation from other revolutionary forces of the proletarian revolutionary movement. This line presented American imperialism and the Soviet Union as the same although in Turkey which was in a condition of national liberation war against American imperialism, we needed good neighbouring relations with the Soviet Union. The *White Aydınlık* (PRA) used the slogan “Down with American imperialism dawn with social imperialism!”. *The Aydınlık* stated that such a slogan would result in the isolation of Turkey from its close neighbours. While the slogan of “damn American imperialism” meant a negative attitude towards Iranian Shah and Greek junta leaving aside America and while this attitude was necessary, the slogan of “damn social imperialism” implied a negative attitude against the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Syria and Iraq which lived thanks to the support of the Soviet Union. American was in Mediterranean with its 6.Filo and in Anatolia with its bases. The Soviet Union was in Black Sea and the Mediterranean with its Navy. “Our campus ‘Maoists’ tried to isolate Turkey’s revolutionary movement from outer world (*the Aydınlık*, 1971a, 253).

“We will break the isolation game of counter-revolution”: “It is unfortunate thing that the fate of Philippines that is one of the first colonies of the period of primitive accumulation of capital and the fate of Turkey which has never confronted with colonial condition, and even more a long years after it made its liberation struggle demonstrates great paralleling in essential terms” (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 273). The similarity was “Philippines democratism” which was nothing but “fascism with parliamentary mask”. The Philippines become the colony of Spain in 1570, and had been occupied by America in 1899. It won its independence from Japan in 1946. This

independence was only nominal. *The Aydınlik* stated that the colonialist system of “the competitive capitalism”, which ruled through military occupations, was already replaced with “new colonialism” of the imperialist age. With the support of America a liberal party was established. Compradors and landowners who increased their wealth during the war and under Japanese occupation thereby came into power. The democratic alliance of the communist party and moderate nationalist party was defeated. Military was fulfilled by American consultants. New military bases were leased by the Americans. Anti-imperialist forces were liquidated. The state implemented terrorist measures against the democratic alliance. Parliamentary politics became the area of free movements of the imperialism and its local extensions. But, economy was dependent on foreign sources and liberal party was losing strength. In 1950, an anti-imperialist movement began in the country (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 274). American imperialism replaced liberal party with nationalist party (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 274-5). What changed was the change of the liberal party which had not been profitable for American imperialism with the other party which it made it wait for the mission to come. This was “the game of democratism” (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 275). More interesting similarity between Philippines and Turkey was that between 1950 and 1960 when anti-imperialist movement was rising, it was argued that the partnership with America was needed for development and was in favour of the country. In 1961, liberal party was provided for seizing power again (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 275).

The Aydınlik said that the multi-party system was erected upon the economic system which still included feudal social relations. The result was to be “Philippines democratism”. The parties in which the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal land owners were dominant appeared in the political scene. The proletariat, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie were not allowed to influence political life. the RPP and the DP competed for American friendship. *The Aydınlik* observed that the RPP lost the competition because

of its historical background and it alone could not seize the power from 1950 on (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 276).

Independent economy of Turkey lived an economic crisis which was related with the world wide crisis of capitalism. The working class realised great struggles which had not been seen in its history; the struggle of the peasants for land rapidly developed and their struggle increased against the exploitation of the usurers and the merchants. Rising costs of living led the other sections of society such as the retired state officials, doctors, technicians, and social police to mobilise and to resist. The crisis also increased the conflicts between the comprador classes of the imperialism. The RPP and the JP gave birth to new parties. The most important among them *the Aydınlık* stated was the Nationalist Order Party (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 278). It was established by Necmettin Erbakan, whose religious oriented bourgeois party would come into the coalition government with Bülent Ecevit's RPP in 1974 and would alone come into the government in the late 1990s.

In Turkey, "military-civil intellectual estate hegemony" was established after the liberation war. The order under the hegemony of this estate tried to create national bourgeoisie, to limit the influence of the compradors, to destroy feudal institutions. By doing so, the new order tried to realise democratic revolution. But revolutionary steps were uncompleted (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 275). The petty bourgeoisie had not a coherent ideology and did not follow a coherent revolutionary line. This incoherency of the petty bourgeoisie stamped over the period between 1919 and the late 1940s. In the beginning, the petty bourgeois bureaucracy behaved warmly towards the first proletarian revolution of the world. Then it adopted a liberal economic policy in 1923's İzmir Economic Congress. It adopted "estatism" between 1929 and 1933 when the capitalist world lived a great economic crisis. Its incoherency and its inability of realising radical reforms such as a radical land reform which would be able to destroy the power of the big landowners

resulted in its defeat by the imperialism and the counter-revolution which waited for this possibility. The Second World War led into good economic conditions for the minorities concerning with foreign commerce, big land owners, and usurer merchants at the expense of the government. During the period of the second war where fascists seemed to victorious the state supported fascist lines and tendencies. The fascists could find a place for themselves even within the state. *The Aydınlık* stated that “Tax for Wealth” was a typical example of fascist policy. The big landowners (“big land ağas”), usurer merchants and the imperialism were determined to overthrow the petty bourgeois power. The petty bourgeoisie established “peasant institutes” and tried to realise “land reform” to obtain the support of the people and the peasants in particular for the continuation of its power. But these steps were “unhopeful” and the signs for new developments. The RPP led into the formation of a new party, the DP, into multi-party system and a counter-revolution in 1950 election (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 276).

27 May 1960 movement meant that military-civil intellectual estate put a short end to the power of the compradors of the imperialism. This movement made a democratic constitution which would not be liked by the counter revolutionaries and established democratic institutions. But there were no “class base” for these democratic steps and their continuation. The economic base of the Philippines democracy was the same. With the support of the American dollars, Justice Party brought the alliance of the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal big land owners into the power. The period of Philippines democracy between 1950 and 1960 came back. The WPT was established thanks to the democratic rights of 1961 constitution. But the leading cadres of this party were engaged with the parliamentary politics of Philippines democraticism. Only difference was the fact that “the petty bourgeois radicalism” had limited the authority of the parliament and increased the authority of the state institutions it controlled thanks to the new constitution (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 277).

The Aydınlık stated that in the limited democratic conditions brought into existence by the new constitution permitted the rise of the proletarian revolutionary struggle without and outside the WPT. This movement brought the anti-imperialist struggle to the masses. Its slogans could succeed in isolating the counter-revolutionary forces (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 277).

The Aydınlık concluded that “the dominant reactionary alliance” was in a condition where it could not rule. Philippines democracy could not go on in the conditions where new constitution and new democratic institutions were in operation. The solution on the part of “the counter-revolutionary forces” was a version of “Yahya Han formula” in Pakistan (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 278).

“Yahya Han formula” was implemented in Pakistan in 25 March 1970. The President of Pakistan Eyüp Han, by agreeing with Yahya Han, the head of the army, was obliged to turn over the government to him. Eyüp Han had been a target for attacks, the Yahya Han formula seemed to have been supported by the revolutionaries. The reality, however, was the fact that a minority ruled the country through bureaucratic and military power and Eyüp Han feared from democratic movements. The democratic events in 1968 and 1969 aimed to overthrow Eyüp Han’s regime. In addition, Eyüp Han and his family became a part of corruption (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 279).

The socialist left seemed to predicate more than what would occur within and after 12 March 1971’s military warning (or intervention). The interesting point was that it also defined the National Security Council as the centre of the state politics. This council is composed of the president of the republic, the prime minister and some ministers related with the subject to be concerned in the meeting of the council, the heads of the military forces. I think that this council was a reason behind the need for a powerful and relatively fixed centre for the bourgeois domination. It represents the *state power* above the *political power* of the parliament and the government. Another interesting point is that *the Aydınlık* ignores that this council was first

formed according to the target of 27 May 1960's coup d'état. However, *the Aydınlik* does not see 27 May as a stage a development in the bourgeois revolution in Turkey. 27 May was an intervention of the military-civil intellectual estate to the counter-revolution of the alliance of the imperialism- the compradors- the feudal landowners.

Last point is related with "fascism". I must ask whether fascism can be possible unless bourgeois revolution is completed. If fascism is the terrorist and dictatorial rule of the bourgeoisie over the working class, the state had to be seized by him in advance and the proletariat had to have elevated to a position where it could threaten the bourgeois order. For the bourgeoisie, any revolutionary threat is now the socialist threat of the proletariat. So if proto-12 March period was a preparation for fascist measures, the bourgeois revolution had to have been completed before. For a bourgeois dictatorship such as fascism to be existed, the bourgeoisie had to have seized the political and economic power before. *The Aydınlik* talks about such a fascist threat below.

The Aydınlik said that Demirel wanted to issue "fascisan laws" and to change the constitution by basing the formula of Yahya Han. This wish seemed to have been approved in the last meeting of the National Security Council. Some attacks and some law proposals pointed to this approval. Yahya Han formula was wanted to be implemented collectively through "a double power". But it might its form according to the resistance towards fascist laws (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 279). But these policies would not be a cure for the declining power of the counter-revolutionary forces (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 280).

Only alternative for the counter-revolution was "**a more open, complete fascism**". However, this alternative was nothing but would be the sign for the beginning of "**a civil war**". The open fascism was obliged to base itself on the big landed property, feudal relations and religious reactionary forces. *The Aydınlik* warned that this sort of fascism would lead into polarisation in the

society. It would drive the last conscious sections to the inverse side (*the Aydınlik* seems to have meant that these sections would be driven to the opposite side of the fascism). This meant that the large part of society would become poorer than before and resist. *The Aydınlik* said that “**A force which will maintain this form of fascism in ‘the peaceful’ conditions is not existed in Turkey**” (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 280).

In addition, the army of Turkey is different. It has “a revolutionary tradition”. It was not yet been dominated by the imperialism. Its officers have a “populist class origin”. Kemalist forces in the army are a serious threat for the imperialists and their local compradors. The imperialism tried to eliminate the Kemalist tradition in the army and tried to turn the officers to aristocrat and non-national agents (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 280).

Moreover, the fascism would confront with the proletarian revolutionary movement which became powerful in every day for integration with the masses. Demirel’s attempt for a collective formula of Yahya Han required the isolation of the proletarian revolutionaries from the other national forces and their neutralisation (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 280). This required that the problems of Turkey had to be attributed to the responsibilities of the proletarian revolutionaries (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 280-1). This also required that “fascist commando organisations” had to be established and driven towards the revolutionary youth and force this youth to the armament and then to create “a literature of ultra extremes”, to charge the responsibility of some provocations over the revolutionary youth, to divide the people within itself and then to blame the revolutionaries for “divisionism”. These all were “the play of isolation” (*the Aydınlik*, 1971b, 281).

Before 12 march, the proletarian socialists of *the Aydınlik* had not party organisation. The debates about this were continuing. This article was published in February 1971, one month after Ertugrul Kürkçü, Yusuf Küpeli, Münir Aktolga and Mahir Çayan had circulated to the public their “**Open**

Letter to Aydınlık” through Kurtuluş Publications in **January** 1971 (see this letter and Çayan’s *Collected Works*, in www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu). This letter, the pamphlet, explained why they left from *the Aydınlık* and their mode of struggle in the framework of the national democratic revolution. Their PLPT-PLFT was established in **February** 1971. But this was not yet addressed to the public.

The Aydınlık said that a collective struggle which did not have a revolutionary political organisation of the proletariat and the poor peasantry could not have a class base and could not have a power against the attacks of fascism (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 280-1). *The Aydınlık* also referred to the need for disciplined, coherent and central for the proletarian revolutionary movement. In addition, a proletarian revolutionary organisation was required for the maintenance of the autonomy of the movement. As for the organisation, *the Aydınlık* emphasised that party organisation should wait for the ideological coherence. The organisation had to be the organisation of “the militants” of “the **real** socialists”. It would make revolutionary collaboration with “real kemalists”. It would rescue Turkey from counter-revolution and move it towards revolution (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 282). *The Aydınlık* finally pointed to campus Maoists and the others who competed with campus Maoists about “left’ chattering” (*the Aydınlık*, 1971b, 283).

When 12 March 1971’s military warning took place, *the Aydınlık* had been already divided within itself. To portray the reciprocal positions of the divisions within *the Aydınlık*, I can say that the centre was represented by Mihri Belli, Muzaffer Erdost and Vahap Erdoğan. Left was represented by Mahir Çayan and his friends in the PLPT-PLFT. The right was represented by Doğu Perinçek, his PRA and the RWPPT. **The centre had no party.** *The Aydınlık* would offer its last issue in March-April 1971. Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism was the common point for all of them. But when **left adopted guerrilla** warfare of the pioneers in the direction of the popular war, **the right adopted Maoist mass line** theory of struggle and three-world theory of

China. **The centre**, Mihri Belli actually adopted what *the Aydınlık* said hitherto in my presentation.

“Let us not be caught unready in next.” Nihat Erim was a politician who was under the influence of İnönü (“under the shadow of İnönü”). He was an agent of status qua. For this reason he could not be a representative of the progressive elements. However, nevertheless, “the intervention of the army which was the beginning of the end for the Philippines parliamentarism” put a better politician to the power in terms of “petty bourgeois radicalism” in comparison to Demirel. Erim was not like Demirel who became a part of corrupted relations, crimes, etc (*Aydınlık*, 1971c, 371).

The Aydınlık argued that the events disapproved the claims that any military intervention would lead into “fascism” and hence the existing parliamentary system had to be preferred. In addition, Ecevit’s claim that military intervention was a fascist intervention made to prevent the rise of “the left of the centre” to the power. The intervention was not against Demirel’s government. *The Aydınlık* argued that Ecevit’s argument was not serious since the government of the state was realised by only two parties. The Philippines democracy excluded the other parties which were not dominated by the compradors and feudal landowners (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 371).

The Aydınlık’s last issue appeared as the issue of March-April 1971. This issue demonstrates the confusions of the time. It analysed 12 March. It publicised the draft programme of the proletarian revolutionary “movement”. I witness here a programme of a movement rather than an organisation such as party or association. It publicised Şefik Hüsnü Değmer’s party programme in 1946 (programme of Turkey’s Socialist Labourer and Peasant Party). It analysed “Celali İsyanları” (Celali Rebellions in the sixteenth century of the Ottoman Empire). It re-published Lenin’s writing about the Paris Commune of 1871 and his speech about 1905 Russian revolution. I think that confusion was seen in the confusions about bourgeois revolution, socialist revolution,

and the mutual place of the classes in the revolution, the historical possibilities and characteristics for a possible revolution in Turkey. It is ironic that this the last issue of *the Aydınlık* started with a warning about future: “Let us not be caught unready in next”. This was said despite the confusions about the past.

The Aydınlık informed that Demirel’s cabinet resigned immediately after the generals presented their “warning of 12 March” to the President of the Republic and the chambers in the parliament. The government which had come into the power thanks to the domination of the comprador capital and feudal land owners over the electorate gave up the power because of “the force of an army in which petty bourgeois radical tendencies prevailed” (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 369). After the resignation of Demirel, Nihat Erim who was a member of the parliament from the RPP was appointed for him to deal with the reforms which had been predicated in the constitution and the laws of the revolution. Erim was assumed to be “neutral” and “supra-parties” prime minister (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 369-70). *The Aydınlık* stated that in a country which came to the front of civil war and in a country where “anarchy” prevailed, a prime minister and his cabinet which claimed to realise reforms in favour of the people and to stop counter-revolution would not be able not to be neutral and supra-party. If it was honest it had to take the side of the revolutionaries and rejected the counter-revolutionary politicians such as Demirel and İnönü in particular. This cabinet would not be able to reformist in petty bourgeois radical framework since it did not deal with the former government and the opposition which implicitly allied with the government. In addition, none of the politicians who were seen in the public since 12 March talked about “American imperialism” (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 370). As for the land reform, *the Aydınlık* stated that if this would mean that the state would redistribute the lands which it expropriated in high prices from the land lords, such a land reform would be “false” reform which could be supported even by American imperialism (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 370-1).

The situation could not be considered worse than the former (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 371). The events demonstrated that even in the bad conditions, Kemalist revolutionary elements prevailed in the army which “originated from a National Liberation War” “in the last analysis”. “Yahya Han Formula” was not valid at least for that time. The new prime minister was obliged to maintain the status qua, which could be changed only through revolution (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 372).

The Aydınlık argued that a military intervention would not have led into fascism and now it stated that the military intervention prevented the fascism which Demirel’s government wanted to put forward. The military changed the method for the maintenance of the status qua. *The Aydınlık* forgot that the revolutionary youth established Marxist-Leninist and Maoist revolutionary parties illegally. The workers rebelled in 1970 June. the RTUCT began to dissolve the TUCT. Intellectuals rejected the political and ideological order of the country and the politicians of the order complained that the 1961’s Constitution was liberal and democratic. the WPT adopted far more socialist orientation. the RPP of İnönü moved towards the left of the centre of the state politics. Socialist and communist threat became a reality before Turkey’s dominant forces.

12 March Warning had contradictory statements. It charged the parliament which was seen as being responsible for the existing bad situation by the warning for implementing the laws of the revolution and implementing reforms. The makers of the warning seemed not to be believed in these statements, *the Aydınlık* stated, and warned that they could seize the power directly. In addition, the owners of the signatures in the warning had contradictory political tendencies. The President of the Republic did not conflict with Justice Party up to then and demonstrated that he advocated Philippines democratism. The problem of the head of the army was the youth and he did not oppose with the Demirel’s government. There were two signatures which belonged to Faruk Gürler and Muhsin Batur who two seed

to be close to the Kemalist officers' demand for stopping "counter-revolution". The composition of the owners of the signatures in the warning implied that "a minimum" and "common" attitude had been adopted after "concessions from revolutionary attitude" were made. *The Aydınlık* said that this idea was shared by many (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 373).

İnönü changed his negative attitude and began to seem to be the owner of the intervention. The newspapers changed their perspectives day by day. 12 March accepted the maintenance of the Demirel's government until new one would be established as if the government of Demirel was liquidated in a normal way. In addition, in Erim's government, some ministers of the Demirel's government worked even though the cabinet of Demirel had been forced to resign. The stranger event was that the ministers of Demirel's government signed some decisions about the missions and retirement of some Kemalist officers who played the role in the intervention. *The Aydınlık* stated that these events demonstrated that "the military intervention" was organised in opposition to "the rules of revolutionarism" and before the eyes of the enemy could not have radical characteristics and would lead into "compromises" and "degenerations" despite the Kemalist characteristic of the army in general (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 373).

The Aydınlık compared the 27 may with 12 March. In the former, the intervention was organised secretly. The president, the parliament, the government, and the higher echelons of the army met with a surprise. But in the latter, the intervention was organised openly and hence "counter-revolutionary circles" could take their measures. The army was still dominated by Kemalist officers. Number of the officers who wanted to implement Yahya Han formula (dressing Demirel's policies with military uniform) was counted (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 373).

All counter-revolutionaries, İnönü among them, degenerated the military intervention which had emerged as a result of Kemalist pressure coming from

the base of the army. They could succeed in canalising it into “the Philippines parliamentarism”. In addition, *the Aydınlik* argued that it was certain that the agents of American imperialism contributed to this result. The warning used “a Kemalist language” and supported reforms. It also blamed the government and the parliament. However, it gave the responsibility to solve the problems to the same parliament. This was not contradictory in fact. The tactic of the warning aimed to neutralise the doubtful elements and isolate the radical and Kemalist ones. In sum, “the front of the counter-revolution” could be able to prevent the intervention of the Kemalist radicals in order to stop the counter-revolutionary development in the form of a revolutionary collaboration with all revolutionary forces (*the Aydınlik*, 1971c, 374).

The revolutionaries could not make what was to be done during the crisis. The ones within the army were not clever. The ones outside the army were passive. All revolutionary “establishments” had to demonstrate their “weight” from the beginning on (*the Aydınlik*, 1971c, 374). *The Aydınlik* recalled that their announcement in 12 March said that a power could not make real radical reforms without the support of the labouring people, the workers and the peasants in particular (*the Aydınlik*, 1971c, 374-5). Top down reformism was doomed to fail. “Radical democratic reforms” could be realised only thanks to the support of the labourers in the cities and the villages. In the absence of active support of the labourers, top down reformism would be prevented and canalised into other direction as seen in the past. All revolutionary forces had to be clever in the revolutionary sense since the many counter-revolutionary forces were organised and even armed. 2 March 1971’s military warning was “an expression of the reaction of the Turkish Army which can maintain Mustafa Kemal’s nation-ist and progressive tradition to a large degree despite everything” “to the comprador Demirel’s government and to a parliament in which the comprador capital and feudal big land owners who gave the authority of governing to him prevail”. *The Aydınlik* continued to say that the politicians of the Philippines democratism and American imperialism could intervene to “progressive attack”. For this

purpose, these elements would possibly prevent the investigation of the fascist commando camps, religious attacks and Demirel's dark sides. Each concession would lead to the degeneration of "progressive attack" and help the formation of the good conditions for "counter-revolution". The labourers in the form of organisations and in a conscious way had to demand democratic and complete realisation of "the democratic reforms" which were mentioned in the warning. The masses had to participate in the reform process. The struggle had to be intensified in order to create "truly democratic" order in which "all labouring class and estates" could organise in their "professional and political organisations" (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 375). In order to realise this purpose, "revolutionary Front, Unity of revolutionary Forces" had to be established. In this "front" or "unity" "all nation-ist and revolutionary class and estates" would participate in organised way (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 375-6). This unity or front had to "neutralise" and "isolate" "the counter-revolutionary front" of the imperialism- the comprador capital and feudal land owners (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 376).

In a period when even the representatives of the non-national classes such as the president of the republic was obliged to accept the implementation of reforms defined in the constitution and the laws of revolution issued in the time of Atatürk according to the warning of 12 March, *the Aydınlık* stated that the labourers had to move forward and propagated the reforms. However, this mobility did not take place. The revolutionary workers stayed passive though the TUCT, representative of the yellow trade unionism organised some activities. The peasants could not act for land reform against the feudal landowners and usurer-wholesale merchant. The revolutionary youth could not cry out their revolutionary slogans in great meetings. In the moment of crisis, the revolutionary forces were ready for such a development. The reason behind this was the fact that the proletarian revolutionaries did not still have a central political organisation to govern the revolutionary struggle. *The Aydınlık* stated that the "creation" of such an organisation was "a sacred duty for all real socialists" (*the Aydınlık*, 1971c, 376).

**A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE SOCIALIST JOURNAL “AYDINLIK”
WITHIN A MARXIAN FRAMEWORK**

VOLUME II

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

BY

ERCAN GÜNDOĞAN

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION**

JULY 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
CHAPTER	

VOLUME I

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. The Context of the Study	1
1.2. The Purpose of the Study	6
1.3. The Methodology.....	7
1.4. The Structure of the Study	8
1.5. From Marx to the Turkish Marxist Movement	18
1.6. The Socialist Journal ‘ <i>Aydınlık</i> ’.....	22
2. CLASS AND CAPITALIST SOCIETY IN MARX.....	29
2.1. Early Development of Class conception in Marx.....	30
2.2. Classes of modern society, trinity of land labour capital. Dialectical Development of inner contradictions of capital62
2.2.1. An Introduction to <i>Capital</i>	63
2.2.2. <i>Capital</i>	71
3. ENTRY OF CAPITAL INTO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND THE DEBATE ON THE MODES OF PRODUCTION IN THE <i>AYDINLIK</i>215
3.1. Subordination of Agricultural Production into Capital Ground-Rent215
3.2. Dissolution of central military feudalism, and	

the comprador alliance.....	249
3.3. Rejecting the idea of Primitive Capitalism	308
3.4. Dominant Classes in the TWP Program.....	315
4. REVOLUTIONARY STAGES AND STRATEGY.....	322
4.1. Background of the Revolutionary Thought in Marx.....	323
4.2. The Stages of the French bourgeois revolution, 1789 to 1871.....	374
4.2.1. “The Civil War in France”: The revolution completed....	382
4.3. The Stages of Revolution in Turkey.....	398
4.3.1. The National Liberation Struggle.....	398
4.3.2. “The Kemalist Reforms Period”.....	401
4.3.3. Anti-Kemalist Counter-Revolution of dominant classes.....	413
4.4. 27 May Movement.....	424
4.5. The National Democratic Revolution.....	427
4.6. The Permanent Revolution in Marx.....	442
4.7. Mao’s Revolutionary Strategy for Backward Countries.....	446
4.8. WPT and the National Democratic Revolution.....	454
4.9. Military Warning against “ <i>Marxist-Leninist</i> ” uprising.....	468

VOLUME II

TABLE OF CONTENTS	xvi
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xx
CHAPTER	

5. REVOLUTIONARY CLASSES AND POSSIBILITIES.....	487
5.1. (National) bourgeoisie and <i>Revolutionary possibilities</i>	488
5.1.1. The Genesis of the Industrial Capitalist in Marx.....	502
5.1.2. Individual, class and Bourgeois-civil society	504
5.1.3. Purpose of Capitalist Production and the Capitalist.....	528
5.1.4. Merchant’s Capital: Old and Modern.....	545

5.1.5. From usury to modern banking.....	562
5.1.6. Capitalist as personification of capital	578
5.1.7. A Marxian interpretation of cultural-spatial identifications.....	584
5.2. PETTY BOURGEOISIE: AS AN INTERMEDIARY CLASS.....	591
5.2.1. Political fall of the petty bourgeoisie after 1848 June.....	608
5.2.2. The “Middle Classes” in WPT program.....	615
5.2.3. The Kemalist Army.....	618
5.2.4. The Relative Autonomy of the state and bureaucracy.....	619
5.3. PROLETARIAT.....	628
5.3.1. Struggle for a Normal Working Day.....	629
5.3.2. Uncompleted Proletarian Revolution: 1848 February.....	640
5.3.3. The Working Class in WPT program	652
5.3.4. Trade Unions: RTUCT and TUCT.....	665
5.3.5. Worker Resistance in June 70: A Sign of Maturation.....	691
5.3.6. Objective existence of the proletariat, the leadership.....	694
5.4. PEASANTRY: AS AN INTERMEDIARY CLASS	699
5.4.1. “The Foundational Moving Force”	700
5.4.2. Primitive Accumulation and Peasant	701
5.4.3. Small peasants in <i>Capital</i>	708
5.4.4. Small (French) Peasants in 1850s	729
5.4.5. The Peasants in WPT Program.....	734
6. THE PROGRAM OF THE “MOVEMENT”.....	736
6.1. The Program of the <i>Communist Manifesto</i> 1848.....	736
6.2. The Criticism of the <i>Gotha Program</i> in 1875.....	738
6.3. Mihri Belli: Addressing the General Meeting in October 1970.....	748
6.4. Class Party for National Front Struggle	761

6.5. The Meeting of October and the Party Question.....	773
6.6. “The Draft Program of the Movement”	789
7. CONCLUSION.....	803
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	824
APPENDIX	
A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	847
VITA.....	855

ABBREVIATIONS

Journals:

The *Aydınlık*: The Socialist Journal *Aydınlık* (Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi) (ASD)

The PRA: The Proleterian Revolutionary *Aydınlık* (Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık) (PDA)

Marx's and Engels' Writings

SW: Karl Marx's Selected Writings

EW: Karl Marx's Early Writings

MESY: Marx and Engels' Selected Writings in *Turkish*

Organisations:

TUCT: Trade Unions Confederation of Turkey (Türkiye İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu) (Türk-İş)

RTUCT: Revolutionary Trade Unions Confederation of Turkey (Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu) (DİSK)

TUT: Teachers' Unions of Turkey (Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası) (TÖS)

AFL-CIO: American Confederation of Worker Trade Unions (Amerikan İşçi Sendikaları Birliği)

AID: American Economic Cooperation Organisation (Amerikan Ekonomik İşbirliği Örgütü)

ICFTU: International Confederation of the Free Trade Unions (Uluslararası Özgür Sendikalar Konfederasyonu)

FRYA: Federation of Revolutionary Youth Associations (Devrimci Gençlik Federasyonu) (Dev-Genç)

Parties:

TWP: Workers Party of Turkey (Türkiye İşçi Partisi) (TİP)

CTP: Communist Party of Turkey (Türkiye Komünist Partisi) (TKP)

PLPT-PLFT: People's Liberation Party of Turkey- People's Liberation Front of Turkey (Türkiye Halk Kurtuluş Partisi- Türkiye Halk Kurtuluş Cephesi) (THKP-THKC)

RWPPT: Revolutionary Workers-Peasants Party of Turkey (Türkiye İhtilalci İşçi-Köylü Partisi) (TİİKP)

DP: Democrat Party (Demokrat Parti) (DP)

JP: Justice Party (Adalet Partisi) (AP)

RPP: Republican People's Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi) (CHP)

NAP: Nationalist Action Party (Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi) (MHP)

NOP: Nationalist Order Party (Mili Nizam Partisi) (MSP)

CHAPTER 5

REVOLUTIONARY CLASSES AND POSSIBILITIES

If the revolution strategy of *the Aydınlık* is an aspect, which is the most distant to Marx, its *perception* of class and class politics is the nearest to him. *The Aydınlık* does not limit class struggle and politics with the bourgeois parliament and concerns all classes in terms of their revolutionary power and capacity and the power balance among the classes.

The Aydınlık states that anti-imperialist consciousness can be brought to the national classes through active struggle within the context of rights and liberties given by 1961 constitution. This struggle will reveal the contradictory interests and ensure the unity of the national classes around the front of their own interest. All democratic and economic demands, all progressive movements have to be supported and participated and organised within the framework of a true revolutionary consciousness and line by the revolutionaries. The NDR struggle can be adopted by the masses only in this way. There are many **instruments of this struggle** such as strikes, struggle for land, reform demands of the students and the professional groups, protests against the American existence in the country, protests against unemployment and high prices, supporting the workers' struggle for democratic rights and social justice, the national movements against the existence of foreign capital and its compradors, protests against NATO, and the boycotts against the foreign goods, and ideological struggle against the imperialist culture. These areas of struggle must be turned into a true revolutionary line. These anti-imperialist movements will enlighten the people and teach it its real interest (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:29). (Here, democracy means popular democracy, and anti-imperialism means popular republic rather than the bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois republic. When it is translated to

the Aydınlık's vocabulary; we have to say “**the imperialism-comprador-feudal land lord alliance**” for the term “**bourgeoisie**” and **its allies abroad and at home**).

The Aydınlık knows that the existence of the contradictions in society does not guarantee even the emergence of conflict and fight. If anti-imperialist movements does not enlighten the people and teach them their interests, “the men will not need even to think” in their normal way of life. “In a society which does not reflect inner contradictions in itself in the form of conflicts, all organisations will stay artificial, in a condition where there is no struggle, the real revolutionary elements in society will not organise labouring masses, but elements which are alien to socialism will organise. To unite national elements which are provoked by the struggle against the dominant alliance and need to take its own side in their natural environment, in their class and professional organisations, and to enter into far bigger conflicts with our increasing power, to influence and organise greater masses, are the method of struggle of the revolutionaries”. There is a dialectic relation between conflict and organisation. The struggle against the imperialism will develop in this dialectic relation and will continue till the imperialism is pulled out from the country and the feudal remnants are liquidated in order to emancipate all peasants (*the Aydınlık*, 1968:29).

5.1 (National) Bourgeoisie and *revolutionary possibilities*

The national bourgeoisie in the NDR: “The interests of the national bourgeoisie in objective terms require that the country be independent and democratic”. However, it has lost its revolutionary characteristic. “It cannot be leading class in the revolution”. However, it can be won to the revolution partially. At least it must be “neutralised” during the struggle against the imperialism ands the feudalism (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 312). *The Aydınlık* (here Erdost and Kaymak) has made their most realistic conclusions here about the position of the national bourgeoisie.

“The bourgeoisie –in its abstract consideration- is in national and democratic characteristic”. The national bourgeoisie of Turkey contradicts with “the international capital” since the former represents “the national capital” and the latter “the international capital”, with “the backward relations of production and reactionism” since pre-capitalist relations prevent the development of capitalism, and with “the proletariat” since this class implies new relations of production within the bourgeois society itself. Erdost states that the national bourgeoisie is objectively existed, but it has not its own political class consciousness and an experience of political struggle in this direction. The national bourgeoisie today sees the mass movement and the proletariat rather than the reactionism and foreign bourgeoisie as a threat. “The ideology of its own class leaves it between the revolution and counter-revolution” (Erdost, 1970:257). **Although it sees** a threat in the proletariat and the masses, its position is still between revolution and counter-revolution according to Erdost. There is still a hope in this class for the revolutionaries. **Again** we go back to Russia of 1907 and Erdost quotes from Lenin, who says that in the period of the bourgeois revolution “the bourgeoisie ‘as a class has not yet feared from the proletarian revolution’ ”. But Lenin thinks that “in the period of developed capitalism it cannot be courageous” and that it is “in general counter-revolutionary”. In 1912, Lenin says (Erdost quotes) “the bourgeoisie fears from the movement of the masses *rather than* the reactionism”. Moreover, Erdost quotes again from Lenin of 1920: “There has emerged a closeness in a certain degree between the bourgeoisies of the exploiter countries and the bourgeoisies of the colonies, that is, frequently and maybe in many situation, the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries supports the national movements on one side, simultaneously also it is in a condition of alliance with the imperialist bourgeoisie, that is, it together with the imperialist bourgeoisie struggles against the revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes” (Erdost, 1970:257). **What Lenin talks** about is the bourgeoisie of the oppressed and colonised countries. But Erdost continues to say that although “the comprador section of the local bourgeoisie has established cooperation with the imperialist bourgeoisie”, “the revolutionary

capability of the national section of the local bourgeoisie has not completely expired in the national democratic revolution” (Erdost, 1970:257-8). **Firstly, the division** of the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries into the national and comprador sections is not existed in Lenin. **Secondly, even before** socialist revolution of 1917 October, Lenin pointed to the bourgeoisie who feared from the mass movement and to the alliance of the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries with the imperialist bourgeoisie against the revolutionary movement and classes. **But there is** still a hope for Erdost and *the Aydınlık*. Revolutionary possibilities of the national bourgeoisie have not yet expired. “It can support partially national movements; at least it is possible by neutralising this section to make them turn from being the pillar of the counter revolutionary classes” **and now the subject** becomes “the bourgeoisie” rather than the “the national section of the bourgeoisie” of the oppressed country: “But in the socialist revolution, the bourgeoisie is counter-revolutionary class to the end and decisively” (Erdost, 1970:258).

Foreign or native: Let me start by pointing to a striking concept, which is frequently used for the negative relationship between the foreign capital and any underdeveloped national economy. It is “**profit transfer**”. I wonder what it means in the context of Marxian analysis of bourgeois political economy. In the context here, foreign industrial capital appropriates surplus value produced by the labourer of Turkey. Foreign money capital obtains interest from the state debts, and a share from the profit of the local industrial capital in the form of interest and a commercial profit from selling raw material (intermediary goods) to the local industry. In addition, speculation, extra profits (caused by monopoly prices of foreign goods, relatively higher productivity in relation to local capital, support of the local state in the form of tax reductions, land provision etc.) and earnings from currency differences (caused by devaluation of the local money) are the other profit sources for the foreign capital. National character of foreign capital is important only for it does not necessarily need to re-invest or spend its own profits and interests in Turkey. But this situation is also theoretically valid for “national” capital.

National character is also important when we consider the command centres of foreign capital. This centre can change the investment area and even its own centre. The question of “profit transfer” is therefore the question of the mobility of capital in general rather than the nationality or nativity of capital. Profits of local and native capital can be also “transferred” to anywhere.

Whether capital is foreign or native (national) is decisive when accumulation and reproduction of capital in an expanded scale is not realised by profits of foreign capital and since foreign capital has an influence over national politics and economy through the movements of capital and the unequal relationships between the world centres of capital and the periphery. Foreign capital links the weak national economy to the interests of the centres of the world capitalist system. Political result of this is the fact that the working class must not only struggle against its own capitalist class but also against a national capitalist class which cooperate with and is supported by foreign capital. In other words, the working class also confronts indirectly with the international alliance of capitals.

The other thing which *the Aydınlık* (here Erdost) ignores is the needs of local capital which is relatively weak and small in relation to foreign capital. Extension of capitalist market, transference of technology and know-how, credit possibilities, new market relations in the world are provided by the foreign capital’s penetration. Even the most “national” and “local” capital benefits from the conditions which are created or demanded by foreign capital, putting aside the benefits coming from all kinds of cooperation between them. The relationship between foreign capital and national capital also seems to be a relationship existing between the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. But the latter relationship is a comprador or dependent relationship in the sense that the petty bourgeoisie wants to become the big bourgeoisie by going away from the labouring classes and closes to the big bourgeoisie in the conditions where it is confronted with the threat of the working class. For this reason, it tends to cooperate with the big bourgeoisie

and is dependent on the economic and political power of the big bourgeoisie for its simple or extensive reproduction.

Spatial existence of the capitalist class is observed in the spatial units of capitalist mode of production (in this or that place, in this or that sphere of production). The existence of capitalist in Turkey is simply the existence of capital in Turkey. The question under consideration is the capital in Turkey rather than Turkish capital. It can be asked: if capital in Turkey was completely owned by the capitalist Turkish citizens, would the imperialism and the comprador bourgeoisie be replaced by the “national bourgeoisie” and its national economy, culture, and politics? It is sure that the foreign affairs and the relationship of the bourgeoisie with the masses would be more nationalised and localised. And more importantly, far more portion of surplus value produced would go into investment in the country, so on. Importation of foreign goods would be more and more replaced by the exportation of local products. However, these all speculations would just mean that capital in Turkey had to be counted as big rather than petty in size and scale. Requirements of capital accumulation are the requirements of capitalist development of production. It can be said that foreign capital could invest his profits on the country rather transfer it to its home, for instance. This does not occur since its “foreigner” status but since it can find out ready far more suitable conditions of production or conditions profit. Aim of the capitalist is profit and its conditions, not “national” considerations. I can claim that if all capital was legally appropriated by national capitalists, if the property titles of all capital were forgiven by foreigners to them, the conditions of capitalist production would follow the same laws governing capitalist mode of production in the same manner as in today. It is sure that a German industrialist was replaced by a Turkish industrialist, a Jewish banker by a Turkish banker, a Greek sailor by a Turkish sailor, etc. What would change is “the personification of capital” in the capitalist. And I must accept that a different “personification” of capital changes many facets of capitalist-society-state relationships for a while. Here Marx’s *“On the Jewish Question”* and all

series of “*Capital*” teaches us that the logic of capital, profit, commerce and money making, the gods of the bourgeois civil society, creates the similar personifications of capital or wealth.

National bourgeoisie is not dominant class: The national bourgeoisie occupies a small place in *the Aydınlık* (here Erdost). “National section of the local bourgeoisie seems to be in the side of the dominant classes” (Erdost, 1970, 253). Here local bourgeoisie is a wider category which includes within itself “the national bourgeoisie”. “when capitalism is in the stage of development, in other words, in a condition where the local bourgeoisie has not yet entered the influence area of the monopoly capitalism, and not yet taken an international characteristic, if in a country foreign capital can play an active and dominant role, the other cause of this is the weakness of the local bourgeoisie” (Erdost, 1970, 253) and here, the local bourgeoisie is used in the meaning of the bourgeoisie in Turkey. “Here still being national section of this local bourgeoisie which is weak cannot be dominant class in a country which is under the domination of clearly powerful and dominant foreign capital” (Erdost, 1970, 253). We have three categories: national bourgeoisie, local bourgeoisie and the foreign capital. The national bourgeoisie is “among the classes which established domination and under their hegemony” (Erdost, 1970, 253). “However, this is contradictory unity, since the national characteristic of capitalism which is in the development stage and the cosmopolite (international) characteristic of the monopoly capitalism contradict each other” (Erdost, 1970, 253).

Here we can also ask whether there is really a contradiction between “the national characteristic of capitalism which is in the development stage and the cosmopolite (international) characteristic of the monopoly capitalism”. It is sure that a monopoly prevents the independent development of small capitals and their transformation into large scale industries. Monopolies in large scale destroy domestic and traditional small scale industries. Monopolies create their monopolist markets. But these all are not related with

the contradiction which is assumed to exist between the national and international characteristics of capital. This contradiction can be only in the meaning of a competition between capitals and capitalists over the market shares, over the distribution of the total surplus value. The question is related with, in terms of **Marxian** framework (*Capital's Volume 3*), the formation of the general rate of profits or the equalisation of profit. Monopolies prevent the formation of the general rate of profits. All disadvantages of the local capital in the face of the foreign monopoly capitals can be compensated by the state of the local bourgeoisie through protective measures, direct and indirect supports. Thereby competitive conditions between the local and international capitals are provided through a transformation of the local capitals into state supported monopolies, putting aside the state budget used by the state in order to support the capital accumulation of the local capitals as **Marx** observed in *Capital's Volume 1*. We have here the coexistence of the state supported local monopolies and international foreign monopolies. In addition these local and cosmopolite monopolies always cooperate with each other. For Marx the political framework of capitalist mode of production and class relations are concerned in the case of the capitalist state. Nationality of the capitalists (the national "personification of capital") can be only a subject of the personal histories of the bourgeoisies and the family histories of the bourgeois generations.

Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that the Turkish bourgeoisie has always cooperated with the international monopolies for its own development excluding the exceptional period of the 1930s where monopoly capitalism lived a world wide crises and where Turkey had to be contented with its own sources and implemented a *estatist* economic policy.

For the "national bourgeoisie", Erdost says that they must be counted as "being in the side of the exploiter classes, an intermediary element". A portion of the "unpaid surplus labour" is appropriated by it (Erdost, 1970b, 81). However, it is not "a powerful class". Semi-dependency is caused by the

weakness of this class. The low level of the productive forces in Turkey is not the result of the national capitalist production, but the result of the imperialism and the backward relations of production in agriculture which “prevent inner accumulation, reproduction” through the exploitation of the value produced. The reason behind the fact that the industrial proletariat lives relatively in a better condition than the small peasant producer is not that the productive forces are constrained by the capitalist production, but by the backward relations of production in agriculture which prevents the development of the forces of production ((Erdost, 1970b 82).

How the imperialism made Turkey a semi-dependent country after the Second World War has been explained through the eyes of Erdost and *the Aydınlık* in general above. Now I will follow the analysis of Erdost and Kaymak about “the national bourgeoisie”. In the related sub-title, they say that **“The National Bourgeoisie Is Existed, But Is Not A Force Which Is Dominant Over the Economic and Political Life”** (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 296). Let me start with the first definition: “The bourgeoisie follows two stages within the process of capitalist development: the one is the stage in which it develops within the national market; in this stage, the bourgeoisie wants to destroy the feudal walls in order for the markets to reach in the national scale. When the national market becomes narrow- this corresponds somehow to the emergence of the monopoly bourgeoisie- the bourgeoisie breaks down its national cloth and dress a ‘cosmopolite’ cloth” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 296). **I must say that these stages of development do not fit** the forerunners of capitalist mode of production. They must be thought for the twentieth century capitalisation attempts. **The first examples of capitalist development** were accompanied with the emergence of the world capitalist market from the Atlantic to the Far Asia after the 16.century. This schema of development is not valid at least for the forerunner countries of capitalism. However, the second generation of the capitalist countries had to begin to their capitalist developments at home since the world markets had already been occupied by the main capitalist countries. For this reason it is

true to say that “In the imperialist world system, the bourgeoisie of the exploiter countries with ‘the cosmopolite’ cloth confronts with the bourgeoisie of the exploited countries with ‘national’ cloth”. However, “it is too late”. The commercial bourgeoisie of the exploited countries are a mere agent of the foreign capital and the monopoly capital and its compradors have already controlled the economy of the country (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 296). Erdost and Kaymak state that “The local industrial bourgeoisie searches for a right to live for itself in the vacuums of the monopoly bourgeoisie” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 296-7). I must say that none of the capitalists wants to be in such a condition. “The local bourgeoisie which is weak can not be the sovereign class in a country which is under the domination of the foreign capital; but it can take its place only as a secondary power whose existence is granted within the sovereign classes” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 297).

The writers first define what “**the national bourgeoisie**” is: “it is the bourgeoisie which the local industrial capital forms, whose activity essentially limits the dependency of the country’s economy on the imperialism in a certain degree, which has a positive impact over the balance-sheet of the foreign commerce and hence can prevent the imperialist exploitation in a certain degree, and the commercial bourgeoisie which is located in the sphere of this bourgeoisie” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 297). They state that “unless there is national capital the commercial bourgeoisie cannot be national”. It is correctly said that the commercial capital is “a capitalist category” only when it is located in the exchange of the goods which are produced through “capitalist production”. Such a commercial capital shares a portion of the surplus product which is a product of the capitalist production. The commercial bourgeoisie which deals with the commodity which is sold by “foreign capital” is “dependent on the origin in which commodity is produced, on the origin of the capital” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 297).

However, from this dependency it cannot be concluded that the commercial bourgeoisie exploits the workers of the imperialist countries. The industrial

bourgeoisie of the imperialist country can reduce the rate of the exploitation of its own worker in a certain degree through the mediation of the commercial bourgeoisie which deals with the commodity which is exported by itself due to the exploitation which provide from the dependent countries. The imperialist capital thereby creates the conditions for “the workers aristocracy” within the working class in the imperialist country (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 297). The commercial bourgeoisie of the dependent country which deals with the foreign commodities becomes “the comprador commercial bourgeoisie”. The commercial bourgeoisie which deals with the commodities which are produced within the pre-capitalist production forms “the usurer-wholesale trader capital”. They are merged into one in the exportation-importation nodes. “These are non-national classes outside the national bourgeoisie” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 297).

The “local bourgeoisie” is composed of “the national bourgeoisie” and “the comprador bourgeoisie”. The general division is between “the local bourgeoisie” and “the foreign imperialist bourgeoisie”. Let me replace “the bourgeoisie” with “capital” without national personification. There must be a competition, co-operation and hence monopolist and exclusive relationships between different capitals within the spatial articulation of the capitalist modes of production as a whole. Then we have various but articulated spheres of capitalist production, circulation and realisation. In such a situation, can not we have a total capital, which produces the total surplus-value or product which would be distributed according to the size of the individual capitals to the individual capitalists. However, if there is not an average rate of profit for the same size of the individual capitals, some capitals will obtain surplus profit while some capitals will not realise the surplus-value produced by them. It is not accidental that Marx concerns “the process of capitalist production as a whole” (*Capital's Volume 3*) after the considerations of “the process of production of capital” (*Capital's Volume 1*) and “the process of circulation of capital” (*Capital's Volume 2*). He analyses “the process of capitalist production as a whole” starting from the analysis of

“the rate of profit”, and “average profit” in which he deals with “the equalisation of the general rate of profit through competition, market prices and market values, surplus profit” and finally moving towards “the transformation of surplus profit into ground-rent”. What we have in the context of the relationship between the local bourgeoisie and the foreign bourgeoisie is nothing but the different spatial contexts, the different size of capitals and the different rates of profits. The interest of the *Capital 3* is the different “capitals” rather than “capital in general” of the *Volume 1 of Capital*. In addition to “productive capital” of the *Volume 1 of Capital*, now Marx presents us “commercial capital”, “money-dealing capital”, “interest-bearing capital”, “fictitious capital”, “banking capital” besides different forms of profit such as “commercial profit, “surplus-profit” which is transformed into “ground-rent” and the “division of profit into interest and profit of enterprise”.

The Volume 3 of Capital can be used as a framework for the capitalist system as a whole which is embodied through various spatial and temporal contexts of the various and different *capitals*. It is sure that this is the subject of the divisions and the division of labour within capitalist world system. The question is on one side the competition between the capitals, and monopolies of some capitals over the others on the other side. In the case of the competition, average rate of profit is searched for. In the case of monopolies, some capitals which are in the monopoly condition appropriate “surplus profits” through differential, absolute and monopoly rents. So the question is turned into the advantages which are created by the productivity of labour, available labour market, location, new inventions, accessibility to cheap and good raw materials, monopoly prices, patent rights, currency differences, and forceful measures such as occupation and colonisation of some lands and markets, and so on. It can be said that a weak and newly developing capital is to have been deprived from many of these advantages. It starts its work in a market which has already been occupied by strong capitals and its initial capital is relatively small. However, there are many advantages for it. This weak bourgeoisie finds ready before itself an immense

mass of peasants, immense mass of industrial reserve army, immense support of the state for capital formation through state budget, availability of speculative activity and immensely cheap price of the labour-power apart from the market which has not yet been saturated and which will not be saturated due to the impetus created by the new products of the higher level of development. Therefore, what we see in the situation of the weak bourgeoisie or weak capital is not only the monopoly power of the foreign imperialist capitals over itself, but many advantages created by the market, the state and the labour force. Moreover it can be argued that weak capital of the newly developing capitalist mode of production possibly appropriate immense mass of surplus profit caused by relatively the lower level of living standards, i.e. the cheaper reproduction costs of labour power, the lower wage levels due to the ever increasing industrial reserve army, the cheaper state credits, profitable public investments which is granted to it, and so on. In addition, the so called weak bourgeoisie directly use the state force in its struggle with the working class and other opposition movements. Hence there is not so much cost for itself for democratic life.

The conflict and struggle which can be seen between the states and nations are meaningful only when these conflicts and struggles are mediated by the dominant class interests. For Hegel, the history is presented as a product of the struggle between the nations. But for Marx, it is presented as a product of the struggle between the classes. A contradiction between a national capital and a foreign capital can be a contradiction between two capitals. In its struggle or competition with the foreign capital, the national capital can obtain the support of the nation and the state and thereby it can present this struggle or competition as a struggle or competition between the nations and the state. The state is used as *the organised force of the dominant class*, but appears in the surface as the representative of the national community. This struggle of the national bourgeoisie with the foreign bourgeoisie is also valid for its struggle with its own proletariat at home. The class contradictions within the home between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can be

transferred to abroad in the form of the conflicts between the states and nations.

The development of capitalist production and rising possibilities for capitalist accumulation create a condition where all kind of bourgeoisie and even the petty bourgeoisie increase their support to the capitalist exploitation of the working class. Foreign capitals offer the possibility for capitalist profits to all local bourgeoisies and even to the petty bourgeoisies and the small peasant producers. In the conditions where capitalist profit making does not face with the problem of reproduction, the capitalist class maintains its class coherence. However, in the conditions of crisis, this class coherence dissolves into conflicting interests and disconnected capitalist productions. In the case of so called national bourgeoisie, which has been presumed to be “weak”, the co-operation and comprador relationships with the stronger foreign capital are replaced with the direct support of the national state in a closed economy. *The Aydınlık*, Erdost, Erdost and Kaymak forget that the imperialist world system is also the imperialist bourgeois system. What is to be done is to disconnect the national bourgeoisie and national capital from this imperialist system. Unless *the bourgeoisie operating as a whole in the national scale* is overthrow, such a disconnection cannot be realised. For this reason, the Bolshevik party wanted the defeat of the *Russia* in the First World War.

The imperialism adds a dimension to anti-capitalist struggle of the proletariat of the country which has relatively undeveloped capitalist economy. The bourgeois class has to cooperate with the bourgeoisies of the developed capitalist countries for its own maturation leaving aside its alliance with backward elements in the country. Thereby it enters into the international alliance of the bourgeoisie. For this reason, the proletarian movement confronts with not only its own bourgeoisie but also with the international alliances of its own bourgeoisie leaving aside its alliance with backward elements in the country. This is what *the Aydınlık* observes about **the**

imperialist-comprador-feudal landowner alliance. Read this alliance as **the alliance of “the international bourgeoisie-national bourgeoisie-landed property”**.

“In Turkey there cannot be Local Finance Capital. There is Comprador Capital”: Erdost and Kaymak state that “the idea that in 1880s antique finance capital was existed, that this local finance capital has dominated the political and economic life since 1925” is wrong (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971). I think that they are rather correct to reject this foolish idea. They say that the concentration of production leads into monopolies. The monopolies then lead into finance capital. In the finance-capital, the banking capital is “the **monopolist** banking capital” and the industrial capital is “the **monopolist** industrial capital”. The finance capital is not a mere merge of the banking and industrial capital”. It is “a historical category”. “The monopoly is the agreement or grouping of the capitalists who keep the production or this or that commodity production or markets to a large degree in their hands”. These groupings can take different forms such as trusts, cartel, trade union, and consortium and share the production and the markets. The finance capital is “the distinctive speciality of the imperialist period” and a “superior form of capital” which dominates the other forms of capital. Several states dominate the others thanks to this form of capital. Finance capital tends to export capital and tends to share the lands. It accumulates “a surplus capital” and invests this surplus in profitable spheres (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 300). For “the idea that the local finance capital has dominated the political and economic life since 1925” to be able to correct, in this period there had to be monopolies which would lead into finance capital (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 300). In addition, the production and the markets had to be shared among the local capitalist groups and there had to be a surplus capital which would be exported to abroad. Turkey had to be in the imperialist stage. However, Turkey needed foreign capital in this period. The country had not a powerful local capitalism. It was a market and investment area for foreign capital. It was indebted and then entered into the domination of the

imperialism. The finance capital creates imperialism, but it is not the single characteristic; “rather, the imperialism covers the finance capital”. “Just as capital is not sufficient to define the capitalism, the finance capital is not sufficient to define the imperialism”. For this reason, the term “finance capital” cannot be used for the term “the imperialism” in the context of the Leninist view of the imperialism (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971, 301).

5.1.1 The Genesis of the Industrial Capitalist in Marx

We put aside what took place in the Christian colonial system” that was the history of “treachery, bribery, massacre, and meanness” (Marx, 1990a, 916, and the pages following), and so on. “The colonial system ripened trade and navigation as in a hothouse”. The companies and the monopolies were “powerful levers for the concentration of capital”. The significance of the colonial system, that is the time of manufacture, also underlies its proclamation of the profit seeking as “the ultimate and the sole purpose of mankind” (Marx, 1990a, 918).

Credit and debt is alternatively used by Marx since the source of public credit is here limited to the public debt that is given to the state’s creditors. (The revenues of the state as a support to the national debts, in other words, the system of taxation, will be dealt with below) The credit given to the state is transformed into public bonds and used by the creditors as “hard cash”. In the system of national debts, “quite apart from the **class** of idle *rentiers* thus created, the impoverished wealth of the financiers who play the role of middlemen between the government and the nation, and the tax-farmers, merchants and private manufacturers, for whom a god part of every national loan performs the service of a capital fallen from heaven, apart from all these people, the national debt has given rise to joint-stock companies, to dealings in negotiable effects of all kinds, and to speculation: in a word, it has given rise to stock-exchange gambling and the modern bankocracy” (Marx, 1990a, 919). Since these all is seen in our time, Marx’s modern society represents

every society whose economic relations are ruled by the laws of the capitalist mode of production. In addition, it is on the contrary of popular belief, Marx's time and before witness a significant role of the state in the accumulation of capital, that is, the significant economic role of the state. Such a role therefore is not limited with the monopoly capitalism of the present century.

The modern system of taxation is "the necessary complement of the system of national loans". The extraordinary expenses of the state are met by the loans and make the further taxes necessary. The taxes raise with the accumulation of debts and the latter makes the state needy for further loans for additional expenses. For this reason, "Over-taxation is not an accidental occurrence, but rather a principle". Marx refers to the Dutch patriot De Witt, who stated that over-taxation was "the best system for making the wage-labourer submissive, frugal, industrious ... and overburdened with work". Marx says that put aside its effects over the wage-labourers, it is also "the forcible expropriation, resulting from it, of peasants and artisans, in short, of all the constituents of the lower middle **class**". Its expropriating effect is also backed by the protection system (Marx, 1990a, 921).

The role of the public debt for the "capitalisation of wealth and the expropriation of the masses are incorrectly seen by some as the fundamental cause of the poverty of the masses (Marx, 1990a, 921). The protection system *manufactured* "manufacturers" and expropriated "independent workers", capitalised "the national means of production and subsistence through artificial means" and shortened the transition period from "a mode of production that was out of date to the modern mode of production". By this system, Marx says that European states *plundered* their own people "indirectly through protective duties, directly through export premiums. They also forcibly uprooted all industries in the neighbouring dependent countries" as England did against the Irish woollen manufacture". The system of protection is much "simplified" by the continental countries of Europe after the example of Colbert: "The original capital for industry here came in part

directly out of the state treasury” (Marx, 1990a, 922). Essence was the same, but not necessarily the methods. State can be used as a shortcut for the gradual change that has taken place in England. However, the disadvantage of the rapid change into industrial capital is seen in the early appearance of the workers’ resistance and of the sharp **class** conflicts. The political and ideological manipulation of the **class** conflict becomes more disturbing and urgent for the rapidly growing capital. This phenomenon is seen in the newcomers of the industrial capital in the nineteenth and twentieth century.

Marx sums up the methods that were applied for the transition to industrial capital: “Colonial system, public debts, heavy taxes, protection, commercial wars, etc., these offshoots of the period of manufacture swell to gigantic proportions during the period of infancy of large scale industry” (Marx, 1990a, 922). This period of manufacture by which the capitalist production develops also changes the morality and sentiments of the people: “the public opinion of Europe lost its last remnant of shame and conscience”. Every method for becoming richer was proclaimed as proud: “The nations bragged cynically of every infamy that served them as a means to the accumulation of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 924). As an example, Marx points to the growth of Liverpool through the means of slave trade. This trade was “its method of primitive accumulation” (Marx, 1990a, 924). From 1730 to 1792, Liverpool raised its ships in the slave trade from 15 to 132. In addition to this, Marx refers to the child slavery that was introduced by the cotton industry in England, and “the unqualified slavery of the New World besides “the veiled slavery of the wage-labourers in Europe” (Marx, 1990a, 925).

5.1.2 Individual, Class and Bourgeois-civil society

Classes in the German Ideology: At the beginning of *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels concern themselves with the great universal problems such as the difference between man and animal. They change the problem into how man differentiates himself from animal. Men begin to make

this division when they begin to “produce their own mean of subsistence”. As they produce these means, they also indirectly “produce their own material life”. This “mode of production” represents “a mode of living”. This mode of living identifies the men. Who the men are overlap with their production, what they produce and in what mode they produce. “Therefore, who the individuals are depends on the material conditions of their productions”. This production requires a certain amount of population. The production itself presupposes individual relations and these relations are conditioned also with the production itself (Marx and Engels, 1987, 38).

These statements demonstrate why Marx and Engels give critical importance to the production in general, and material production of life along side with the relations among the men. **The** production and individual relations are immediately driven to the general debate about the division of labour, the modes of property. They said that there were there sorts of property: tribal property which was the first form of property and was seen in the primitive conditions of production; the second form was the communal property and the state property. This property was seen in the antique cities which were created by the united tribes. The slavery was seen. The communal property and private property were seen together. However, the former depended on the latter; the third form of property was “feudal property” or “estate property” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 40-1). The direct producers were the slaves in the second form of property while, in the third, feudal property, they were “enslaved small peasants”. As feudalism developed, an opposition emerged against the cities. The hierarchical structure of the land and the corresponding military vassal relations “gave the nobles a complete authority over the serfs”. “This feudal structure just as the old communal property was a cooperation against the dominated producer class”. But the relationships with the direct producers and the form of cooperation were different since the conditions of production were different. The feudal rural structure corresponds to the guild property in the cities. The need for a market, necessity of unity against the parasitic nobles and the need to resist against

the serfs who migrated to the cities, feudal characteristic of all country created the guilds, “the feudal organisation of the professions”. Limited production and limited capital accumulated in the hands of the artisans, rising population created a hierarchical structure in the cities as in the rural areas. All property was based on the land property in the rural areas in which the serfs were dominated and on the individual labour, having little capital, which the governed journeymen (Marx and Engels, 1987, 42). The divisions into the estates were clear. Leaving aside the existence of the princes, nobles, the clericals, and the peasants in the rural areas, the existence of the masters, journeymen and the apprentices and then “the house servant as plebeian” the cities there did not emerge significant division of labour. Marx and Engels said that the countries were united in the form of the feudal kingdoms. This was a need for the landed aristocracy and the cities. The “dominant class”, that is, the aristocrats” were organised under the head of a monarch (Marx and Engels, 1987, 43).

The division of labour also involved the contradiction between the individual interests and the collective interests of all individuals. This collective interest, however, was not existed in imagination as “universal interest” but “existed in actuality as the mutual dependencies of the individuals among whom the work is distributed”. The contradiction between the private and collective interests led “the collective interest as the state” become independent from the real interests of the individual and the community”, acquire a false commonality appearance on “the concrete base” of the real division of labour and the interests. Among these (collective) interests, “class interests”, which were “conditioned by the division of labour”, “became differentiated from all other groupings in this sort”, one of them dominated the other, were seen. Marx and Engels said that they would develop the notion of “class interest” later on. They concluded that all struggle within the state, struggle between democracy, aristocracy and monarchy, or struggle for universal suffrage were false appearances of the real struggles of the various classes. In addition, each class which wished sovereignty led into the abolishment of old social

forms (Marx and Engels, 1987, 60). And the proletariat, this class, when its turn came, firstly had to “seize the political power” in order to present “its essential interest as the interest of all”. This was the first thing which it had to do at the beginning (Marx and Engels, 1987, 61).

Marx and Engels said that “the masses of the workers who are only the workers” also presumed “the world market” and “the proletariat can be existed only in the framework of the universal history, just as the communism which is the work of the proletariat can be existed only as ‘historical universal’ existence”. Here Marx and Engels recalled their Hegelian background. But they did this materialistically. What they meant by “historical universal existence of the individuals” pointed to “existence of the individuals which is directly linked to the universal history” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 65). And it is not necessary to say that Marx and Engels used here the words “universal” and “world” synonymously.

As for the formation of classes, let me follow Marx and Engels in the case of their ideas about individual, class and society. They said that “bourgeois class” was formed gradually of “the local bourgeoisies” of various cities in the Middle Ages. A “mode of work” changed the living conditions of each isolated bourgeois and turned them into “common” and “living conditions which are independent from each lonely individual”. The bourgeoisies created these conditions and these conditions created bourgeoisies. In time, “common conditions turn into the conditions of class” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 105). The same conditions, interests created the same habits. The bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels suggested, developed gradually as the conditions which created it developed. It was divided within itself into various sections according to an inner division of labour. It began to collect all old property owner classes to itself to the extent that all property was transformed into commercial and industrial capital. Meanwhile, the bourgeoisie transformed the former propertyless classes which had been existed before the bourgeoisie and some sections of the properties classes till then to “a new

class, the proletariat". They said that "each individuals form a class as long as they have to realise a common struggle against another class; in another cases, they are enemy for each other in the competition" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 106).

Marx and Engels **seem to see the class** as a grouping of men who had certain interests and problems as regards with other class interests and forces **to the degree that the class was newly forming and not yet alienated to itself**. As for its developed condition, they saw "class" as the *social mediation* through which the *individual* became *socialised*. They said that "class itself becomes independent from individuals; the individuals finds ready their own living conditions, they acquire from their class their conditions in life, besides this, their own personal development and all track this draws; they are dependent on their class". Marx and Engels continued to say that "this appearance" is related with "the dependency of each individual on the division of labour" and it could be abolished only when "private property and the work itself is abolished". Marx and Engels said that "this dependency of the individuals on their class" led into dependencies upon various imaginations (Marx and Engels, 1987, 106). "This dependency of the individuals on certain classes cannot be abolished as long as a class who has no longer to make a private class interest be accepted as sovereign to the dominant class emerge" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 107). Marx and Engels seemed to say that this dependency upon class could be abolished thanks to the existence of the proletariat.

Marx and Engels did not see the individual as abstract and pure entity. They said that "the individuals acted from them, surely not from what the ideologues understand as 'pure' individual, from themselves within their own conditions and in the framework of their certain historical relations". However, despite this act of the individual persons, there emerged "a difference" between the social relations which obtained independence as a result of the division of labour and the individual life of the persons. Marx and Engels said

that this did not mean, for example, that a capitalist would abandon his personal existence; “but **their identities are conditioned by the class relations which are certain from top to bottom, and this difference demonstrates itself as an opposition to another class**, and this difference is seen to them only when they are bankrupted” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 108). Here Marx and Engels pointed to the division between the **alienated and independent social or class life** of the individuals and their personal lives. This division (difference) is seen in the class opposition and in the moment when an individual changed or was obliged to change his class position (bankruptcy).

However, Marx and Engels suggested that, “this phenomenon” (division above) was yet “concealed” in the case of “estate” or “tribe”. A noble stayed as noble, a man who was not noble stayed as a man who was not noble. Nobility was linked to his personality. “The division between the individual personality and, as opposed to this, the individual as a member of a class, the contingency of the conditions of existence for the individual, can emerge only with the class which itself is a product of the bourgeoisie” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 108). This statement, to me, can be evaluated as such: 1) the division between the individual and the individual as a member of a class pointed to a contingency for the life of the individual; 2) the division is developed through the development of the bourgeoisie as a class; 3) “the classes” (in modern sense) are the products of the bourgeoisie. In other words, the bourgeois order created a world in which serfs or the lords needed not necessarily to continue their life as serf or lord; the formation of the class phenomena required a level of economic development which meant the development of the division of labour that would lead into an independency of the social relations from personal lives; “the class” is a new social division between the individual and the community (or society).

The individuals seemingly were freer in the bourgeois domination than before since their conditions of life were “contingent for themselves” (108). However,

Marx and Engels said that “in actuality, they are certainly less free because they are more dependent on an objective force” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 108-9).

Lastly, let me follow Marx and Engels about **civil society** and about the relationship between **the state** and **the property relations**. They said that “civil society” “covers all material relations of the individuals”. Even though civil society presents itself as “national community” abroad and “has to be organised as the state” at home, it “transcends the state and the nation” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 123). Here Marx and Engels used the term for “bourgeois-civil society”, or “bourgeois society”. They recalled that the term “civil society” emerged in the eighteenth century immediately when “property relations were freed from the community of the ancient age and the middle age” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 123). The civil society “as civil society”, they said, could develop only with the bourgeoisie. Marx and Engels also recalled again that “the social organisation which is the direct result of the production and commerce and always forms the foundation of the state and, also, the idealist superstructure has been always stated with the same name, too” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 124). Thereby, Marx and Engels firstly presented the famous division between the base and the superstructure and defined the civil society as the social organisation of the economic life and as the foundation which forms the state and the idealist superstructure.

The **first form of property** in the antiquity and the middle ages was “the tribal property”. In “the antique peoples”, who lived together in the cities, the property of the tribe seemed to be as “the state property” and “the right of the individual over this property” seemed to be “a mere possession”. Marx and Engels suggested that “the private property in complete sense” always started with “the movable property”. For the peoples which began to go away from the Middle Age, the tribal property demonstrated a development in which it lost all communal appearances of property and reached into “the modern capital”, which “represents pure private property conditioned by big

industry and universal competition". Marx and Engels stated that "Here is the modern state, which corresponds to this modern private property". They said that property owners seized the state with through taxes and state debts (Marx and Engels, 1987, 124). "The existence of the state" depended on the credits to be given by the property owners, i.e. the bourgeoisies (Marx and Engels, 1987, 124-5). "Since the bourgeoisie is no longer an estate but a class, for this reason only, it has to organise in all national level rather than only local level and has to give its own common interests a universal form" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 125). Here I can conclude that a class cannot create and maintain itself at the local or regional level. This is one of the **differences between the estate (order) and the class**. It is a modern social division. The classes cannot form themselves as long as estates of the feudal society maintain themselves through fragmented political geography. In addition, the state under consideration is the nation-state, i.e. "the modern state" which corresponds to "the modern private property".

Marx and Engels suggested that once the private property is freed from communal property, "the state acquired a special existence besides the civil society and outside it". However, they continued to say: "this state" was "nothing but the form of organisation which the bourgeoisies selected for themselves due to inevitability in order to mutually secure their properties and the interests inside as well as outside" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 125). It is understood that Marx and Engels thought that the bourgeois national state was a product of necessities. The different states conditioned each other. In addition, **the modern state is a form of class organisation of the bourgeoisie**.

Let me continue to follow Marx and Engels: They said that: "Today only in the countries where estates in their development have not yet reached completely in the stage of class and which reached in far more developed evolution where they still play a role, although they were liquidated, in other words, in the countries where there is a mixed condition, hence, in the

countries where none of the sections of the population could not have reached in the condition to dominate the others, the independence of the state is existed” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 125). This “productive” and “complex” statement says that **estate is the lower form of the class**; the independence or the autonomy of the state is a result of the mixed condition in which estates and the classes are coexisted and none of the classes are able to dominate the others; estates can play a role although they have been liquidated in a far more developed countries.

This “independence of the state” was seen in Germany, said Marx and Engels. The most completed example, on the other hand, of the modern state was “the North America”. They stated that all modern English, French and American writers saw the state as a result of the private property and even more this idea was shared by the public as well (Marx and Engels, 1987, 125).

Marx and Engels made a definition of the state: “a form through the mediation of which the members of a dominant class make their common interests superior, in which an epoch, all civil society is summarised”. For this reason, said they, “all public institutions pass through the mediation of the state and acquire a political form”. They said that the idea that the laws were based on “the will”, even “the free will” did not have any “concrete foundation” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 125). **We can conclude that: 1) state is a mediation of the recognition of the class interests as superior and universal; 2) the state summarises the civil society; 3) whatever the public is becomes political through the state.**

The Communist Manifesto, Classes and the Bourgeoisie: One of the interesting points in *Capital* is that it gives several references to the *Manifesto* apart from the *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. The manifesto is the most agitating book where Marx and Engels **use clear class language**. It is interesting but not surprising that Marx’s most scientific book

frequently refers to his most political book since he tries to build the scientific base of the socialist politics of the working class after 1845s.

The *Manifesto* was written in order to formulate the principles of *The Communist League* and published in February 1848. The final text was the product of Marx. But he benefited from materials and early drafts of Engels. It was completed in Brussels in December and January of 1847. The *Manifesto* corresponds to a time period where the roads of liberal **democracy** and communism lastly intersect. From then on, they follow the different paths.

Before we introduce the class politics of communism in the *Manifesto*, let us go to the *volume 3 of Capital*, where Marx would state that

We have together here, moreover, and confronting one another all three classes that make up the framework of modern society-wage-labourer, industrial capitalist, landowner (Marx, 1991b, 756),

and in another place of the *same* volume, would say that:

wage-labourers, capitalists, and landowners” “form the three great classes of modern society based on the capitalist mode of production (Marx, 1991b, 1025)

In relation to England he observed that:

It is undeniably in England that this modern society and its economic articulation is most widely and most classically developed. Even here, though, this class articulation does not emerge in pure form. Here, too, middle and transitional levels always conceal the boundaries (although incomparably less so in the countryside than in the towns). We have seen how it is the constant tendency and law of development of the capitalist mode of production to divorce the means of production ever more from labour and to concentrate the fragmented means of production more and more into large groups, i.e. to transform labour into wage-labour and the means of production into capital. and this tendency also corresponds to the independent divorce of all landed property from capital and labour, or the transformation of all landed property into the form of landed property corresponding to the capitalist mode of production (Marx, 1991b, 1025).

In the *Manifesto* of 1848:

The “distinctive feature” of the modern bourgeois society underlies the fact that “it has **simplified the class antagonisms. Society** as a whole is more and more splitting up **into two great hostile camps**, into **two great classes** directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat”;

In *Capital Volume 3* of 1860s: Marx would state that: even in England, “**class articulation** does not emerge in pure form” . Then he adds that

middle and **transitional** levels always conceal the boundaries;
classes that **make up the framework** of modern society-wage-labourer, industrial capitalist, landowner;
wage-labourers, capitalists, and landowners as **the three great classes** of modern society.

In the modern bourgeois society, class *antagonisms* are simplified, society is splitting into two great camps. But articulation of the great classes in society as a whole also involves middle levels between proletariat and bourgeoisie, and transitional levels because both of historical change from feudalism to capitalism, and of the changes within and between classes with the dynamics of capitalist mode of production. Marx (and Engels) does not exclude the ranks, orders and middle and transitional classes (levels) in the bourgeois society. But, its framework is made up of the three great classes, and its distinctive feature is the fact that it simplifies the class antagonisms. Hence, it clearly demonstrates the relations and struggles between classes.

In addition to the historical development of bourgeoisie from the middle ages, the *Manifesto* states that the modern industry established world-market which had been initially paved by the discovery of America. With the development of industry, trade, transportation and market, the bourgeoisie “increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages” (SW, 247). Old classes are pushed into the background. They

did not disappear completely from the scene. This is one of the historical sources of “transitional levels” in *Volume 3 of Capital*.

It should be noted that the Manifesto does not go backwards from the feudal period in the presentation of the historical development of the bourgeoisie. This is logical since it previously stated that the modern bourgeois society “has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society” (SW, 246). In addition, the bourgeoisie conquers the political power for itself in the modern representative state, which is nothing but the modern representative **democracy** based on the party politics, general suffrage, and periodical elections, so on. The other thing to be taken attention is the role of the executive of the modern State (the execution, government or the administration of the State specifically, not the State as a whole), seen as a committee functioning for the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisies, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his ‘natural superiors’, and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous ‘cash payment’. It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervour, of chivalrous, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom-Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation (SW, 247-8).

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe”

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the Middle Ages, which Reactionists so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man’s activity can bring about

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed...In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations...The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature (SW, 248-9).

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation...It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt **the bourgeois mode of production**; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image (SW, 249).

The bourgeoisie obtains a divine power, creates and transforms everything in the way it wants. The statements in the Manifesto all demonstrate that the social and economic development in the bourgeois epoch cannot be compared with any other one. This development is enthusiastically interpreted because it is seen as being the material conditions for a real development of mankind.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West" (SW, 249).

Marx **makes compliments to the things he wants to transcend** (as he did for Hegel and Ricardo). As here, he points to the progressive role of the bourgeoisie, but he does so just in order to demonstrate the limits of that class. This is one of the examples for the argumentation form of the Manifesto. But let us continue to follow what the bourgeoisie did:

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised mean of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interest, laws, governments, and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one-frontier, and one customs-tariff (SW, 249).

The *Manifesto* here frames the concept of “**nation**”. It is a necessary product of the transformation in the population, productive forces and property relations. It is a political centralisation in which we have “one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one-frontier, and one customs-tariff”

The bourgeoisie, states the Manifesto, founded itself on the mean of production and exchange. The latter was originated in the previous mode of production, in feudal society. “At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal **relations of property become no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces**; they become so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder” (SW, 249-50). The incompatibility of the old relations of production and the new productive forces is over-passed through the establishment of “free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class” (SW, 250).

The whole spirit of the *Manifesto* is seen in these statements:

The **weapons** with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are **now turned against the bourgeoisies itself**.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; **it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians**” (SW, 250).

The *Manifesto* describes the modern working class as the proletarians in order to differentiate it from the working classes of the earlier epochs. The difference is seen in the fact that “the proletariat, the modern working class”, “a class of labourers”, “**live only so long as they find work**” and “**find work only so long as their labour increases capital**”. “These labourers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market”. The commodification of labour in the bourgeois society subjects labour and labourer to the economics of commodity. The interesting thing is the explanation of the arguments on which Marx’s *Capital* would be founded later on, in similar forms. Here we can argue that *Capital* as a whole exists on Marx’s mind in a dispersed form. For example, here is the summary of some detailed analyses which can be found in *Capital*:

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labour, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of commodity, and therefore also of labour, is equal to its cost of production. In proportion, therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time or by increased speed of the machinery, etc. (SW, 251).

Modern industry, states the *Manifesto*, converts the mass of labourers into an industrial army and subjects them to the command of officers. It renders them the slaves of the bourgeois class, of individual bourgeois manufacturer, of the

state, and also of the machines. It needs less skill and strength. With its development, age and sex differences lose their “distinctive social validity for the working class” (SW, 251).

Marx of the *Manifesto* points to the different stratum of “**two great classes** directly facing each other” (SW, 246): “No sooner is the exploitation of the labourer by the manufacturer, so far, at an end, and he receives his wages in cash, than he is set upon by the other **portions of the bourgeoisies**, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.”. The landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc are portions of the bourgeoisie. But, now:

The lower strata of the middle class (in German editions, *the lower sections of the old middle strata*, see the editorial note of Turkish translation of the Manifesto; 1993, third edition, Sol Publication, translated by M. Erdost) - the small trades people, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally (and rentiers, in German editions see the same translation), the handicraftsmen and peasants- all these sink gradually into the proletariat (SW, 251).

This “sinking” to the lower next category occurs because of the insufficiency of individual capitals in the face of competition of the big capitals and because new technical development renders superfluous skills of many (SW, 251-2). “Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population” (SW, 252). This means that every member of the society may become a proletariat.

The *Manifesto* portrays the development of proletariat and its struggle against the bourgeoisie:

With **its birth** begins its struggle with the bourgeoisie. **At first the contest is carried on by individual labourers**, then by the workpeople of a factory, then by the operatives of one trade, in one locality, against the individual bourgeois who directly exploits them. They direct their attacks not against the bourgeois conditions of production, but against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy imported wares that compete with their labour, they smash to

pieces machinery, they set factories ablaze, **they seek to restore by force the vanished status of the workman of the Middle Ages.**

At this stage the labourers still form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country, and broken up by their mutual competition. If anywhere they unite to form more compact bodies, this is not yet the consequence of their own active union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which class, in order to attain its own political ends, is compelled to set the whole proletariat in motion, and is moreover yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage, therefore, **the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeoisie.** Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisies; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But **with the development of industry** the proletariat **not only increases in number**; it becomes **concentrated in greater masses**, its strength grows, and it **feels that strength more**. The various interests and conditions of life within the **ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalised**, in proportion as machinery **obliterates all distinctions of labour**, and nearly everywhere **reduces wages to the same low level**. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes **their livelihood more and more precarious**; **the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes**. Thereupon the workers begin to form **combinations (Trades' Unions) against the bourgeois**; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there **the contest breaks out into riots**.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The **real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the workers**. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to **centralise the numerous local struggles**, all of the same character, into **one national struggle between classes**. But **every class struggle is a political struggle**. and that union, to attain which the burgers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the **modern proletarians**, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years (SW, 251-2).

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a **political party**, is continually being upset again by

the **competition between the workers** themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels **legislative recognition of particular interests** of the workers, by **taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie** itself. Thus **the ten-hours' bill** in England was carried.

Altogether, **collisions between the classes of the old society further** in many ways the course of **the development of the proletariat**. **The bourgeoisie** finds itself involved in a constant battle. At **first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times, with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries**. In all these battles, it **sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for its help, and thus to drag it into the political arena**. The **bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons** for fighting the bourgeoisie.

Further....**entire sections of the ruling classes** are, by the advance of industry, **precipitated into the proletariat**, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. **They also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress** (SW, 252-3).

The proletariat is not a minority. Its interest is not those of the minorities. Its movement is not that of minorities. Its consciousness is not given externally, and its movement is not dependent. "The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority". "The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole super incumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air". "Official society" is the existing society which is alien to the proletariat. The proletariat must direct its movement against the "super incumbent strata of official society" (SW, 254).

The form of the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, observes the Manifesto, is "at first a national struggle". This struggle is not a national struggle, but the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie at the national level. "The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie" (SW, 254). The term "national" means only the geographical framework of the struggle.

Proletarians and Communists: The *Manifesto* differentiates, on the one hand, the communists and “the other working class parties”, on the other hand, communist and socialists. The first differentiation is based on these facts:

1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the **common interest of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality**. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisies has to pass through, they always and everywhere **represent the interests of the movement as a whole** (SW, 255)

The Communists are *practically* “the most advanced and resolute section of the working- class parties of every country, that **section which pushes forward all others**” and *theoretically*, “they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and **the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement**” (SW, 255-6). The Communists are defined as practical and theoretical vanguard and the universal representative of the whole proletarian movement. “**The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on the ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer**”. It is not idealist, and not utopian, but founds its conclusions upon the material development conditions of the movement. These conclusions “merely express, in general terms, **actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes**”. The manifesto immediately states that the “abolition of **existing property relations** is not at all a distinctive feature of Communism”, but, “**the abolition of bourgeois property**”, which is “the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of many by the few”. So, its theory “may be summed up in the single sentence: **Abolition of private property**” (SW, 256).

The *Manifesto* demonstrates **how the Communists can answer the rapprochements** levelled against them in relation to private property, personal freedom, civilisation, the family, education, morality, religion and nationality.

As for the rapprochements related with the Communists' "desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labour, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity, and independence", the *Manifesto* (Marx and Engels) replies that, if the property of the petty artisan and of the small peasant" is concerned, their property is destroyed by the development of industry; if, on the other hand, the property of capital is concerned, it can be asked: "does wage-labour create any property for the labourer?". "Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage-labour" (SW, 256). Capital itself is "a collective product". It is put into motion by collective power of society. It is "not a personal", but "a social power". For this reason, the conversion of capital into "common property, into the property of all members of society" is only a change in the "social character of the property". "It loses its class-character". The capitalist has not only "a purely personal, but a social, status in production" (SW, 257).

Does the abolition of private property means the abolition of the property over the means of subsistence? "we by no means intent to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labour, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labour of others". What is wanted to be abolished is "the miserable character of this appropriation, under which the labourer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only in so far as the interest of the ruling class requires it" (SW, 257).

As for the individuality and independence, the *Manifesto* replies by comparing the bourgeois society with Communist society: in the former,

“living labour is but a means to increase accumulated labour”. In the latter, “accumulated labour is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the labourer”. In the former, “capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality”. Only in this sense, “The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at” (SW, 257).

It is seen that the *Manifesto* as the most political expression of the communist ideas finds its arguments on the bourgeois conditions of production. Even freedom and individuality is directly connected with the conditions of production: “By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying”. Freedom is market freedoms of the bourgeoisie”. These freedoms are defined in a reference to the restrictions of the middle Ages (SW, 257).

Private property is un-existent for “nine-tenths of the population”. Its existence depends on this non-existence (SW, 258). The property is already not valid for the immense majority. In addition, if individuality is assumed to be existed with the bourgeois property, it is assumed that individual can exist only in the form of the bourgeoisie (SW, 258).

The objection that working cannot be possible without private property is meaningless because those who work is without private property while those who do not work has private property: “there can no longer be any wage-labour when there is no longer any capital”. In terms of “the Communistic modes of producing and appropriating” material and intellectual products, the bourgeois thinks, “the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself”. Similarly, “the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture”. But, this culture is “for the immense majority, a mere training to act as a machine” (SW, 258).

The “notions of freedom, culture, law are the products of “the conditions of your bourgeois production and property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class” (SW, 258).

The objection about “abolition of the family” is replied that the present family, “the bourgeois family” is founded on “capital, on private gain”. Its ideal development is seen only among the bourgeoisie. This fact “finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution”. The Manifesto argues that when the family has validity among the proletarians and when public prostitution disappears, the bourgeois family also “vanishes”. But, all of them “will vanish with the vanishing of capital” (SW, 259).

In the question of education, the objection levelled against the Communists is their replacement of home education with social one. It is argued that the bourgeois education is also social education, which is determined and intervened by society “by means of schools, etc.” “The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class” (SW, 259).

In the bourgeois society, it is stated, “by the action of Modern Industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labour”. The “exploitation of children by their parents”, proclaims the manifesto, will be stopped. As for the status of women under this system, they are reduced to “mere instruments of production”. As a result, when the bourgeois hears that the means of production are to be put into the collective control, he thinks that the Communists will introduce “community of women”. But, “the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of

production”; in the case of so called “community of women”, the Manifesto replies that “The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial” (SW, 259). In addition, it is said that the bourgeoisie must have a look at his own relations, put aside common prostitutes (SW, 259-60). In contrast to the rapprochements of the bourgeoisie, the manifesto replies that “it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution both public and private” (SW, 260).

Socialist and Communist Literature: The manifesto classifies the socialist literature into three groups: 1. Reactionary Socialism (*Feudal socialism, petty-bourgeois socialism, German or ‘True’ socialism* are three examples); 2. Conservative, or Bourgeois, Socialism; 3. Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism.

Petty-bourgeois socialism found its economical base in the destructed “**medieval burgesses**” and “**the small peasant proprietors**” and “**a new class of petty bourgeois**” in the modern civilised countries. The first two classes were “the precursors of the modern bourgeoisie”, and “still vegetate side by side with the rising bourgeoisie”. The last class *fluctuates* between “proletariat and bourgeoisie” and “ever” *renews* itself “as a supplementary part of bourgeois society”. Nonetheless, its individual members are “being constantly hurled down into the proletariat by the action of competition, and, as modern industry develops, they even see the moment approaching when they will completely disappear as an independent section of modern society, to be replaced, in manufactures, agriculture, and commerce, by overlookers, bailiffs, and shopmen” (SW, 264).

The *Manifesto* observes that in the countries like France where peasants form far more than half of the population, “writers who sided with the proletariat against the bourgeoisie” used “the standard of the peasant and

petty bourgeois in order to criticise the bourgeois regime and advocated the working class “from the standpoint of these immediate classes”. Sismondi was the main figure of the petty bourgeois socialism both in France and in England. This socialist school, however, is appreciated by the *Manifesto* for its contribution to the critical analysis of the conditions of modern production.

These contributions which had been made by the petty bourgeois socialism would lay the base upon which Marx’s *Capital* would be developed. But, despite its scientific contributions for a more developed analysis of modern production, their standpoint was reactionary in the sense that it translated only the interests of the immediate classes fluctuating between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. For this reason, the manifesto appreciates it only for its initial contribution to the criticism of the bourgeois social and economic order. As for its aims, this school was again “**reactionary and Utopian**” since it “aspires either to restoring the old means of production and of exchange, and with them the old property relations, and the old society, or to cramping the modern means of production and of exchange, within the framework of the old property relations that have been, and were bound to be, exploded by those means”. Their concrete proposals at last were “corporate guilds for manufacture” and “patriarchal relations in agriculture” (SW, 264). At the end, it is “stubborn historical facts” ended this form of socialism (SW, 265).

Marx (and Engels) of the *Manifesto* puts distance between his ideas and the *philosophy of praxis* (‘Philosophy of Actions’) and between his communist theory and the so called searches for the scientific and philosophical foundation for socialism. This distance seems to be related with his theory of historical materialism (which was antithetical to historical idealism), and may be revealed in his statement above: “**The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on the ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer**”. These conclusions “merely express, in general terms, **actual**

relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes". The statements seem to have been put forward against idealism, and utopianism.

5.1.3 Purpose of Capitalist Production and the Capitalist

The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation: The expropriation of the capitalist expropriators is already a result of "the immanent laws of capitalist production itself". The centralisation of capitals means the expropriation of "many capitalists by a few". Besides this, the other developments occur and make capitalist society another old society: "the growth of the co-operative form of the labour process, the conscious technical application of science, the planned exploitation of the soil, the transformation of the means of labour into forms in which they can only be used in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world market, and with this, the growth of the international character of the capitalist regime". These are the positive base for a new society. But they are also accompanied by the negative results of the capitalist transformation: "Along with the constant decrease in the number of the capitalist magnates", "misery, oppression, slavery, degradation and exploitation grows; but with this there also grows the revolt of the working **class**, a **class** constantly increasing in numbers, and trained, united and organised by the very mechanism of the capitalist process of production". These are the *objective* and *subjective* conditions of the *new* mode of production. Both of them imply only that "The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production which has flourished alongside and under it. The centralisation of the means of production and the socialisation of labour reach a point at which they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated" (Marx, 1990a, 929). It is sure that since Marx suggests that the growing revolt of the working **class**

and the objective conditions of the new mode of production are the product of the same process, the act of expropriation of the capitalist expropriators can be only the act of the working **class** and its revolt, i.e., its revolutionary act.

Marx's above statements about the transformation of capitalist mode of production into a new mode of production rejects the tendencies of the twentieth century Marxism such as *economism* and *voluntarism*. What he offers us is the possibilities and the conditions of the socialist mode of production that are created by capitalist production itself. But, as Marx stated before in the case of the transformation of the old society into capitalist mode of production, "new forces and new passions" that spring up in the bosom of society" must "feel themselves to be fettered by that society". In the case of the transformation of the capitalist mode of production into new one, he also observes that as the negative results of capitalist production develops, there also "grows the revolt of the working **class**". But, it should be noted that the revolt as such is not qualified by Marx. He had not offered us the revolutionary programme of the working **class** except for the expropriation of the capitalist expropriators.

At this point, in order to portray the polarisation society into the mass of people and a few usurpers, Marx refers to *The Communist manifesto*:

The advance of industry...replaces the isolation of the workers...with their revolutionary combination...Of all the **classes** which confront the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary **class**. The others **classes** decay and disappear in the face of large-scale industry... The lower middle **classes**, the small manufacturers, the shopkeepers, the artisans, the peasants, all these fight against the bourgeoisie in order to save from extinction their existence as parts of the middle **class**... They are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history (Marx, 1990a, 930, note 2)

Development of the Law's Internal Contradictions: If the rate of exploitation is given, the creation of surplus-value faces no other **barrier** than the working population (Marx, 1991b, 351) and its unpaid or surplus-labour.

But the surplus-value stemming from surplus-labour is objectified in commodities and the total mass of commodities must be sold. If they are not sold completely and at the price of production, though the worker is exploited, “his exploitation is not realised”, and this may mean “partial or complete loss” of capital. “The conditions for immediate exploitation and for the realisation of that exploitation are not identical”. The conditions for immediate production and for market (circulation or reproduction process of capital) are separated not only “**in time and space**”, but also “**in theory**”. “The former is restricted only by the society’s **productive forces**, the latter by the **proportionality** between the different branches of production and by the society’s **power of consumption**”. Marx observes that this (“the society’s **power of consumption**”) is “determined neither by the *absolute* power of production nor by the *absolute* power of consumption but rather by the power of consumption within a **given framework of antagonistic conditions of distribution**, which reduce the consumption of the vast majority of society to a minimum level, only capable of varying within more or less narrow limits” (emphasise added; Marx, 1991b, 352). This restriction is furthered by the expansion of production because of the drive for accumulation (Marx, 1991b, 352-3). The “revolutions in method of production”, the devaluation of the existing capital”, “the general competitive struggle and the need to improve production and extend its scale, merely as a means of **self-preservation**” are the causes that create “the law governing capitalist production”. Marx refers to alienating character of the market and market relations. “The market...must be continually extended, so that its relationships and the conditions governing them assume ever more the form of a **natural law independent** of the producers and **become ever more uncontrollable**” (Marx, 1991b, 353).

Crises are *momentary* and *violent* solutions for the existing contradictions. On the contrary of general belief, they are functional in the re-establishment of the “disturbed balance”. To remember the problems which capital face in its reproduction process, crises discipline production and consumption,

sellers and buyers, and the relationship between commodity and money in every manner. In addition, it is very significant that Marx does not induce from crises sharp political conditions for the socialist politics. I think that for him, **crises do not necessarily weaken the class of capitalists as a whole, and do not necessarily strengthen the socialist politics.** Marx is careful in establishing any direct and **automatic correlation** between the rise of revolutionary politics and the crises. The studies on the political economy extend his class analysis, and his revolutionary perspective. With the development of capitalist mode of production, power of classes and their alliances change, international economic and political affairs begin to affect economic and political environment for bourgeois and proletarian politics at the local level. In *Capital*, Marx does not give us the conditions of revolution, but an economic framework for the class formation of capitalist society, and economic problems of capitalist society. **Briefly, what Marx does is to demonstrate what makes capitalism, how capitalism changes, and what capitalism cannot do.** The answers form the framework in which workers revolutionary politics **is** and **should** be made **before** and **after** revolution.

(Let us recall the Marx's observations about English industrial cycle above, on the real economic history and the significant manifestations of the each period; in Marx, 1990a; 583-84: Here only direct relation between crisis and revolutionary events can be established between the 1830 revolution in *France* and 1825 crisis of England and between the 1848 revolutions in *Europe* and 1847 crisis there. We can observe firstly that the "complete collapse" occurred when one of the significant spheres of the world market, the United States, entered into a multi-dimensional civil crisis. Secondly, the capitalist-worker alliance could be maintained only till the 1846's period when the industrial capitalism succeeded of eliminating the resistance of the landed property and of repealing of the Corn Laws. The military could be used against the workers in the country that is frequently recalled as the cradle of the liberal democracy. Thirdly, as related with the theoretical meaning of Marx's *Capital*, capital accumulation is the accumulation of power for the

capitalists that is used against the working **class**. In order to succeed in his struggle against the workers, the capitalists must constantly accumulate his power).

The development of trade and commercial capital directs production towards exchange-value”, “extends its scope, diversifies it and renders it cosmopolitan, developing money into world money”. Trade has “a solvent effect on the pre-existing organisations of production, which in all their various forms are principally oriented to use-value”. But, that its solvent effect results into “the dissolution of the old mode of production depends first and foremost on the solidity and inner articulation of this mode of production itself”. The new mode which can emerge after the dissolution “does not depend on trade, but rather on the character of the old mode of production itself”. In the ancient world, it led into a slave economy (Marx, 1991b, 449). “In the modern world, on the other hand, its outcome is the capitalist mode of production”. But Marx adds that “this result is itself conditioned by quite other circumstances than the development of commercial capital”. Marx points to the relation between urban industry and the development of trade in the context stated above. He says that trade depends on urban development as soon as urban industry is separated from agriculture and produces commodities, which requires trade. However, the high level of development of commercial capital in Rome’s late republican era was not accompanied with any progress in crafts. But, this accompanying progress occurred in the Greek cities and Corinth in Asia Minor and Europe. Marx observes that the relation between commercial capital and the industrial development created “false conceptions” in the context of “the transition from the feudal to the capitalist mode of production”. It is true that the development of trade in the 16 and 17. Centuries was “a major moment in promoting” this transition (“sudden expansion of the world market”, “the multiplication of commodities in circulation”, “competition” “for the seizure of Asiatic products and American treasures”, “the colonial system” were all “a fundamental contribution towards shattering the feudal barriers to production”). However, the manufacture as

“the first period” of “the modern mode of production” developed only in places where conditions suitable for it had been created in the Middle Ages (Marx, 1991b, 450). The formation of a new world market during the 16 and 17. Centuries had an important effect over “the defeat of the old mode of production and the rise of the capitalist mode”. However, the reverse occurred once the capitalist mode had been created. World market was the base of this mode. But, need to increasing scale of production created a condition where “it is not trade that revolutionises industry, but rather industry that constantly revolutionises trade”. Commercial superiority is now connected with the large-scale industry. “The history of Holland’s decline as the dominant trading nation is the history of the subordination of commercial capital to industrial capital” (Marx, 1991b, 451).

“The obstacles that the internal solidity and the articulation of pre-capitalist national modes of production oppose to the solvent effect of the trade” are easily seen in the commerce of England with China and India. In these countries, states Marx, “the broad basis of the mode of production is formed by the union between small-scale agriculture and domestic industry, on top which we have in the Indian case the form of village communities based common property in the soil, which was also the original form in China”. In India, England applied direct economic and political power in order to destroy the “small economic communities” (Marx, 1991b, 451). Here, it is seen that Marx uses the term “mode of production” for the scale, place and purpose of the production together with the common property of the village communities as a mere technical and physical organisation of production rather than in the context of class relations, appropriation of surplus product. and the statement of “the internal solidity and the articulation of pre-capitalist national modes of production” implies a more general indication as social, economic and political organisation of production. Nevertheless, Marx refers to pre-capitalist modes of production without giving a definite name to them. In addition, here the question is the solvent effect of trade over all pre-capitalist modes of production and whether this is a revolutionary one. He says that “In so far as

English trade has had a revolutionary effect on the mode of production in India, this is simply to the extent that it has destroyed spinning and weaving, which form an age-old and integral part of this unity of industrial and agricultural production, through the low price of English commodities” (Marx, 1991b, 451-2). By doing so, “it has torn the community to pieces”. But the dissolution is going on gradually despite destruction. Marx here does not say that the effect is revolutionary. On the other hand, the effects of trade are seen less in China to which “direct political force” is not levelled as in India. Marx states that China, having a “great economy and saving of time that results from the direct connection of agriculture and manufacture”, demonstrates “a very stubborn resistance” to the products of English large scale industry with the general expenses of their circulation (Marx, 1991b, 452).

Meanwhile, Marx observes that unlike English trade, “Russian trade leaves the economic basis of Asiatic production quite untouched” (Marx, 1991b, 452). But Engels adds that the situation is beginning to change since Russia attempted to develop its industry in its home market and “the adjacent Asiatic ones” (footnote 51, Marx, 1991b, 452). What is meant by the Asiatic ones is surely the hinterland of Russia towards Asia.

As regards with the merchant’s capital, Marx suggests that the “transition from feudal mode of production” has two different paths. The one is “the real revolutionary way” through which the “producer may become a merchant and capitalist, in contrast to the agricultural natural economy and the guild-bound handicraft of medieval urban industry. The other way is the situation where “the merchant may take direct control of production himself”. But, this “cannot bring about the overthrow of the old mode of production by itself, but rather preserves and retains it as its own precondition”. Marx observes that even till his century, “the manufacturer in the French silk industry, and the English hosiery and lace industries too, was a manufacturer only in name” (on contrary of popular belief this manufacturing merchant does not fulfil a

revolutionary function in the transition from feudal mode to capitalist mode). “In reality he was simply a merchant, who kept the weavers working in their old fragmented manner and exercised only control as a merchant; it was a merchant they were really working for” (Marx, 1991b, 452). Engels adds the example of ribbon and braid makers, and the silk-weavers in Rhineland. At Krefeld, a railway was build for the trade between the urban ““manufacturer”” and “these rural-weavers”. But the hand-weavers became redundant because of mechanisation (footnote 52, Marx, 1991b, 452). Marx states that this way of transition, which preserves the old mode of production, “always stands in the genuine capitalist mode of production and **disappears with its development**” (Marx, 1991b, 452-3).

That the merchant takes the direct control of production does not make the merchant a manufacturer. This path for transition does not revolutionise the mode of production, rather

it simply worsens the conditions of the direct producers, transform them into mere wage-labourers and proletarians under worse conditions than those directly subsumed by capital, appropriating their surplus labour on the basis of the old mode of production (Marx, 1991b, 453).

Here for Marx, to be able to see a real revolutionary transformation, **even the formation of wage-labourer and proletarians is not adequate**. In addition, the conditions of these proletarians are worse than those of the real proletarians which are directly subsumed by capitalist mode. This is why the peasant of Turkey is more miserable than the urban worker. Moreover, we understand from the term “really revolutionary way” a development in the living and working conditions of the producer and the forces of production.

Results of the Immediate Process of Production: For Marx, capitalist mode of production does not distinguish itself in term of the commodity production or capital in itself, as a social wealth. It is sure that it generalises the production of commodities and it is based on capital as the material and

monetary wealth. But, “the immediate purpose and the authentic product of capitalist production is *surplus-value*”. In addition, labour can be counted productive and the worker a productive worker, “if it or he creates *surplus-value* directly, i.e. the only productive labour is that which is directly *consumed* in the course of production for the valorisation of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 1038). A productive labour “directly serves capital as the agency of its self-valorisation, as means for the production of surplus-value” (Marx, 1990a, 1039). Labour power of the productive worker is power that is productively consumed for the creation of surplus-value and hence for the self-valorisation of capital.

Marx takes attention to “the overall labour process” which is composed of many individual workers. There is a division of labour between the hands and heads, i.e. between manual labour and engineers, managers, technologists, etc. Here, we have “the aggregate worker”, and their “*combined activity*” resulting in “an aggregate product” that is composed of “a *quantity of goods*”. Marx observes that “here it is quite immaterial whether the job of a particular worker, who is merely a limb of this aggregate worker, is at a greater or smaller distance from the actual manual labour. But then: the activity of this aggregate labour-power is its *immediate productive consumption by capital*, i.e. it is the self-valorisation process of capital, and hence,... the immediate production of surplus-value, the *immediate conversion of this latter into capital*” (Marx, 1990a, 1040). In a detailed definition of productive labour, Marx says that the first premise is the existence of wage-labourer. The second premise is that this labourer must be directly incorporated into capital as “a *living factor*” and must be the variable component of capital. But wage-labourer does not need to be a productive worker. This is the situation when labour is purchased to be consumed as a “*service*”, i.e. as a “*use-value*”, which does not “replace the value of variable capital”. Here, the work of labourer is “consumed for its *use-value*, not as *creating exchange-value*”. The capitalist meets the worker not “in his role of capitalist, a representative of capital”. The money paid for the worker is “*revenue*, not *capital*”. The

money appears “as a means of circulation, not as capital” (Marx, 1990a, 1041).

Marx states that “The more production becomes the production of commodities, the more each person has to, and wishes to, become a dealer in commodities, then the more everyone wants to make money, either from a product, or from his service, if his product only exists naturally in the form of a service, and this money-making appears as the ultimate purpose of activity of every kind”. The development of commodity production makes men wish to be commodity dealer or money-maker. Marx’s statements aim to point to the fact that “the immediate purpose and the authentic product of capitalist production is *surplus-value*”. Only the productive worker produces surplus-value. Everyone who makes money and become a dealer in commodities does not produce surplus-value. In addition, every wage-labour is not the producer of surplus-value. However, Marx argues that “In capitalist production the tendency for all products to be commodities and all labour to be *wage-labour*, becomes absolute”. This seems for many to mean that ever person under capitalist society will become proletarian. This is not true since Marx just says “*wage-labourer*”. “A whole mass of functions and activities which formerly had an aura of sanctity about them, which passed as ends in themselves, which were performed for nothing or where payment was made in roundabout ways (like all the professions, barristers, doctors, in England where the barristers and the physician neither could nor can sue for payment to this very day)- all these become directly converted into *wage-labourers*, however various their activities and payment may be” (Marx, 1990a, 1041-42). Their prices are subject to “the laws that govern the price of *wage-labour*”. However, the conversion of these services into wage-labour and their performers into wage-labourers, says Marx, should not be confused with their conversion into productive labour and productive worker. The apologists of capitalist production convert the productive worker, “simply because he is a wage-labourer, into a worker who only exchanges his services (i.e. his labour as a use-value) for *money*”. By doing so, they conceals “the specific

nature of this 'productive worker' and of capitalist production-as the production of surplus-value, as the self-valorisation of capital in which living labour is no more than the agency it has embodied in itself" (Marx, 1990a, 1042).

Capitalist production includes certain productive processes that can be carried out "in a way typical of *earlier modes of production*" and in which capital-relation ("the relations of *capital and wage-labour*") did not exist and hence "the capitalist concepts *productive* and unproductive labour" is incompatible. "But in line with the dominant mode of production, even those kinds of labour which have not been subjugated by capitalism in reality are so in thought" (here the terms *dominant mode of production* and *capitalism* first used by Marx). The example is "the self-employed worker" as being "his own wage-labourer". His means of production "appears" to this labourer "in his own mind as capital". Capitalist and the wage-labourer is the same person. Marx states that "Such anomalies provide welcome opportunities for all sorts of hot air about the difference between productive and unproductive labour". His reply has been given above by saying for such a situation, that "the capitalist concepts of *productive* and unproductive labour are quite inapplicable" since "the relation of *capital and wage-labour*" is not exist (Marx, 1990a, 1042).

Marx's example is the taxes and the public services and hence the situation of the state personnel. "The *services* that the capitalist buys freely or under compulsion (for example from the state) for their use-value are not consumed productively and cannot become *factors of capital*, any more than the *commodities* he buys for his personal consumption. They do not become factors of capital; they are therefore not productive labour and those who carry them out are not *productive workers*" (Marx, 1990a, 1041). According to these definitions, roads and security which the state offers to the capitalist are not the factors of capital and not consumed productively. The *workers* who build roads and protect the capitalist are not productive worker. Their

labour is consumed for their use-value, but not consumed for creating exchange-value. But, the raw materials that are produced by the state and consumed by the capitalists productively are the materials incorporated into the capitalist process of production and counted as factors of capital. They are not used as the commodities for the personal consumption of capitalist. They form a part of constant capital of the capitalist. Nonetheless, there is a difficulty about why the services that the capitalist buys freely or under compulsion, for example, from the state, cannot be counted as components of capital. But the difficulty disappears when it is seen that the services of the state are expensed from the revenues of the state and that its services are consumed as use-values, not “as *creating exchange value*”. In fact, the capitalist, among the other people, gives tax to the state and takes a service from it. However, now we have transferred the difficulty to the area of taxes.

Taxes, “the price for government services”, “belong to the faux frais de production”. They are not significant amount for the capitalists and when converted into direct taxes, they form “the disbursement of revenue”. In addition, “legal proceedings” and “contractual agreements” are nothing but the arrangements, or “stipulations between commodity owners as buyers and sellers of goods, and nothing to do with the relations between capital and labour”. One part may become “wage-labourer of capital”. But there is not here any productive worker (Marx, 1990a, 1043).

The other determination of productive labour is concerned with the socially necessary aspect of labour. Marx states that “when we speak of *productive labour* we mean *socially determined labour*, labour which implies a quite specific relationship between the buyer and the seller of labour”. It is “exchanged directly for *money as capital*, i.e. for money which is intrinsically capital, which is destined to function as capital and which confronts labour-power as capital”. As stated before, productive labour is the variable component of capital. Its labour reproduces the value of labour-power. It is a “a value creating activity” that “valorises capital and *confronts* the worker with

the values so created and transformed into *capital*". For the labour to be productive there must be a "specific relationship between *objectified* and *living* labour that converts the former into capital also turns the latter into productive labour". Surplus-value is the "specific product of the capitalist process of production". It is "created only through an exchange with *productive labour*" (Marx, 1990a, 1043). The *specific* product of the capitalist process of production is neither only the commodities, nor the use-values that are objectified in particular products. The particular utility or the use-value of a product is meaningful for capital only in terms of "its ability to generate exchange-value (surplus-value)". The capitalist production is "a process which absorbs unpaid labour, which makes the means of production into the means for extorting unpaid labour" (Marx, 1990a, 1044).

Productive labour *absolutely* ignores (since Marx says "utterly unconnected". I think he should have said "not necessarily connected") any connection between the content of labour and the utility or the use-value in which labour is objectified. For this reason, certain labour can be productive or unproductive. Marx gives some examples in the context of literary, music and teaching that are assumed so distant from the labour theory of value and from capitalist production. Milton who is the writer of *Paradise Lost* was an unproductive worker. He produced his book "as a silkworm produces silk, as the activation of his own nature", and then he "sold his product for 5 Sterling and thus became a merchant". Unlike Milton, "a writer who turns out work for his publisher in factory style is productive worker". This "literary proletarian of Leipzig who produces books, such as compendia on political economy, at the behest of his publisher is pretty nearly a productive worker since his production is taken over by capital and only occurs in order to increase it". Similar example is related with musical talent: "A singer who sings like a bird is an unproductive worker. If she sells her song for money, she is to that extent a wage labourer or merchant. But if the same singer is engaged by an entrepreneur who makes her sing to make money, then she becomes a productive worker, since she *produces* capital directly". The last example is

concerned with a teacher “who works for wages in an institution along with others, using his own labour to increase the money of the entrepreneur who owns the knowledge-mongering institution, is a productive worker” (Marx, 1990a, 1044). However, Marx’s analysis of productive worker must be connected to the other parts of his theory of capital accumulation, especially the analysis of the development of capital’s domination over labour in formal and real levels. As for the last example about the schoolmaster, he says that “But for the most part, work of this sort has scarcely reached the stage of being subsumed even formally under capital, and belong essentially to a transitional stage” (Marx, 1990a, 1044). The work of this sort, it is sure, is in the transitional stage, and is not even in the level of formal subordination of labour by capital. This is valid for Marx’s time. Publishing companies, newspapers, journals, televisions, cinemas, worldwide web, musical industry and the extension of private education in a worldwide scale have for along time reached a level of development beyond Marx’s imagination. Marx is right in his definitions for the second half of the nineteenth century. However, his statements and determinations are, as always, beyond his time and far more applicable to our time.

Marx observes that “On the whole, types of work that are consumed as services and not in products separable from the worker and hence not capable of existing as commodities independently of him, but which are yet capable of being directly exploited in capitalist terms, are of microscopic significance when compared with the mass of *capitalist* production” (Marx, 1990a, 1044). Today, many types of work, after they are produced, can be separated from the worker and be existed as commodities independently of him and many services can be turned into products separable from the worker. Entertainment is an industrial work today. But it is sure that the services that are not separable from the producer and not capable of existing as commodities independently of him have also rapidly increased in the twentieth century. This is perfectly exemplified by the *unproductive* activities of state and increasing weight of the consultancy works all over the world.

For these types of work, Marx is right, only for his time, to say that “They may be entirely neglected, therefore, and can be dealt with under the category of wage-labour that is not at the same time productive labour” (Marx, 1990a, 1045).

A type of work can be performed for different employers. The same worker can be in the service of an industrial capitalist, or work directly for the immediate consumer. “He is a wage-labourer or day labourer in either situation, only he is a *productive* worker in the one case and *unproductive* in the other, because in the one he produces capital and in the other not; because in the one case his work is a factor in the self-valorisation process of capital and in the other it is not” (Marx, 1990a, 1045). This definition can be applicable to the state personal. The same planner is unproductive worker in the service of the state and in the case of free activity of his profession, and productive in the planning firm for which he works for a wage.

The products which are consumed as revenue do not “re-enter production as means”, and hence “they have no use-value for the process of reproduction”. The productive labour here “produces use-values and objectifies itself in the products that are destined only for unproductive consumption”. The articles of unproductive consumption “could, if need be, also function again as capital” (Marx, 1990a, 1045). Marx states that if the progress of the reproduction process is prevented by “the disproportionate diversion of *productive labour* into unreproductive articles, it follows that the means of subsistence or production will not be reproduced in the necessary quantities”. In such a situation, it is not just to condemn the manufacture of luxury articles within the context of capitalist production. But, luxury goods are sine qua non of a mode of production which “creates wealth for the non-producer and which therefore must provide that wealth in forms which permit its acquisition only by those who enjoy” (Marx, 1990a, 1046). We can add to Marx’s definition that as the productivity of labour rises with the development of capitalist production, the portion of surplus labour within the value of commodity

increases, and hence the personal consumption of capitalists and the other persons who shares surplus-value increases. However, this subject is not concerned within *the volume I of Capital*.

Apart from the *services*, in the case of "the non-material production" (Marx, 1990a, 1047), we meet "commodities", separated from producer, and which "can circulate in the interval between production and consumption as commodities, e.g. books, paintings and all products of art as distinct from the artistic achievement of the practising artist". Marx observes that in such cases, capitalist production is "possible only within narrow limits". These "people" are "not independent" and "mainly work for merchant's capital, e.g. booksellers". But Marx states that this is "a pattern that is only transitional in itself and can only lead to a *capitalist mode of production* in the formal sense". Their position, however, does not exclude the fact that "exploitation is at its greatest precisely in these transitional forms" (Marx, 1990a, 1048).

In the other case of non-material production, the product can not be separated from the act of producing. Here capitalist mode of production is limited and operates in certain places. The doctors or teachers (in "the learning factory") can be mentioned here. "Such peripheral phenomena can be ignored when considering capitalist production as a whole" (Marx, 1990a, 1048).

What about "productive capital? Marx has demonstrated that productive labour is "vital for accumulation since only the exchange for productive labour can satisfy one of the conditions for the reconversion of surplus-value into capital". As the "representative of *productive capital*", the capitalist performs "a *productive* function". It directs and exploits productive labour. "In contrast to his fellow-consumers of surplus-value who stand in no such immediate and active relationship to their production, his class is the *productive* class par excellence". In terms of his directing function in the labour process, the capitalist also "performs *productive labour* in the sense that his labour is

involved in the total process that is realised in the product” (Marx, 1990a, 1048). His “fellow-consumers of surplus-value” do not form a productive class as all wage-labourers do not form a productive class. Nonetheless, productivity is not the criteria for class belongings. In addition, Marx implies that there is a class-fellowship that is determined by the degree of “immediate and active relationship” to the production of surplus-value.

Net and Gross Product: The definition that the purpose of capitalist production is the production of surplus-value is rather productive observation for Marx. The fact that “Its aim is *net produce*” means that the purpose of capitalist production is not “the existence of the producer” (Marx, 1990a, 1049). In the earlier modes of production, on the other hand, “the worker was an end in himself and appropriate employment was his privilege, a right which the entire order was concerned to maintain” (Marx, 1990a, 1050). In addition, the purpose of capitalist production conflicts with “the idea of the protectionist system (as opposed to free trade), an idea tinged with nationalism, which holds that industries should be protected since they form the source of income for a mass of people” (Marx, 1990a, 1050). The “individual capitalist only obeys the immanent law, and hence the moral imperative, of capital to produce as much surplus-value as possible” (Marx, 1990a, 1051).

The ideal is “the greatest possible reduction of wages, the greatest possible increase in the number of those living off *produit net*”.

The “law of capitalist production is to increase constant capital at the expense of variable, that is, to increase surplus-value, net produce”. In addition, “net produce is to be increased in relation to the part of product that replenishes capital, i.e. wages”. The gross or aggregate product “grows in relation to the net product” and, since the net product is composed of wages and surplus value (net produce), then “the net product also grows in relation to the gross product” (Marx, 1990a, 1051). The ideal is “the greatest possible

reduction of wages, the greatest possible increase in the number of those living off *produit net*" (Marx, 1990a, 1051).

5.1.4 Merchant's Capital: Old and Modern

One part of the social capital is on the market as a commodity waiting to transform into money, while another part is as money waiting to be turned into commodities. For this metamorphosis of capital, "a special function of a special capital" is needed and "fixed by the division of labour as a function that falls to a particular species of capitalists, commodity capital becomes commodity-dealing capital or commercial capital". Here Marx points to confusion about the transport and storage and dispersal of goods. They "should be viewed as production processes that continue within the process of circulation" (Marx, 1991b, 339). Commercial capital has specific functions and performs its role "exclusively in the circulation process". It is "the transformed form" and is "always to be found on the market". It is "perpetually confined to the circulation sphere". It is a portion of capital since the industrialists also buy and sell commodities among themselves (Marx, 1991b, 380). Commodity dealer is a capitalist but he does not produce commodities but deals them and facilitates their metamorphoses. For this, he first buys and then gets money (being "the possessor of money capital"). His buying and selling act is limited to the circulation sphere and "not interrupted by the interval of the production process" which stays outside its operations. In the movement of commodity to money, for instance, the linen, its owner only changes (Marx, 1991b, 381). Marx states that the operation of the merchant fulfils the functions of commodity capital in the circulation process (and reproduction process) by transforming the commodity capital of producer into money. Hence the commercial capital is the commodity capital of the producer which is to be transformed into money: "only instead of being an incidental operation carried out by the producer himself, this function now appears as the exclusive operation of a particular species of capitalist, the merchant, and acquires independence as the business of particular capital

investment” (Marx, 1991b, 382). The specificity of the merchant is the fact that he may continue its selling act and its money capital he has advanced is valorised in the process of M-C-M’, and this why this “specific kind of capital” evolves (Marx, 1991b, 383).

It is sure for the existence of a special kind of commodity as such, there must be mutual advantages or necessities for the producer and the merchant. Marx says that commercial capital, if it exists as commodity capital in the market, is the part of industrial capital waiting for its metamorphosis (Marx, 1991b, 386). The commodity dealer represents the commodity capital in the circulation as the producer previously represented there. For the producer of the commodity, time period of the metamorphosis is now shorter than before and continues for the merchant. By doing so, the reproduction process of the producer can continue without interruption. In addition, the producer can transform his commodities into money and advance more money for the reproduction process only by having a small amount of reserve money. Otherwise, “the scale of reproduction” would be limited. As we have stated above, “This is why another part of the social capital, in the form of commercial capital, is always to be found in the circulation sphere. It is regularly applied simply to buying and selling commodities. There thus seems to be only a change in the persons that have this capital in their hands”. The “producer saves time in selling which he can apply to supervising the production process, while the merchant has to spend his entire time selling” (Marx, 1991b, 383). Because of the division of labour, capital needed for selling and buying activity is smaller, the metamorphosis of capital is facilitated and commercial capital as a whole also facilitates the turnovers of various capitals (Marx, 1991b, 388).

The turnover of industrial capital is composed of the circulation and production times and the turnover of commercial capital is restricted by the turnover of the industrial production as a whole in the production branch it operates, since it is not identical with the turnover of the industrial capital

(Marx, 1991b, 388-9). For this reason, Marx states that if the commercial capital quickly turns over, the less commercial capital exists within the total money capital, and vice versa. “The less developed production is, the greater is the sum of commercial capital in proportion to the amount of commodities put into circulation in general; the smaller, however, it is in absolute terms or compared with more developed conditions and conversely. In undeveloped conditions of this kind, therefore, the greater part of money capital proper is in the hands of merchants, so that their wealth constitutes monetary wealth as far as others are concerned” (Marx, 1991b, 389). Marx sums that the velocity of the circulation of the merchant’s money capital depends on the repetition of the production process and the interconnection of the different production processes, and on the consumption (Marx, 1991b, 389-90). (If so, we can say that the greater commercial capital circulates slower in undeveloped conditions of production). Merchant’s capital is composed of commodity capital and money capital. The greater the former is, the smaller the other is (Marx, 1991b, 390)

Capital functions within the circulation process in the form of commercial capital. The reproduction process as a whole includes in itself only as a phase the **circulation process in which “no value is produced, and thus also no surplus-value”**. “The same value simply undergoes changes of form”. The metamorphosis of commodities is not related with “the creation or alteration of value”. Selling commodity means **the realisation of surplus-value which is “already existed** in the commodity”. “Nor does the buyer realize any surplus-value with the second act, exchange of the money capital back into commodities”. “In fact, in as much as these metamorphoses cost **circulation time-a time during which capital produces nothing** at all, and therefore certainly **does not produce any surplus-value**-there is a **restriction on the creation of value**, and the surplus-value, as expressed in **the profit rate**, will actually vary inversely with the length of the circulation time. Commercial capital thus creates neither value nor surplus-value, **at least not directly**. In so far as it contributes towards **shortening the**

circulation time, it can **indirectly help** the industrial capitalist to increase the surplus-value he produces. In so far as it **helps to extend the market and facilitates the division of labour** between (Marx, 1991b, 392) capitals, **thus enabling capital to operate on a bigger scale**, its functioning **promotes the productivity of industrial capital** and its accumulation. In so far as it **cuts down the turnover time**, it **increases the ratio of surplus-value** to the capital advanced, i.e. the rate of profit. and in so far as a smaller part of capital is confined to the circulation sphere as money capital, it **increase the portion of capital directly applied in production**" (Marx, 1991b, 393).

Commercial Profit: It is sure that profit which the merchant can obtain in his acts must be a portion of value or the surplus-value which is already existed in the commodity he deals with. Marx states that "It is a mere semblance that commercial profit is just a supplement, a nominal increase in the price of commodities above their value" (Marx, 1991b, 395). He says that since this kind of capital does not itself produce any value, "it is clear that the surplus-value that accrues to it in the form of the average profit forms a portion of the surplus-value produced by the productive capital as a whole". A part of surplus-value, the profit of merchant falls to his "**share**". This profit, which is obtained in selling act, "**must be equal to the difference between his purchase price and his sale price**" (Marx, 1991b, 395). If there are some **costs** of circulation, the profit is **not pure** one. For simplification, Marx says that he ignores this sort of costs in the analysis (Marx, 1991b, 395-6).

The industrial capitalist realises in circulation surplus-value or profit which is already produced. On the other hand, the merchant "**does not merely realize his profit in and through circulation, he also makes it there**" (Marx, 1991b, 396). The "whole idea that profit is derived from a nominal increase in commodity prices, or by selling them above their value, arises from the viewpoint of commercial capital". This is an "illusion", says Marx, when "the predominance of the capitalist mode of production" is assumed. It

is “not the way commercial profit is realized”. He also adds that here the only average profit is concerned rather than individual cases. This is to assume as if the industrial capitalist sells his commodities at their production prices and to assume that the merchant’s capital does not influence the formation of the general rate of profit. This was assumed at the beginning of the analysis, says Marx since it was assumed that commercial capital was not exist and the average profit rate was determined by the equalisation of the profits of industrial capitals in various spheres of production (Marx, 1991b, 397). When commercial capital is involved, it is seen that “a capital... takes a share in profit without participating in production” (Marx, 1991b, 397-8).

To supplement the analysis, Marx demonstrates that commercial capital is involved in the total capital, besides total industrial capital. For example, the total industrial capital in a year is $720c + 180v = 900$ and $s' = 100$ percent. And capital produced **C** will be $720c + 180v + 180s$ and its value or price of production (two coincides when the totality of commodities is concerned) = 1080. The rate of profit on the total capital of 900 is 20 percent, which is the average rat of profit. Now when it assumed the existence of a commercial capital of 100 and that its share in profit is 10 percent, which is 10 percent in the total surplus-value of 180. It gets 18 percent profit rate. “The profit to be divided among the remaining nine-tenths in the total capital is now only 162”. Therefore, the selling price of C of the industrial capital for the merchants is $720c + 180v + 162s = 1062$. When the merchant adds the average profit of 18 percent to his capital advanced (100), the selling price of the commodities will be $1062 + 18 = 1080$ (the price of production, or when the total commodity capital, value). Marx states that even though the merchant sell the commodities at their value or price of production, the fact is that he bought them from industrialist below their value or production price. When the commercial capital is also exist and included into the analysis, it is seen that it “contributes to the formation of the general rate of profit according to the proportion it forms in the total capital” (Marx, 1991b, 398). (Marx recalls that he hitherto assumes that the price of production is the price of the

commodity as equal to its cost plus the average profit; Marx, 1991b, 398-9). So we have “a real price of the commodity as the sum of the production price + the commercial profit (Marx, 1991b, 399). “Marx sums that “Just as industrial capital only realises profit that is already contained in the value of the commodity as surplus-value, so commercial capital does so only because the whole of the surplus-value or profit is not yet realised in the price of the commodity as realised by industrial capital” (Marx, 1991b, 399-400). “The general profit rate thus already takes account of the deduction from the surplus-value which falls to commercial capital, i.e. a deduction from the profit of industrial capital” (Marx, 1991b, 400). So at the beginning, “a mere semblance is the supplement of the commercial profit to the selling price of commodity. Now it is seen that it is “a deduction from the profit of industrial capital”. For this reason, Marx follows that when commercial capital is bigger in comparison with industrial capital, industrial profit becomes smaller. In addition, the average rate of profit seems to be smaller “for the directly exploiting capitalists” when concerning the share of the commercial capital. In above-mentioned example, average profit rate seems to be 18 percent rather than 20 percent. It is already the fact that “the rate of profit is always expressed in a lower figure than the rate of actual surplus-value”. Here, the difference between them is greater (Marx, 1991b, 400) (profit rate 18 pc. to 100 p.c. rate of surplus-value rather than 20 to 100).

Marx states that **scientific analysis** seems to follow the formation of the general rate of profit by starting with the industrial capitals and the competition between them and then taking account the intervention of commercial capital. However, historical development follows the reverse course. **In historical development, commercial capital first fixes the commodity prices** around their value, and the **circulation process mediates the reproduction process where the general profit rate is first determined** (Marx, 1991b, 400). Industrial profit was initially determined by commercial profit. After the predominance of the capitalist mode of production and after the producer becomes merchant, “commercial profit is

reduced to the aliquot share of the total surplus-value that accrues to commercial capital as an aliquot part of the total capital concerned in the process of social reproduction” (Marx, 1991b, 401). The money capital of the merchant is in the position of the fixed capital of the industrial capitalist. The price the merchant pays for the commodity, “he replaces its production price, = M, in money”. His profit is “simply the portion of commodity value that productive capital has not included in the production price of commodity, and has in fact left out” (Marx, 1991b, 401).

(In the case of the turnover of commercial capital, i.e. the movement of commodity capital, Marx states that commercial commodity prices **in an earlier period** were in a high level because the productivity of labour was lower and hence the production prices were higher, and because a general rate of profit was, absent. Consequently, **the high level of commercial commodity prices permits the commercial capital to acquire a far more portion of the surplus-value than would be drawn in the case of the general capital mobility**. Such a situation ended with the development of the capitalist mode of production, Marx, 1991b, 423)

(In addition, the turnover of commercial capital, i.e. the movement of commodity capital, rises with the development of the transportation technology. This reduces the absolute amount of the commercial capital and raises the general profit rate. As the capitalist mode of production develops, the movement of commodities begins to need less commodity capital and the ratio of the commercial capital to industrial capital declines. With the development of the capitalist mode of production, “all production becomes commodity production and hence the whole of the product comes into the hands of agents of circulation”. In an earlier mode of production, production was realised on a smaller scale and mass of products were directly consumed by the producers themselves and a large part of the producers sold their commodities directly to the consumers (Marx, 1991b, 425). In earlier modes, even though commercial capital was larger according to the

commodity capital, its **absolute amount was smaller** because commodity production and commodity capital was smaller (Marx, 1991b, 425-6). However, Marx states that it was **relatively greater** because the prices of the commodities were in a higher level caused by the low level of development of the labour's productivity. In the capitalist mode, the mass of the commodities is greater and hence mass of the commercial capital grows. In addition, commercial capital increase with the advance of the capitalist mode since the entering into the retail trade becomes easier and the speculation rises. Also there emerges "a surplus of unoccupied capital". Marx states that this development of "non-functioning or only semi-functioning commercial capital" is related with the "competition among capitals", Marx, 1991b, 426).

When the merchant has other expenses besides the money capital he advanced. These costs have to be reclaimed by the merchant from other agents of circulation and in part a part of his business (Marx, 1991b, 401). However, this additional capital "goes into the formation of the general rate of profit". The commercial costs for the circulation of commodities are not involved in the production of use-value, but in the realisation of their value. These costs realise the commodity value (Marx, 1991b, 402).

Marx observes that a merchant whose business and capital is small may be the only worker employed (Marx, 1991b, 403). "He is paid by the part of the profit that accrues to him from the difference between the purchase price of the commodities and their real price of production" (Marx, 1991b, 403-4). In addition, his profit may be in the level of "the wage of a better-paid skilled worker", may be less than it. Here Marx observes that the persons "functioning alongside him" (merchant stated above) are "the direct commercial agents of productive capitalists-buyers, salesmen, commercial travellers-receiving the same income or higher, whether in the form of wage or a share in the profit made on each sale". In the case of the small commercial capital, "the merchant pockets the commercial profit as an independent capitalist; in the other case the direct employee of the industrial

capitalist is paid a part of the profit in the form of either a wage or a proportionate share in the profit of the industrial capitalist". But in all cases, income for him seems to be as a wage, and even this payment does not take the form of wage, "the size of his profit may still be only equivalent to the wage of a better-paid worker". The income as such derives from the commercial profit. Marx adds that "his labour is not value-creating labour" (Marx, 1991b, 405).

The industrial capitalist may be his own merchant in order to realise the value of his commodity. He needs additional capital for this operation. But this additional capital does not mean "any more surplus-value". In addition, this sort of operation implies the reduction in the rate of profit for the industrial capitalist class and for individual capitalists since a part of total capital is taken away from the valorisation process and left for "secondary operations" (Marx, 1991b, 405).

The commercial wage-labourers: As for the commercial wage-labourers, Marx observes that he is a wage-labourer like any other. "Since the merchant, being simply an agent of circulation, produces neither value nor surplus-value (for the additional value he adds to commodities by his expenses is reducible to the addition of previously existing value...), the commercial workers...cannot possibly create surplus-value for him directly". Marx answers the question: "This question has in fact already been resolved by the general analysis of commercial profit". He says that "**commercial capital makes a profit by not paying productive capital in full for the unpaid labour contained in the commodity**", "and, as against this, **itself receiving the additional portion which it has not paid for once the commodity has been sold**". The amount of the profit of the individual merchant depends on the capital he employs. He can employ more capital and hence more "unpaid labour of his clerks". "**Their unpaid labour, even-though it does not create surplus-value, does create his ability to appropriate surplus-value**, which, as far as this capital is concerned, gives

exactly the same result; i.e. it is **its source of profit**. Otherwise, the business of commerce could never be conducted in the capitalist manner, or on a large scale” (Marx, 1991b, 407).

In the case of productive capital, unpaid labour of the worker creates surplus-value directly. The unpaid labour of the commercial employee “creates a share in that surplus-value for commercial capital” (Marx, 1991b, 407-8). The latter is employed in order to appropriate a share in the already produced surplus-value. The variable capital of the merchant “transfers to itself a part of the surplus-value that industrial capital has created” (Marx, 1991b, 408).

Commercial capital is “the form in which a part of the industrial capital functioning in the circulation process has become autonomous” (Marx, 1991b, 412). “Commercial capital, with an office instead of a workshop, functions continuously in the circulation process” (Marx, 1991b, 412-3). As the production scale grows, there emerges a need for a commercial office since the industrialist’s commercial operations raise. Expenditure on the commercial workers of the commercial office, says Marx, takes the form of wages, but is different from the variable capital to buy productive labour. It increases the outlays of the industrial capital without increasing the surplus-value directly. This outlay reduces the profit rate. It is used for the realisation of value which is already created. The more commercial workers mean the less rate of profit since the surplus-value remains constant. For this reason, there emerges a kind of division of labour (Marx, 1991b, 413). Marx states that “as commercial salaries increase, a part of these is often paid as a percentage of the profit” (Marx, 1991b, 414).

“The commercial worker proper belongs to the better-paid class of wage-labourer; he is one of those whose labour is skilled labour, above-average labour”. His price (price of labour) is determined “by the value of his labour power, i.e. its cost of production”. But, his wage does not have any “necessary relationship to the amount of profit that he helps the capitalist to realise”.

Marx observes that the wage of the commercial worker “has a tendency to fall, as the capitalist mode of production advances, even in relation to average labour”. This is firstly because the division of labour within the commercial office needs only one-sided skills, which cost less for the capitalist as this ability develops through work and develops quickly as one-sidedness increases with the division of labour (Marx, 1991b, 414). Secondly, commercial skills are acquired easily and cheaply as the capitalist mode of production “adapts teaching methods” to “practical purposes” (Marx, 1991b, 414-5). “The general extension of popular education permits this variety of labour to be recruited from all classes which were excluded from it and were accustomed to a lower standard of living”. This sort of education increases the supply of this labour and competition in it. “With a few exceptions, therefore, the labour-power of these people is devalued with the advance of capitalist production; their wages fall, whereas their working ability increases”. Marx states that their number increases if there is more profit to be realised and **their increasing number is “always an effect of the increases in surplus-value, and never a cause of it”** (Marx, 1991b, 415). Here, Engels, as the editor of *Capital's Volume 2 and 3*, adds that Marx's prognosis can be exemplified by **“the fate of the commercial proletariat”** after 1865 (When Marx writes the book). The “hundreds of German clerks skilled in all commercial operations” knowing three or four languages offer their services in London for weekly 25 shillings “well below the wage of skilled mechanic”. (and he says that there is a gap of two pages here in the manuscript of *Capital*, footnote, Marx, 1991b, 415).

Capital needed for the circulation costs “by the overall class of industrial capitalists as a whole is now Capital needed for the circulation costs” (Marx, 1991b, 415-6). They both take the “charge of the circulation function” and “take over the circulation costs that arise from it”. For the industrial capital, costs as such **“appear as expenses”** whereas for the merchant they **“appear as the source of his profit”**. Hence, for the merchant, the outlay to take over

the costs of circulation is “productive investment”, and for him again, “the commercial labour” is “directly productive” (Marx, 1991b, 416).

Some Historical Information about Merchant’s Capital: The 20. chapter of *Capital’s Volume 3* deals with the relationship between the merchant and the development of the capitalist mode of production in the context of the transition from feudalism and other pre-capitalist modes of production to modern production. The chapter makes clear many points about the definition of capital, and capitalist mode of production. Meanwhile, it puts forward many controversial concepts and ideas which create debates within Turkish Marxists.

Trading capital is “the oldest historical mode in which capital has an independent existence”. For its existence, no more than the existence of “the simple circulation of commodities and money” is needed. It fulfils the function of mediation for the commodity exchange. The circulation as such is adequate for its existence. “Whatever mode of production is the basis on which the products circulating are produced- whether **the primitive community, slave production, small peasant and petty-bourgeois production, or capitalist production**- this in no way alters their character as commodities, and as commodities they have to go through the exchange process and the changes of form that accompany it”. Here it should be noted that although Marx says “Whatever mode of production” and exemplifies them as **the primitive community, slave production, small peasant and petty-bourgeois production, or capitalist production**, he is just interested with the trans-historic character of the merchant capital just as the trans-historic character of capital. For the latter, Marx stated above that capital has the forms in history (as seen in this statement: “the oldest historical mode in which capital has an independent existence”). In addition, examples stated above are not given as specific and distinctive modes of production.

The poles or extremes which commercial capital mediates “should be present as commodities, whether production is over its whole range commodity production or whether it is merely the surplus from producers who work to satisfy their own direct needs that is put on the market” (Marx, 1991b, 442). There must be commodities which the merchant mediates between the extremes. But, these commodities need not be necessarily produced in the completely commodity production. They may be the surplus products which are put on the market to satisfy the direct needs of the producers. Commodities which the merchant deals with are not necessarily the products of the commodity producers.

Only in the conditions of “the full development of capitalist production”, “product is produced simply as a commodity and not at all as a direct means of subsistence” Now the trade and the merchant begins to control production (Marx, 1991b, 442-3). In addition, trade in everywhere it operates “promotes the generation of a surplus product designed to go into exchange, so as to increase the consumption or the hoards of the producers” (Marx, 1991b, 443). Commercial capital exchanges commodities. But the exchange is not necessarily between the direct producers. Seller may be “the slaveowner” in “**the slave relationship**”, “the feudal lord” in “**the serf relationship**” or “the state receiving tribute” in “**the relationship of tribute** (where the primitive community is under consideration)” (Marx, 1991b, 443). Marx states that “**whatever the social organisation of the spheres of production** whose commodity exchange the merchant mediates”, “his money always functions as capital” (Marx, 1991b, 443). Marx refers to some examples of “**relationships**” and then uses the statement of “**whatever the social organisation of the spheres of production**”. Marx just says that for the existence of the commercial capital, products need not necessarily to be sold by the direct producers. and he implies that the spheres of production may have various social organisations and the seller of the product is not necessarily the direct producer.

“In all earlier modes of production”, commercial capital “appears as the function of capital *par excellence*, and the more so, the more production is directly the production of the producer’s means of subsistence”. But under the capitalist mode of production, where *capital* controls production, commercial capital “appears simply as capital in a *particular* function”. As “the historical form of capital”, commercial capital before capital takes control of the production, in its development to a certain level, is “**a historical precondition for the development of the capitalist mode** of production” (Marx, 1991b, 444). Its existence in a certain degree of development is necessary for the development of capitalist mode of production. But this is only *a* precondition. Commercial capital means “the concentration of monetary wealth” and the “production for trade, wholesale outlet rather than supply to the individual client” in order to satisfy the precondition of the development of capitalist production. The development of commercial capital promotes and develops the production for exchange value. But, Marx states that “Even so, this development, taken by itself, is insufficient to explain the transition from one mode of production to the other” (Marx, 1991b, 444).

Under the capitalist production, commercial capital loses its “separate existence, to become a particular moment of capital investment in general”. Its profit rate is reduced to the general average through the equalisation of profits. It operates “simply the agent of productive capital”. The specific social condition which is formed in its development loses its determining power. Rather, its domination means the existence of outmoded conditions (Marx, 1991b, 445). The independent development of commercial capital is “synonymous with the non-subjection of production to capital” and “thus stands in inverse proportion to the general economic development of society”. This means also that the circulation process acquired “independence vis-à-vis its extremes” (“exchanging producers”). As a result, this means that “circulation has still not mastered production, but is related to it simply as its given precondition”, and that “the production process has not yet absorbed circulation into it as a mere moment” (Marx, 1991b, 445). On

the other hand, in the capitalist production, “The production process is completely based on circulation, and circulation is a mere moment and a transition phase of production, simply the realisation of a product produced as a commodity and the replacement of its elements of production produced as commodities” (Marx, 1991b, 445-6).

The independent development of commodity capital “stands in inverse proportion to the level of development of capitalist production”. This is a law for Marx. In the example of Venice, Genoa, Holland, carrying trade were conducted to exchange the commodities of commercially and economically undeveloped countries. The source of profit was obtained through this exchange rather than the supply of national products. Commercial capital was “separate from the extremes, the spheres of production. They exploited producing countries. However, with the development of economy in the extremes (countries and communities they exploited) their commercial monopoly and trade begun to fall. Marx states that their decline is “a particular form which the subordination of commercial capital to industrial capital takes with the progressive development of capitalist production” (Marx, 1991b, 446).

Before “capitalist society”, says Marx, “it was trade that prevailed over industry; in modern society it is the reverse”. Trade influenced the communities with whom it made exchange; “it subjects production more and more to exchange value, by making consumption and existence more dependent on sale than on the direct use of the product”. “In this way it dissolves the old relationships”. It did not make it content with the surplus production, but also made “entire branches of production dependent on it” (Marx, 1991b, 448). However, the profit of commercial capital as such “appears as defrauding and cheating” and originates extremely from this. It “exploits the difference between production prices in various countries”. Marx says that, by doing so, “it acts to equalise and establish commodity values”. In addition, “these modes of production enable commercial capital to

appropriate for itself a preponderant part of the surplus product". This could be done partly because the production of communities it makes exchange with is made for use-value and the fact their products are to be sold at their value is not significant "for their economic organisation", and partly because the surplus product is appropriated by the agents which "represent the consumption wealth" such as "the slaveowner, the feudal lord and the state (e.g. the oriental despot)". The dominant position of the commercial capital, says Marx, means "a system of plunder" (Marx, 1991b, 448), and also its development is "directly bound up with violent plunder, piracy" (Marx, 1991b, 449).

Meanwhile, Marx observes that unlike English trade, "Russian trade leaves the economic basis of Asiatic production quite untouched" (Marx, 1991b, 452). But Engels adds that the situation is beginning to change since Russia attempted to develop its industry in its home market and "the adjacent Asiatic ones" (footnote 51, Marx, 1991b, 452). What is meant by the Asiatic ones is surely the hinterland of Russia towards Asia.

Marx gives the example of the furniture manufacture in London in which separate branches of production is based on handicraftsmanship. Each firm produces a part of whole furniture. All firms are conducted by "one master with a few journeymen". The furniture is sold to the owners of stores. The masters sell his products and buy raw material and pay wages. "Under these conditions **they are really only middlemen between the merchant and their own workers**". Not the masters but the "merchant is the real capitalist and pockets the greater part of the surplus-value" (Marx, 1991b 453). Marx states that "Things are similar in the transition to manufacture from branches that were formerly pursued as handicrafts or as sidelines to rural industry". But we should not that he sees only a similarity in the transition to manufacture or to rural industry. (He said above "manufacturer only in name"). In above example, the producer (master) does not become capitalist, but the merchant takes the direct control of the production and become "real

capitalist”. Even more, in contrast to above-mentioned example; “The transition to large scale industry depends on the technical development of the small owner-operated establishment” (the case of the masters above).

With the merchant’s initiative, there can be an “exceptional” transition to a genuinely capitalist mode of production (see Engels’ note in Marx, 1991b, 453). This is the first case where **“the merchant becomes an industrialist directly”** (for example, “crafts that are founded on trade”) (Marx, 1991b, 453). Secondly, **“the merchant makes the small masters into his middlemen, or even buys directly from the independent producer;** he leaves him nominally independent and leaves his mode of production unchanged”. and the third way is the fact that **“the industrialist becomes a merchant and produces directly** on a large scale for the market” (Marx, 1991b, 454). (Here again we see how Marx uses **the term mode of production** in a very flexible way, even in an individual case of the producer)

What the merchant did in the Middle Ages, says Marx, was to transfer commodities, “whether they were produced by guild or by peasants”. Then he “becomes an industrialist, or at least has craftsmen in his employment, and particularly small rural producers”. In other way, “the producer becomes a merchant”. He no longer “receive” raw material from the merchant and work for him as before, but he buys raw material himself and sells his product to the merchant. The elements of production are commodities he buys himself. He also produces for not only the particular customer or merchant, but for “the entire world of commerce”. At the beginning, “trade is the precondition for the transformation of guild and rural domestic crafts into capitalist business”; but now with the development of manufacture and increasing scale of production, this production “creates a market for itself and uses its commodities to conquer it” and “Trade now becomes the servant of industrial production, for which the constant expansion of the market is a condition of existence” (Marx, 1991b, 454). Production in massive scale is no longer limited by trade, if there is no problem with existing demand, but “rather the

scale of the capital functioning and the productivity of labour so far developed” (Marx, 1991b, 454-5). That is the productive capacity of capital and labour.

Now we have industrial capital which has prevailed over the commercial capital. “The industrial capitalist is constantly faced with the world market; he compares and must compare his own cost prices not only with domestic market prices, but with those of the whole world”. This behaviour was previously seen in the acts of the merchant and “ensured commercial capital its mastery over industrial” (Marx, 1991b, 455).

Commercial capital, says Marx, is “the first independent mode of existence of capital in general. and it exercised “an overwhelming influence” “in the period when feudal production was first overthrown” and when the modern production first raised (Marx, 1991b, 455).

5.1.5 From usury to modern banking

Usury: Usury does not develop the social productivity of labour even at the expense of the worker as in capitalism. In “**the developed capitalist mode of production**”, even though the worker is alienated from the conditions of labour, Marx states that “This alienation of the conditions of production from the producer...corresponds here to a **real revolution in the mode of production itself**”. Isolated labour is replaced with a labour working within a division of labour and specialisation, the machines replaces the tools. The mode of production does not permit the isolation of the labourers and the fragmentation of the instruments of production that is “linked with the petty property”. In the capitalist mode of production, “usury can no longer divorce the condition of production from the producer, since they are already divorced” (Marx, 1991b, 731).

The only **revolutionary effect of the usury on “pre-capitalist modes of production”** can be seen in the conditions when “it destroys and dissolves the forms of ownership which provide a firm basis for the articulation of political life and whose constant reproduction in the same form is a necessity for that life” (Marx, 1991b, 732). Since usury does not change the mode of production as Marx stated above, he says that it is revolutionary only in so far as it dissolves the form of the relations of property upon which political life is based and breaks down the constant reproduction of this form. “In Asiatic forms, usury can persist for a long while without leading to anything more than economic decay and political corruption” (Marx, 1991b, 732). Here it should be noted that Marx uses the term “Asiatic form”, and that in the above mentioned statement he begins with the term “pre-capitalist modes” and then goes to the term “the forms of ownership” (which provide the firms basis for the articulation of political life). We know that Marx does not use the term the mode of production only in the context of the forms of ownership, or the relations of distribution, and its legal expression, the relations of property. In addition, in the case of usury, he has already stated that usury does not change the mode of *production*, which consists of the productive forces and the relations of production in its technical meaning.

Marx continues: “It is only where and when the other conditions for the capitalist mode of production are present that usury appears as one of the means of formation of this mode of production, by ruining the feudal lords and petty production on the one hand, and by centralising the conditions of labour on the other” (Marx, 1991b, 732). Usury may be one of the means of formation of the capitalist mode of production in so far as it ruins the feudal lord and the petty production and centralises the conditions of labour. Again here Marx does not use the term “feudal mode of production”, or *mode* of “petty production” since it is known that usury does not change the mode of production. Usury ruins the feudal lord and the petty production but not create the capitalist lord and farmer. However, it prepares a condition through which capitalist and capitalist production can develop. “Usury has a

revolutionary effect on pre-capitalist modes of production only in so far as it destroys and dissolves the forms of ownership which provide a firm basis for the articulation of political life and whose constant reproduction in the same form is a necessity for that life” (Marx, 1991b, 732). It has a negative effect over the productive forces of society and the economic power of classes and the property base of the political life.

We have seen that the mode of production does not change under the influence of usury, but faces economic decay and even political corruption, etc. Marx states that **“Usurer’s capital has capital’s mode of exploitation without its mode of production”** (Marx, 1991b, 732). Marx continues: “This relationship **also recurs within the bourgeois economy in backward branches of industry, or those that are struggling against the transition to the modern mode of production**” (Marx, 1991b, 732). Usurer continues to live in backward regions of industry and in the pre-modern resistant points of industry within the bourgeois economy. Nevertheless, these branches and sectors are located within the bourgeois economy and face the capitalist sort of exploitation of the usury. Parasite lives in the cells of the capitalist mode of production. The existence of usury in some sectors of the capitalist production as a whole does not necessarily imply the existence of pre-capitalist modes of production, but the existence of pre-capitalist relations of exploitation and of money relations between the money lender and the producers, who, we can say, are mainly the urban and rural small producers (we put aside the consumers because of the context).

Interest-bearing capital, whose old and archaic form is usurer’s capital, “together with its twin brother, merchant’s capital”, is older than the capitalist mode and seen in “the most diverse socio-economic formations” (Marx, 1991b, 728). In the slave economy of the Greco-Roman period, “money can be valorised as capital and comes to bear interest precisely because it can be invested in this way” (Marx, 1991b, 728-9). The more importantly for our context, Marx states that “Usurer’s capital, as the characteristic form of

interest-bearing capital, corresponds to the **predominance of petty production**, of peasants and small master craftsmen working for themselves” (Marx, 1991b, 729). Marx states that “in the developed capitalist mode of production”, the worker (producer) confronts the conditions of production and the products as capital. For this reason, he does not need to borrow money as a producer, leaving aside that he borrows money for personal needs. On the other hand, when the worker (producer) has the conditions of labour “in reality or in name”, as a producer “he relates to the money-lender’s capital” as “usurer’s capital” (Marx, 1991b, 729). As for the difference between a banker and a usurer, each corresponds to different “social modes of production and the social arrangements corresponding to them” (Marx, 1991b, 730-1).

The usurer appropriates “the excess of the producers’ most essential means of subsistence, the amount that later becomes wages (the usurer’s interest being the part that later appears as profit and ground-rent)” (Marx, 1991b, 730). The usurer’s interest rate thus is different from the modern interest rate, says Marx. Usurer’s interest involves “*all* surplus-value save that which accrues to the state”. In the modern rate of interest, however, “at least the normal interest” “forms only one part of this surplus-value”. A comparison between these two different forms of interest ignores the fact that “the wage-labourer produces and yields to the capitalist who employs him profit, interest and ground-rent, in short the entire surplus-value”. If the usurer owns the conditions of labour, apart from appropriating the surplus labour, this “complete expropriation of the worker from his conditions of labour” does not imply the development tendency of the capitalist mode of production, “but rather the given presupposition from which it proceeds”. After considering this complete expropriation of the labourer, Marx points out that “The wage-slave is just as much excluded by his position as the slave proper from being a debt slave, at least in his capacity as consumer; if he can become so at all, it is in his capacity as consumer” (Marx, 1991b, 730). (Here Marx implies that the usurer wants the producer to continue its productive capacity at least in

the form of wage-slave, and want him to be a debt slave in terms of his consumption capacity. Nevertheless, the producer is turned into a wage-slave even if he continues to possess his conditions of labour). Marx concludes that usurer's capital "impoverishes the mode of production, cripples the productive forces instead of developing them, and simultaneously perpetuates these lamentable conditions in which the social productivity of labour is not developed even at the cost of the worker himself, as it is in capitalist production", in the conditions where it actually appropriates all the surplus labour of the direct producer, without altering the mode of production; where the producer's ownership or possession of their conditions of labour (and **the isolated petty production** corresponding to this) is an essential precondition; where capital therefore does not directly subordinate labour, and thus does not confront it as an industrial capital" (Marx, 1991b, 730-1). It impoverishes the mode, cripples the productive forces and perpetuates the conditions in which it operates. The usury destroys not only the poor but also the rich. For the case of Roman era, Marx states that "usury that impoverishes **the poor petty producer goes hand in hand with the usury that ruins the rich landed proprietor**, and he recalls that "As soon as the usury of the Roman patricians had completely ruined the Roman plebeians, **the small farmers**, this form of exploitation came to an end, and **the petty-bourgeois economy** was replaced by a pure slave economy" (Marx, 1991b, 730). Usury destroys "ancient and feudal **wealth**, and ancient and feudal **property**". On the other hand, it "ruins **small peasant and petty-bourgeois production, in short all forms in which the producer still appears as the owner of his means of production**" (Marx, 1991b, 731). Usury destroys both the rich land owners and the poor petty producers at the end since it impoverishes the mode of production.

(Meanwhile, Marx uses the **terms the petty bourgeois economy, the petty-bourgeois production, small production, small peasant, petty producer, small peasant and petty-bourgeois production** in their pre-capitalist context. For this reason, the term "bourgeois" **seems like a metaphor** both in the

capitalist mode and in phases prior to it. And, the term “petty commodity production” is completely related with the small production of more or less, in reality or nominally autonomous producers. Commodity here means only the product which is sold at the market. It does not matter whether it is produced for exchange purpose or exchanged for the needs for the producers himself).

Usurer looks **like a parasite**, says Marx, **clinging on to the mode** of production. It “forces reproduction to proceed under ever more pitiable conditions”. Whether “**slavery prevails**, or the surplus product is consumed by **the feudal lord and his retinue**, the mode of production still remains the same even though slaveowner or feudal lord fall prey to usury; it simply becomes harsher for **the workers**” This is because the usury leads the feudal lord or the slaveowner to take more from the worker. Moreover, the usurer may replace the slaveowner or the feudal lord and himself become a slaveowner and landowner. Previous patriarchal exploitation (since it was largely a means of political power”) is replaced by that of “**money-grubbing upstart**” in the same mode of production (Marx, 1991b, 731).

We have seen that the mode of production does not change under the influence of usury, but faces economic decay and even political corruption, etc. Marx states that “**Usurer’s capital has capital’s mode of exploitation without its mode of production**” (Marx, 1991b, 732). Marx continues: “This relationship **also recurs within the bourgeois economy in backward branches of industry, or those that are struggling against the transition to the modern mode of production**” (Marx, 1991b, 732). Usurer continues to live in backward regions of industry and in the pre-modern resistant points of industry within the bourgeois economy. Nevertheless, these branches and sectors are located within the bourgeois economy and face the capitalist sort of exploitation of the usury. Parasite lives in the cells of the capitalist mode of production. The existence of usury in some sectors of the capitalist production as a whole does not necessarily imply the existence of pre-capitalist modes of production, but the existence of pre-capitalist relations of

exploitation and of money relations between the money lender and the producers, who, we can say, are mainly the urban and rural small producers (we put aside the consumers because of the context).

Usury is historically important” when it leads into “capital” (Marx, 1991b, 732). “Usurer’s capital and mercantile wealth” give rise to “the formation of a monetary wealth independent of landed property” (Marx, 1991b, 732-3). Besides the landed property, there emerges a monetary wealth. However, **if the products do not properly take the character of commodity and if the exchange value does not properly direct the production, money appears “wealth in general”,** upon which “hoard formation” depends. This monetary wealth “emerges **as the absolute form of the commodity**”. and Marx says, “it is particularly **its function as means of payment that develops interest** and with it money capital” (Marx, 1991b, 733). The less developed phase of commodity production is the less driving power of exchange-value over the production conditions this monetary wealth. It produces interest for its owner who lends his money to the needy. “What the petty producer needs money for above all is for payment” Marx observes that “money rents and money taxes play a major role here” The hoard owner offers his “money as money”, rather than “capital”. But interest enables him to transform his money to capital, “**into a means by which he takes partial or complete command of surplus labour, and in this way of a portion of the conditions of production themselves, even if these nominally still confront him as someone else’s property**” (Marx, 1991b, 733). He can take control of the conditions of production even without owning their property rights. The only barrier against the usurer, says Marx, is “the incapacity of those in need of money to pay or their capacity to resist”. This is because usury is not integrated with production. “Usury seems to live in the pores of production”. Apart from money needed for payments by the petty producer, Marx observes that “**In small peasant and petty-bourgeois production, money is used principally as a means of purchase when the worker loses his conditions of production by accident or some extra-ordinary**

dislocation (**the worker being generally still their owner in these systems of production**), or at least when they are not replaced in the ordinary course of reproduction” (Marx, 1991b, 733). Here **small peasant and petty-bourgeois production as systems of production is a trans-historic category just like usury itself, which can be found in various parts of the history.**

The fact that **the worker** loses his conditions of production is also realised with wars. Marx gives example: “The same wars through which the Roman patricians ruined the plebeians, forcing them into war services which prevented them from reproducing their conditions of labour, and hence pauperised them... filled the stores and vaults of the former with plundered copper, the money of the time”. The plebeians needed commodities, but the patricians lent them these moneys they did not need, in return of “enormous and usurious levels of interest”, and “thereby making the plebeians into their debt slaves”. In the Roman Empire, also “famine” caused the “free man to sell children and themselves as slaves to the rich”. In the period of Charlemagne, French peasants lives the same fate after wars, position of the debtors was replaced with the position of serf. Marx states that the conditions of labour of the petty producers are so much sensitive to any accidents, that any impoverishment creates for them a condition “in which the parasite of usury can seize hold”. The peasant “falls prey to usury, and once in that position he never recovers his freedom” (Marx, 1991b, 734).

However, this is a result only. The usury has its “proper, principal and specific terrain” is that it fulfils “the function of money as means of payment”. All monetary obligations need money for payment in certain date. For this reason, Marx says, usury connects with “tax farmers” from ancient Rome till today. With the development of trade and the commodity production, simultaneity of purchasing and paying acts disappears and need for money is felt in certain dates. “The modern money crises show how even today this

can lead to circumstances in which money capitalist and usurer merge into one” (Marx, 1991b, 734).

The credit system: For the position of the credit system for the formation of a new mode of production, Marx predicts that “there can be no doubt that the credit system will serve as a powerful lever in the course of the transition from the capitalist mode of production to the mode of production of associated labour; however, only as one element in connection with other large-scale organic revolutions in the mode of production itself” (Marx, 1991b, 743). It will be an important lever, be only one element within the other great transformations in the mode of production. It is not adequate by its own for the transformation of the existing mode of production as a whole. Marx here points to some socialist illusions (of Saint-Simonians and of Proudhon) about the power of the credit and banking system. He says that owner of these illusions ignores the mode of production and the credit and banking system “as one of its forms”. “As soon as the means of production cease to be transformed into capital (which also means the abolition of private property in land), credit as such no longer has any meaning”. Proudhon, says Marx, wants the continuation of commodity production without money and dreams of “interest-free credit”. This was a “wish arising from the petty-bourgeois standpoint”. Provided that the capitalist production exists, interest-bearing capital exists as the foundation of credit system (Marx, 1991b, 743).

“The credit system develops as a reaction against usury”. But this just means “the **subordination of interest-bearing capital to the conditions and requirements of the capitalist mode of production**”. In the modern credit, **interest-bearing capital completely adapts to the capitalist conditions** of production. **Usury continues to operate**, and “in countries of developed capitalist production, it is **freed from the barriers that former legislation had always placed** to it”. Interest-bearing capital **keeps “the form of usurer’s capital vis-à-vis persons and classes, or in conditions where** borrowing in the sense appropriate to the capitalist mode of production does

not and cannot occur; **where** borrowing results from individual need... **where** borrowing is for extravagant consumption; **or where the producer is a non-capitalist producer, a small peasant, artisan, etc., i.e. is still the possessor of his own conditions of production as a direct producer; finally where the capitalist producer himself operates on so small a scale that his situation approaches that of those producers who work for themselves**" (Marx, 1991b, 735). Marx states that the interest-bearing capital as an essential element of the capitalist mode can be differentiated from the usurer's capital only in terms of "the changed conditions under which it functions", and in terms of the changed figure of the borrower. Not only producer, but also a "potential capitalist" can borrow and use money as capital to appropriate the surplus labour of others. However, Marx states that these potential capitalists "actually reinforces the rule of capital itself" and lead the capitalist production to extent its action area towards the lower strata of society (Marx, 1991b, 735). He compares this phenomenon with the fact that the church of the Middle Ages reinforced its rule by **establishing "its hierarchy out of the best brains in the nation, without regard to status, birth or wealth"** (Here we learn from Marx that the only **open class** is not the bourgeoisie. The policy of the church can also be observed in the modern public and private bureaucracy).

Reaction against usury, therefore, is not related with the attempts for protecting the victims of usury (Marx, 1991b, 736). (Marx points to some "credit fantasies" developed to emancipate aristocracy from usury, for example, "a land bank with paper money based on landed property"). Rather, the credit system firstly emerged in Venice and Genoa of the twelfth and fourteenth centuries to emancipate the over-sea wholesale trade from "the rule of old-fashioned usury and from the monopolising of money-dealing" (Marx, 1991b, 736-7). The founder merchants of these associations wanted to **emancipate "both their government and themselves from usury"** and also to subordinate the state "more securely to themselves". In Holland "commercial **credit** and dealing in money" **developed on the side of the**

trade and manufacture. In time, **“interest-bearing capital became subordinate to industrial and commercial capital”**. Marx states that with this old model of Holland and the present model of England, “The monopoly of old-fashioned usury, based on poverty, was thrown overboard there automatically” (Marx, 1991b, 737). Since with its development, industrial capital subordinates commercial capital, now we have a hierarchy of industry, commerce and money-dealing.

This subordination was realised by crying demand for “compulsory reduction” of the interest rate with a reference to Holland. Legislation is put forward to “subordinate interest-bearing capital to commercial and industrial capital” (Marx, 1991b, 737-8). This demand found its spokesmen such as Josiah Child, the father of stock-jobbing and the founder of modern banking in England. Marx states that there occurred a “violent struggle against usury, the demand for the subjection of interest-bearing capital to industrial capital”. This struggle is “simply the prelude to **the organic creations** that (the) conditions of capitalist production produce in the **form of the modern banking system**, which on the one hand **robs usurer’s capital of its monopoly**, since it **concentrates all dormant money reserves together and places them on the money market**, while on the other hand **restricting the monopoly of the precious metals themselves by creating credit money**” (Marx, 1991b, 738). This is a relation between competition and monopoly, i.e. the struggle of industrial capital against the monopoly of usurer’s capital and of the precise metals.

The opposition against usury says Marx can be seen in all writing in England in the late 17.century and in the beginning of the 18.century. The “demand for the emancipation of trade and industry from usury” is also levelled against the state (Marx, 1991b, 738). Marx says that the debates of the time, which all demanded “the subjugation of the interest-bearing capital and loanable means of production in general to the capitalist mode of production”, also were also the base of “credit illusions of the Saint-Simonians”. Saint-Simon,

in his early writings welcomed modern bourgeois society against feudal society” and “the industrialists and bankers against the marshals and law-mongers of the Napoleonic era”. He was “only in his last work” the spokesman of the working class and its emancipation (Marx, 1991b, 740). Marx recalls that Saint-Simon’s “credit and banking dreams” was realised with the establishment of the Cr dit Mobilier by an ex-follower of him. It was “a form that incidentally could come to such prominence only in a country like France, where neither the credit system nor large-scale industry was developed to the modern level. In England and America this kind of thing would have been impossible” (Marx, 1991b, 741) (in editorial information said that this bank is established nominally to support the industry and protected by the Bonapartist government. But it provided an environment for speculative operations till its bankruptcy in 1867, Marx, 1991b, 741). The interesting thing is that undeveloped conditions of the capitalist mode of production lead into dreams and also that Marx saw France as a country “where neither the credit system nor large-scale industry was developed to the modern level”.

In the banking system, Marx states that **precise metals as money is “the foundation** from which the credit system can *never* break free” (Marx, 1991b, 741). and “the **credit system presupposes the monopoly possession of the social means of production (in the form of capital and landed property)** on the part of private individuals”, and “is itself on the one hand **an immanent form of the capitalist mode** of production and on the other hand **a driving force of its development into its highest and last possible form**” (Marx, 1991b, 742). Put aside the former statement about the precise metals, the presupposition of the credit system requires the transformation of the means of production into capital and the monopoly over landed property. This means that fragmentation of the means of production, as in the case of small production, contradict with the modern credit system. The last statement means that credit system is an inherent characteristic of the capitalist production and moves it towards it’s the most developed form.

The banking system is a product of the capitalist mode of production. For this reason, although The Bank of England, for example, has an immense power over the trade and industry, it, however, “supplies the form of a general book-keeping and distribution of the means of production on a social scale, even if only the form”. This is because it is “the most artificial and elaborate product” created by the capitalist mode (Marx, 1991b, 742). It counts, registers and distributes the means of production in the name of society under the capitalist mode of production. We see that banking system takes its power from the capitalist mode of *production*. As for this distributing function of the banking system, Marx points to **the formation of the average profit of the individual capitalist or any particular capital**. He says that this average profit is “determined” “by **the total surplus labour that the total capital appropriates**, from which **each particular capital simply draws its dividends as a proportional part of the total capital**”, rather than by “the surplus labour that this capital appropriates first-hand”. Integration of particular capitals and the division of total capital into its parts is realised through the banking system. “**This social character of capital is mediated and completely realised only by the full development of the credit and banking system**” (Marx, 1991b, 742). The social character of capital is also in the function the banking and credit system fulfils that “places all available and even potential capital that is not already actively committed at the disposal of the industrial and commercial capitalists, so that neither the lender nor the user of this capital is its owners or producers”. Marx points to the anonym character of capital or money in its origin and destination. The banking and credit, he says, “thereby abolishes the private character of capital and thus inherently bears within it, though only inherently, the abolition of capital itself” (Marx, 1991b, 742). This dialectic interpretation echoes the argumentation Marx offers to us in the Manifesto of the Communist Party as in the case of private property which is being abolished by the capitalist system itself for the large part of society. Here the abolishment of capital is the emancipation of social capital from the capitalist mode of production. However, in the banking and credit system, we have “a

special business”, a particular capital; what occurs is only the fact that “the distribution of capital is removed from the hands of the private capitalists and usurers and becomes a special business, a social function”. This system “thereby also become the most powerful means for driving capitalist production beyond its own barriers and one of the most effective vehicles for crises and swindling” (Marx, 1991b, 742).

For Marx, as we have seen above, the development level of industrial capital has an impact over the minds of intellectuals and their analysis. In addition to the examples of Saint-Simonians and socialist Proudhon, Marx observes that **“even a section of political economists, particularly in countries where industrial capital is not yet fully developed, as in France, cling to interest-bearing capital as the basic form and see ground-rent, for example, simply as another form of this, in so far as here too it is the form of a loan that prevails”** (Marx, 1991b, 744). Interest-bearing capital and the merchant’s capitals are “the oldest forms of capital” and they “appear to the popular mind as the form of capital *par excellence*” (Marx, 1991b, 744). Interest-bearing capital is seen as the basic form of capital and the other forms of capital is seen merely as a form of it because of its historical existence and its seemingly self-valorising character. In this mind, ground-rent is seen as “the form of a loan”. However, Marx replies that “In this way the internal articulation of the capitalist mode of production is completely misconstrued, and it is quite overlooked that both land and capital are only hired out to capitalists” (Marx, 1991b, 744). (These sorts of misconstructions have been seen in **Turkey** in the context of monetarism of 1980s and the conception of rent in the urbanisation process). The so called basic form of capital, interest-bearing capital and land as another form of it are only employed by capitalists in return for payment. In addition, “Instead of money, means of production can of course be loaned in kind, in the shape of machines, business premises, etc” (Marx, 1991b, 744). These means which are loaned express money. When money is paid for their wearing and tearing, besides interest paid, this payment is related with the use-values.

Mars observes here that “The distinguishing thing here again is whether they are loaned to the immediate producers, which presupposes the non-existence of the capitalist mode of production, at least in the sphere in which this kind of thing takes place, or whether they are loaned to industrial capitalists, which presupposes precisely that the basis is the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 1991b, 745). Here Marx explains many possible misconstructions about the existence and the validity of the capitalist mode of production. Firstly, the form of a loan is non-capitalist if it takes place between the lender and the immediate producer, for example urban or rural petty producer. Secondly, the existence and absence of the capitalist mode of production can be distinguished in terms of spheres of the relation. (The “**mode**” of capitalist production implies that **a** production must be realised in *capitalist* manner. In this sense, capitalist mode of production as a whole involves only the production spheres which makes production in a capitalist manner. This related with the penetration of the capitalist mode into the other spheres of production. If it has not yet penetrated into somewhere, therein we have not production realised in capitalist manner). Hence, the domination of the capitalist mode of production does not mean that all spheres of production is under the capitalist mode of production. Thirdly, if the immediate producer takes credit or loan money or the means of production, this “presupposes the non-existence of the capitalist mode of production”. This is because we know that the immediate producer is only a wage-labourer of the capitalists, does not work for himself. Fourthly, Marx suggests “the capitalist mode of production” as a “base”.

Marx continues to say: “It is still more irrelevant and senseless to drag in the renting of houses, etc. for **individual consumption**. It is plain enough that the working class **is swindled in this form too**, and to an enormous extent; but it is **equally exploited by the petty trader who supplies the workers with means of subsistence**. This is a **secondary exploitation**, which proceeds alongside the **original exploitation** that takes place directly within the production process itself. The distinction between selling and lending

here is completely immaterial and formal, and, as already shown, appears fundamental only for those who are in complete ignorance of the real context” (Marx, 1991b, 745).

Marx differentiates the **original exploitation** from the **secondary exploitation**. The latter takes place mainly in the sphere of the reproduction of labour-power. The costs of this reproduction must be equal to the wage or salary of the labourer if there is not any secondary exploitation. This is impossible because, as Marx stated above, “in the renting of houses, etc. for individual consumption”, “the working class is swindled ... too, and to an enormous extent; but it is equally exploited by the petty trader who supplies the workers with means of subsistence”, and so on.

“Usury, says Marx, just like trade, exploits a given mode of production but does not create it; both **relate to the mode of production from outside**” (Marx, 1991b, 745). This relation from outside is **not an articulation** and we understand from Marx, which is not included in “**the internal articulation of the capitalist mode of production**” (Marx, 1991b, 745). Usury is “**conservative**” in this sense that it tries to maintain the mode of production to which it relates. Moreover, where the commodity production is less developed, there circulation process plays less significant role, and “the more usury flourishes” (Marx, 1991b, 745). Monetary wealth of the usurer “develops in a country all the more, the more the bulk of production is confined to services in kind, etc., i.e. to use-values” (Marx, 1991b, 745). Usury is a form of capital of the backward countries and spheres of production.

The interest-bearing-capital: In the case of commercial capital, we still have a process and a unity of poles, the procedures of the purchase and sale of commodities. Its movement is M-C-M'. However, in **the interest-bearing-capital**, this is “obliterated in M-M'”; “capital presents itself in this way, as this directly self-valorising value, for all active capitalists, whether they

function with their own capital or with borrowed capital” (Marx, 1991b, 515). “Capital appears as a mysterious and self-creating source of interest, of its own increase”. It is “unmediated by the production and circulation process”. This “money breeding money” “no longer bears any marks of its origin”. Marx calls this “automatic fetish”, by which “social relation is consummated in the relationship of a thing, money, to itself”. “While interest is simply one part of the profit, i.e. the surplus-value, extorted from the worker by the functioning capitalist, it now appears conversely as if interest is the specific fruit of capital, the original thing, while profit, now transformed into the form of profit of enterprise, appears as a mere accessory and trimming added in the reproduction process”. Marx observes that in the interest-bearing capital, “The fetish character of capital and the representation of this capital fetish is now complete”. “In M-M’ we have the irrational form of capital, the misrepresentation and objectification of the relations of production, in its highest power: the interest-bearing form, the simple form of capital... the ability of money or a commodity to valorise its own value independent of reproduction- the capital mystification in the most flagrant form” (516). Money acquires interest “no matter whether it is asleep or awake, at home or abroad, by day and by night” (Marx, 1991b, 517-8).

5.1.6 Capitalist as personification of capital

Personification in the Trinity Formula: Marx presents the categories of capital-profit, land-ground-rent, labour-wage as the trinity formula of the political economy. This “economic three-in-one points to the “sources of the wealth annually available” which “belong to completely disparate spheres and have not the slightest analogy with one another” (Marx, 1991b, 953); capital offers the capitalist profit, land offers the landowner ground-rent, and labour-power offers the worker wages. These components of the total value “constitute the annual incomes of three classes, the capitalist, the landowning and the working class, revenues distributed by the functioning capitalist, as the person who directly pumps out surplus labour and makes use of labour in

general” (Marx, 1991b, 960). However, despite their common source, sources of these respective revenues become independent categories and lose their relation to the wage-labour exploited by functioning capital. Categories of capital, land, and labour become personified in the capitalist, the landowner and the wage- labourer while persons become things in the form of capital, land and labour. Economic trinity of capital-profit, land-ground-rent, labour-wages “completes the mystification of the capitalist mode of production, the reification of social relations, and the immediate coalescence of the material relations of production with their historical and social specificity”. Marx states that classical economics “dissolved this false appearance and deception, this autonomization and ossification of the different social elements of wealth vis-à-vis one another, this personification of things and reification of the relations of production, this religion of everyday life, by reducing interest to a part of profit and rent to the surplus above the average profit, so that they both coincide in surplus-value; by presenting the circulation process as simply a metamorphosis of forms, and finally in the immediate process of production reducing the value and surplus-value of commodities of labour”. However, “even its best representatives remained more or less trapped in the world of illusion” because of their “bourgeois standpoints”. Marx states that vulgar economics, “a didactic and more or less doctrinaire translation of the everyday notions of the actual agents of production” finds its foundation in this “trinity, in which the entire inner connection is obliterated”. It also points to “the self-interest of the dominant classes, since it preaches the natural necessity and perpetual justification of their sources of income and erects this into a dogma” (Marx, 1991b, 969).

A struggle is presented here as an antagonist act of collective entities (it is funny to say that society is the sum of individuals. This is the total population of the society. The society, on the other hand, is at least a community, a system, or companionship. But in the development of Marxian theoretical background, it is the alienated form of generic or species- life of the human beings). It is not surprising that Marx uses the words “struggle”, “collectivity”

and “**class**” at the same place. Here, it seems that **class** is identified with the collectivity that is formed around a collective interest, i.e. **class** interest. The worker as having only labour-power is the individual expression of its own collectivity, or collective entity of the sellers of the labour-power. The capitalist, likewise, is the individual expression, individualisation (personification) of the collective entity of the owners of capital.

Let us recall Marx’s statement given above:

He is fanatically intent on the valorisation of value; consequently he ruthlessly forces the human race to produce for production’s sake. In this way he spurs on the development of society’s productive forces, and the creation of those material conditions of production which alone can form the real basis of a higher form of society, a society in which the full and free development of every individual forms the ruling principle. Only as a personification of capital is the capitalist respectable. As such, he shares with the miser an absolute drive towards self-enrichment. But what appears in the miser as the mania of an individual is in the capitalist the effect of a social mechanism in which he is merely a cog. Moreover, the development of capitalist production makes it necessary constantly increase the amount of capital laid out in a given industrial undertaking, and competition subordinates every individual capitalist to the immanent laws of capitalist production, as external and coercive laws. It compels him to keep extending his capital, so as to preserve it, and he can only extend it by means of progressive accumulation (Marx, 1990a, 739).

Marx states that “Profits as distinct from surplus-value can rise as a result of the economical use of *collective* conditions of labour”. All saving in production is based on the fact that the means of production and materials are used collectively. However, for the worker who enters into the system of this collective labour, economical use of collective condition of labour appears to him “as *given* conditions, *independent* of himself; they are the *forms of capital*”. The economies in production appear as distinct from “the *surplus labour* of the worker”. They seem to be the “*act and achievement of the capitalist*”, who functions here as the personification of the *social character* of labour, of the *workshop as a whole*”. Similarly, science, which is the “general intellectual product of the social process”, appears as the extra job of capital

because its usage in the process of production occurs outside the ability and knowledge of the individual worker. The development of society, in a similar way, appears to be “the productive forces of capital as opposed to labour” since “society is marked by the exploitation of labour by capital” (Marx, 1990a, 1053).

The power of the capitalist stems from the fact that “he is the personification of capital” (Marx, 1990a, 1053-54). But since the material conditions of labour are “not subject to the worker, but he to them”, the employment of labour by capital “entails the personification of things and the reification (*Versachlichung*) of persons”. The things, the products of labour and all social conditions of labour, confront the worker as “‘*Capital*’ ” and “something *alien, objective, ready-made*, existing without their intervention, and frequently even hostile to them” (Marx, 1990a, 1054). The power of social labour appears to be the power of capital. In the context of capital’s productivity, Marx states that, “capital appears *productive*”, “as the *personification and representative*, the reified form of the ‘social productive forces of labour’ or the productive forces of social labour” and since labour “presents itself” “as a set of attributes that are intrinsic to capital as a thing” (Marx, 1990a, 1056), it becomes clear that personification and reification are the same process.

Let me complete the question of the trinity formula by presenting what Marx understands from “capital” in its *demythified* form: “Capital, land, labour! But capital is not a thing, it is a definite **social relation of production** pertaining to a particular historical social formation, which simply takes the form of a thing and gives this thing a specific social character. Capital is **not the sum of the material and produced means** of production. Capital is the **means of production as transformed into capital, these being no more capital in themselves than gold or silver are money**. It is the **means of production monopolised by a particular section of society**, the products and conditions of activity of labour-power, which are **rendered autonomous vis-**

à-vis this living labour-power and are **personified in capital through this antithesis**. It is not only the **worker's products which are transformed into independent powers**, the products as masters and buyers of their producers, but the social powers and interconnecting form of this labour also confront them as properties of their product. Here we therefore have one factor of a historically produced social production process in a definite social form, and at first sight a very mysterious form" (Marx, 1991b, 953-4).

As for land, it has no value in itself. Its fertility just "let a certain quantum of labour give a certain product, conditioned by the natural fertility of land"; "surplus-value cannot be earth". Lastly, so called the third factor of production, labour is "an abstraction and taken by itself cannot exist at all", or what is meant by it, "the entire productive activity of man, through which his metabolic interchange with nature is mediated" (Marx, 1991b, 954).

Marx is a **reductionist** in the sense that he reduces the analysis of all capitalist wealth into the analysis of the value created by labour-power against the background of a labour theory of value. All means of production and the conditions of labour as capital and land as described within the relations of production above are just the factors of "the entire productive activity of man".

Capital, (and the capitalist which is "simply personified capital, functioning in the production process simply as the bearer of capital"), extract a surplus labour from the immediate producers or workers. It receives this surplus labour "without an equivalent" and. This surplus labour "always remains forced labour" despite the existence of "free contractual agreement" It "in some form must always remain, as labour beyond the extent of given needs". Just as in the slavery, in the capitalist system, "it has an antagonistic form and its obverse side is pure idleness on the part of one section of society". It is sure that a social development needs surplus labour for itself. and "one of the civilizing aspects of capital" is that "it extorts this surplus labour in a

manner and in conditions that are more advantageous to social relations and to the creation of elements for a new and a higher formation than was the case under the earlier forms of slavery, serfdom, etc". For Marx, **capital fulfils two functions for the historical social development of man**; "it leads towards a stage at which **compulsion and the monopolisation of social development** (with its material and intellectual advantages) by one section of society at the expense of another disappears". In addition to the possibility for a transcendence of this unequal social development, "it creates the material means and the nucleus for relations that permit this surplus labour to be combined, in a higher form of society, with a greater **reduction of the overall time devoted to material labour**". Marx points to **THE TIME ECONOMICS OF FREEDOM FOR ALL**. He states that surplus labour can be great when the total working day is short and relatively small when the total working day is long". The problem is related with the productivity of labour rather than its length. For example, if the total working day is 6 hours, which is composed of 3 hours necessary labour-time and 3 hours surplus labour-time, the rate of surplus labour is 100 percent. If the former is 12 hours, which is composed of 9 hours necessary and 3 hours surplus labour, the rate of surplus labour 33x1/3 percent (Marx, 1991b, 958). "The realm of freedom really begins only where labour determined by necessity and external expediency ends; it lies by its very nature beyond the sphere of material production proper" (Marx, 1991b, 958-9). It is sure the realm of natural necessity expands as the needs expand. But "the productive forces to satisfy these expand at the same time". Freedom can emerge only in the control of the sphere of material production in a way that "socialised man, the associated producers, govern the human metabolism with nature in a rational way, bringing it under their collective control instead of being dominated by it as a blind power; accomplishing it with the least expenditure of energy and in conditions most worthy and appropriate for their human nature". This is freedom which can be created through a collective control of the sphere of material production proper by the associated producers. It is not individual freedom as liberal philosophy claims or as some "humanist" interpreters of

Marx in their so-called “**humanist Marx**”. Not human being, but the social life of human beings is concerned here. Marx seems to reply to them “The true realm of freedom, the development of human powers as an end in itself, begins beyond it, though it can only flourish with this realm of necessity as its basis. The reduction of the working day is the basic prerequisite” (Marx, 1991b, 959). **Kant echoes** in the statement “the development of human powers as an end in itself”, in a different context; But Kant will be meaningful only when a collective control of the sphere of material production proper by the associated producers is established in a higher form of society. Thereby, Marx completely puts an end to **socialism as a utopia** and replaces it with **socialism as a science**.

5.1.7 A Marxian interpretation of cultural-spatial identifications

“The basic problem of revolution is the problem of power”, says and adds Erdost correctly; “a correct revolution strategy” and struggle requires knowing which classes have to be overthrow (Erdost, 1970:249). **Interests of foreign capital**, its extensions, its local agents and big landowners in feudal or capitalist sense are surely dominant class interests in Turkey. However, nationality of capital is very important for *the Aydınlik* since it determines the distribution of wealth produced in Turkey and the state and the class relations in the country. Foreign capital is not only capital but also the imperialism. Bid landed property is not only landed interest, but also a factor which determines the composition of ruling class alliance and class balance in the country. However, must these “dominant classes” be necessarily presented as “counter-revolutionary”? I think that they can be “counter-revolutionary” only against the working classes. The fact that so called “national bourgeoisie” can confront with the foreign bourgeoisie, the imperialist states, and the imperialist capitals does not necessarily mean that the interests of the national bourgeoisie always contradicts with the interests of the foreign capital. Rather, the size and the share of the local capitals in international economic relations, instead of its nationality and geographical position, can

make the national bourgeoisie a weak rival or partner of the foreign capital of the imperialism. Here we observe that objectively weak local bourgeoisie is in a position of the petty bourgeoisie in front of the powerful foreign capital. The relatively small local capital sees the foreign capital as rival and enemy to itself. Definition of dominant classes of *the Aydınlık* (in its name, here Erdost) is shadowed by national identifications. Here, *the Aydınlık* goes away from Marxian theory in which class analysis follows the categories of capital and different capitals are defined in terms of production, circulation and realisation of surplus labour, surplus-value, and the national context is only the framework of local capital or local mode of production and the framework of spatially defined class relations. The state defines the spatial framework of the local capitalist mode of production. For this reason, the state is presented as the political, legal and geographical framework of the local modes of capitalist production. When Marx says “German bourgeoisie”, for instance, he means the bourgeoisie in Germany, capitalist mode of production in Germany, spatially defined bourgeois class. The bourgeois class (capitalist class) is a universal category, which manifests itself by capital rather than by nationality even though this manifestation always requires spatial, legal and cultural contexts as products of the history of local capital in general, and of the society, it dominates. Nationality of capitals and the bourgeoisies are related with their spatial formations, competitions, and monopolies in and between themselves. For Marx, the state rather than the national state, and similarly the capitalist class rather than national bourgeoisie is substantial and conceptual. Marx deals with even a war between two national states in terms of the confrontation of the rival capitals and classes in and between themselves. Inner problems of spatially defined capital are caused on the one hand, by the class struggle or class war and on the other hand, by accumulation and reproduction problems of capital. The fact that Marx abolishes the distinction between home politics and foreign politics for a country is in fact caused by the universality of capital. In this universality, “nationality” is not a substantial characteristic of capital. In Marx’s *Capital*, it should be noted, the spatial framework of capital is not at all “national state”

just as the personification of capital, the capitalist, is not at all “the national bourgeoisie”. But the framework is the capital as a universal category and its mode of production.

Last to mention is a quotation made by Erdost from Engels (*The Communist Manifesto*). This quotation is from Engels’1893 Preface to Italian translation of the Manifesto (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 103): “In any country the domination of the bourgeoisie is impossible as long as there is not national independence” (Erdost, 1970:253). **Here Engels stated** that only the Parisian workers attempted to overthrow the bourgeois order in the 1848 revolutions. Italian, German and Austrian workers, on the other hand, did nothing but brought the bourgeoisie to the power from the beginning. “But in any country as long as national independence is not existed, the domination of the bourgeoisie is impossible” (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 103). But Engels pointed to the situations of Italy and Germany before 1848 revolutions. The former had been dependent on the Austrian Empire, and the latter had been indirectly but effectively under the yoke of the Russia (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 102). The 1848 revolutions brought the bourgeoisie into the power at the expense of the monarchical classes and interests. In addition, What Engels referred to is “the domination of the bourgeoisie” in the context of the 1848 revolutions which tried to lead into a bourgeois democratic order against the feudal states, monarchies, kingdoms, etc. Moreover, he concerned the bourgeois domination par excellence rather than “the domination of the national bourgeoisie”. Furthermore, “dependence” meant “the subjection to the foreign sovereignty” (*The Manifesto, in Turkish*, 1993; 102). As far as I know, Turkey lived such a dependent condition only during the years after the end of the First World War (National Liberation Struggle).

Erdost and Kaymak observe that in the industrial statistics of 1964, there were 3012 workshops which employed 10 and more workers. 2645 within this figure belonged to “local private capital” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 297).

They suggest that many of them form “the middle bourgeoisie” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 299). “As it is the fact that the bourgeoisie is not the dominant class, it has lost the leading class characteristic of the revolution in the ages of the national democratic revolutions, as it was formerly the case in the age of the bourgeois democratic revolutions” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 298). *The Aydınlık* and Erdost, and Erdost and Kaymak here never attribute a revolutionary leadership to the national bourgeoisie during the national democratic revolution in the age of imperialism. The argument is that the national bourgeoisie is not a target for the revolutionary forces since it is not the sovereign class. In addition, “within the imperialist world system”, “the national section of the local bourgeoisie (the section which is interested in the national independency): 1) contradicts with the monopoly capital- since the national bourgeoisie has a complete development possibility only in a independent country; on the other hand, the monopoly bourgeoisie represents the cosmopolite capital, the dependency of the exploited countries and the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie contradict; 2) contradicts with the pre-capitalist relations of production and the reactionism- since all pre-capitalist relations, the reactionism prevent the development of capitalism, the overspending and the concentration of the markets; 3) contradicts with the proletariat- since the proletariat tells the socialist relations of production which means the negation of the capitalism within bosom of the bourgeois relations of production” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 298). The national section of the local bourgeoisie contradicts with the foreign capital, with the pre-capitalist relations and with the proletariat. Which contradiction is the most important is contingent on the political struggle and the development of the national democratic revolution. Erdost and Kaymak argue that “the national bourgeoisie” “could not reach in the political consciousness of its own class and has not struggled politically in this direction in its history”. The revolutionary struggle of the masses is more dangerous than the reactionism in its eyes. The ideology of the proletarian ideology is more dangerous than the ideology of the monopoly bourgeoisie in its eyes. “Its fear from socialism moves it to the armful of the comprador classes”. Nevertheless, Erdost and

Kaymak do not lose their hopes: "For this reason, the national section of the local bourgeoisie (whose section which should have an interest in the conditions where Turkey is independent and democratic country) will remember its nationality only in the moment of a great revolutionary rising and will leave from the comprador bourgeoisie in order not to live its fate". However, this is valid for "the stage of the national democratic revolution". It is "in the stage of the socialist revolution" that "the national bourgeoisie as a class will stand opposed to the revolution" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 298).

The national section of the local bourgeoisie seems to be the weakest point of the ruling classes just like the Russia which was the weakest ring in the imperialist system in the time of Lenin. It also seems to be the petty bourgeoisie which moves towards the proletariat in the time of revolution. Even though this class fears from socialism, it can be won by the national democratic revolutionary uprising. It can remember its national origin and can leave from the comprador bourgeoisie if it does not want to be liquidated by the revolutionary forces.

We can ask some question: should we neglect the national bourgeoisie as a target in the revolution simply as it is weak? Can it leave from the comprador bourgeoisie in the revolutionary uprising? Is it correct to define "the national bourgeoisie" as such: "it is the bourgeoisie which the local industrial capital forms, whose activity essentially limits the dependency of the country's economy on the imperialism in a certain degree, which has a positive impact over the balance-sheet of the foreign commerce and hence can prevent the imperialist exploitation in a certain degree, and the commercial bourgeoisie which is located in the sphere of this bourgeoisie". I think that as Erdost and Kaymak have observed that the national bourgeoisie was rather aware of the socialist threat and that it therefore tended to the reactionary forces against the mass movement, the national bourgeoisie shall possibly behave as a capitalist attitude against the revolutionary movement. As for its isolation from the comprador classes, it can be said that this is possible only when its single

domination is existed as a possibility. Let me say that so called nation bourgeoisie can liquidate the foreign capital and its extensions only for its single domination. But this can be an international class conflict of the bourgeoisies as in the case of the imperialist wars and as for the definition of “the national bourgeoisie”, we see that the criteria is its capability of limiting “the dependency of the country’s economy on the imperialism”, having “a positive impact over the balance-sheet of the foreign commerce” to “prevent the imperialist exploitation”. The bourgeoisie is “national” when it can prevent and limit the imperialist exploitation thanks to an independent and strong national economy in front of the imperialism. I think that these definitions all are related with the power and capabilities of the national bourgeoisie rather than the definition of the national bourgeoisie. Since Marx has not such a definition, I can just say that what is decisive for the identification and personification of capital as such can be simply the national origins of the capitalists. Geographical space of production, circulation and realisation of individual capitals is not necessarily fixed but is restructured through the movements of capitals. We can talk about “a capitalist Turkish citizen” who employs “Turkish wage-labourers”, but we do not talk about “Turkish surplus-value”, “Turkish necessary labour” or “Turkish commodity”, etc. But we can talk about “the national income”, “the national production”, “the national community”, “the national state”, “the national army”, “the national tariff barriers”, “the national legal system”, “the national foreign policy”, “the national education”, and “the national culture”. However, the classes which form the modern bourgeois society or “a national society” cannot be defined with their cultural and citizen identifications. Leaving aside capital and capitalist, the working class, however, needs a relatively fixed spatial framework for its reproduction. For this reason, the place for the worker to work and live is more fixed than the place of capital which circulates and moves from one place to another. Only for this reason, the working class is more “national”. When Marx talks about the class which can elevate itself to the national scale, he means that this class can have the opportunity to represent and lead the national community and hence the national state.

However, this “nationality” is related with the hegemony of a class which forms itself as a dominant class in the national community. Only if *the Aydınlık*, Erdost, and Erdost and Kaymak point to the absence of the national hegemony of the national section of the local bourgeoisie, we can say that the question is the bourgeois hegemony over the national community rather than the national composition of the bourgeois rulers. It can be asked whether even the most “national” bourgeoisie faces with struggle of the proletariat or with the socialist threat will remember its “national” characteristic whatever it is.

Nation and Country for Communists: In the case of *The Communist Manifesto*, we have concerned with above, the meaning of “nation” and “national” is explained in terms of the seizure of political power of the working class. Let us repeat the same statements. It was said there:

“The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationality” The reply is one of the most important contributions to the Communist politics: “The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got”. The “nation” for the proletariat is meaningful only when it seized the political power and make itself “leading class”: “Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to the leading class of the nation (*national class* in the German edition of 1848, see the same Turkish translation, 129), must constitute itself *the* nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word” (SW, 260). Acquisition of political supremacy, becoming leading class of the nation or the national class, and the re-constitution of nation are the simultaneous aspects of the *proletarian* or *non-bourgeois* meaning of “national”. The Manifesto use the notions the “nation”, and “national” in a sense that they refer only to the politico- geographical constitution of the proletarian power. As for the “national difference and antagonisms between peoples”, the Manifesto continues its optimism by pointing to “the development of bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world-market, to uniformity in

the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto". In addition, they will be vanished still faster under the supremacy of proletariat. Even more, common action of "the leading civilised countries at least, are one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat" (SW, 260). Especially the last definition may surprise many when common action of so called "leading civilised countries" moves as a reactionary alliance against a possible revolutionary action in one country. But what is meant seems to be a co-operation or partnership among the advanced countries, which will affect positively each other in terms of freedom, etc.

5.2. PETTY BOURGEOISIE: AS AN INTERMEDIARY CLASS

Under the heading of "the petty bourgeoisie", we have not "peasantry". This is because the search for worker-peasant alliance, the emphasis over the semi-dependent feudal relations in the agricultural structure and the observations about the Kemalist cadres in the civil and military bureaucracy prevent *the Aydınlık* from seeing bourgeois or capitalist oriented characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie. Kemalist officers and small peasants are the allies of the proletarian movement. Despite this optimism, *the Aydınlık* does not see the socialist oriented potential, which it sees in the petty bourgeoisie, of the RTUCT and the WPT. In addition, question of the relative autonomy of the state and its bureaucratic tool, pointed to, in Marx, the limits, and reasons and foundations of this autonomy. Weakness of the bourgeoisie and a balance between the rival classes led into such an autonomy. However, this did not mean that the state and bureaucracy was not based on the bourgeois order. *The Aydınlık* thought that the Kemalist army officers who were assumed to have carried the Kemalist revolutionary tradition were the main allies of the proletarian revolutionary movement. However, the army officers were not the officers of the socialist state. There was the limit for their relative autonomy. *The Aydınlık* seemed to have confused the revolution and revolutionaries of the past with the revolution and the revolutionary forces of the present and the future.

Petty bourgeoisie and the revolutionary possibilities: In the period prior to the imperialism, the proletarians and the peasants were the allies of the bourgeoisie in “the bourgeois democratic revolutions”. Both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had an interest in this revolution against feudalism. However, the bourgeois democratic revolution was “an end” for the bourgeoisie and for the proletariat it was “‘a stage’ in the path going to ‘the end’” (Erdost, 1970:261). This is the formula of the permanent revolution thesis in the words of Erdost.

The petty bourgeoisie has “two tendencies”, one towards the bourgeoisie since it has a small capital and the other towards the proletariat since it is also a labourer before his products. In the bourgeois democratic revolution, just as both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie had interest, the petty bourgeoisie has also interest in terms of its bourgeois and proletarian characteristics. Erdost states that these are the revolutionary possibilities of the petty bourgeoisie during the bourgeois democratic revolution. However, in the socialist revolutionary period, the bourgeois aspects of this class conflicts with its labourer characteristics. “This conflict may move it to the front of the forces (this is the landowner in the village) which oppose the socialist revolution *to the extent that its property ownership prevails over its labourer characteristic*”. In this context, the difference between the national democratic revolution and bourgeois democratic revolution underlies that fact that “In the national democratic revolution, the each characteristics of the petty bourgeoisie had revolutionary possibilities; in the socialist revolution, only the labourer characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie has revolutionary possibilities. Its characteristic as a property owner determines its counter-revolutionary possibilities” (Erdost, 1970:261).

In addition to its labourer characteristic, Erdost says that “the national characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie is one of the revolutionary possibilities”. But a section of this class has lost its national characteristic since “it has contacted with the foreign capital”. The rural petty bourgeoisie

has contacts with the foreign capital through credits, etc. But the possibility of contacts is much more for the urban petty bourgeoisie. The branches, and the agents of the foreign firms, oil distribution stations are some examples, says Erdost. An oil station which sells foreign oil may oppose to the nationalisation of oil at the beginning. But if he is ensured that he can continue its job and as the revolution becomes successful, "he will be aware of his previous counter-revolutionary attitude". and now, Erdost seems to have benefited from the dynamic analyses of Marxian texts, particularly from Marx's analyses in the Manifesto, and the French class struggles: "The petty bourgeoisie abandons these all doubts, the falters between the revolution and counter-revolution only within the successful waves of the revolution and then takes its position in the side of the revolutionary classes" (Erdost, 1970:261).

Erdost does not attribute a static and absolute attitude to the position of the petty bourgeoisie during the national democratic revolution. Its attitude is contingent on the performance of the revolutionary politics.

"In the bourgeois society, the petty bourgeoisie is not an independent class which moves in its own way". It is a class which "falters between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie" (Erdost, 1970:262). Erdost asks what these facts mean for the socialists?: "the fact that in the capitalist countries the peasants are standing away from the socialist movement of the workers and participate in the various reactionary and bourgeois parties"(quotation from Lenin), and that "today they have participate in the counter-revolutionary parties of the dominant classes" (Erdost, 1970:262). *The Aydınlık* and Erdost have never argued hitherto that the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie are the ready and easy allies of the proletariat and the socialist movement. But they have pointed to the double and confused characteristics of these classes and to the revolutionary possibilities which could be revealed in favour of socialist politics of the national democratic revolution. The question has never been that the peasantry or the petty bourgeoisie are revolutionary

or counter-revolutionary. Erdost asks whether the facts stated above determine the position of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie in the revolution. Do these facts demonstrate that “the petty bourgeoisie is reactionary class?” Erdost now refers to Marx’s criticism of the *Gotha Programme* of the German social democrat party in 1875. Therein, Erdost says that Marx criticised the programme which argued that “all other classes against the working class are a reactionary mass” and quoted from the Manifesto which had stated that “the middle classes were revolutionary in terms of the fact that it was inevitable that they would move to the side of the proletariat”. According to Erdost, Marx argued that it was “‘foolishness’ ” to “show the petty bourgeoisie as being within the reactionary mass even in the period of the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie” (Erdost, 1970:262).

Erdost continues to say that “the proletarian revolutionaries” develops the “different” revolutionary potentials of the petty bourgeoisie in “different” stages of the revolution and “struggle to rescue it from the influence of the parties of the dominant classes and to render it its own ally” (Erdost, 1970:262). Erdost says that “the petty bourgeoisie as being both property owner and labourer in the national democratic revolution is revolutionary”. But “in the period for the power struggle of the socialist revolution”, “it falters between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat” since it is a property owner. In this period, “the proletariat” develops “the revolutionary possibilities of the poor and oppressed masses whose labourer characteristics” and tries to obtain their support. However, “relatively wealthy ones, the middle peasants are neutralised by the proletariat” (Erdost, 1970:262).

The urban petty bourgeoisie: *The Aydınlık* (here Erdost and Kaymak) here shifts the emphasis from the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie to only the urban petty bourgeoisie. Erdost and Kaymak observe that the characteristic of the urban petty bourgeoisie changes from time to time. “Pre-capitalist categories” such as the artisans and shopkeepers which depend on the

backward technology move from the modern streets to the margins of the cities and the towns in which industry and commerce are not developed. The fact that the commerce is being dominated by capitalist production changes the petty bourgeoisie. “On the one hand while the products which is produced and exchanged as commodities through pre-capitalist relations of production are replaced by the commodities which are produced within the capitalist relations of production”, the artisan’s work which is based on backward technology is replaced by workshops which repairs the industrial products. While a little of the artisans whose labour are based on backward technology enter into commerce, the large numbers of them are becoming proletarian. Erdost and Kaymak state that the petty bourgeoisie is “an uncertain class” since one face of it looks at the bourgeoisie, and the other face looks at the proletariat. “It flatters between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat according to its changed position. It is not strong in economic terms. It is not organised. To think of the interests for tomorrow is its class tendency”. The petty bourgeoisie begins to relate to the foreign capital. However, “to the proportion that its labourer side prevails over the capital it is an exploited class” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 311). “The petty bourgeoisie cannot be the leading class of the revolution because of these characteristics of it”. “However, since it is exploited and the majority of the sections who has little capital are becoming proletarian, the large masses of it participate in the revolution in the struggle against the imperialism and feudalism in the waves of the revolution. During the revolution before us, it is the **ally** of the revolutionary classes” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 312).

The petty bourgeois intellectuals and the national democratic revolution: National liberation war in Turkey was led by the petty bourgeois intellectuals. After the war, they became “sovereign” against the background of “dispersed” and “small scale production”. However, as “this economic base” was turned into semi-dependent country after the development of the bourgeoisie and the imperialist dependency and the raising influence of the feudal big landowners. These facts “strengthened the

hegemony over the small scale producers”. But this was only a reason. The more important reason was “the development of the proletariat “on the left side of the petty bourgeois democracy” (Erdost, 1970:264).

The revolutionary characteristics of the national liberation war are not related with the leading class in it, but with whether it encourage or prevent the imperialism. In this sense, Erdost states that the petty bourgeois struggle during the stage of the national democratic revolution must be supported by the proletarian revolutionaries since this struggle is revolutionary (Erdost, 1970:264). However, this does not mean that the proletarian revolutionaries must give up the leading role to the petty bourgeois intellectuals in the national democratic revolution. This will be “unfaithfulness to the ground purpose and the ideology of the proletariat” (Erdost, 1970:265).

“A Criticism of New Opportunism” is a long polemic and response made by Erdost against Korkut Boratav, the Emek group and the PRA. The article reformulates Erdost’s previous studies according to the replies and criticism which were levelled by Boratav and PRA to them. The most important aspect of the article is that it explains the relationship between the national democratic revolution strategy and the debates over the existence of feudal and semi-feudal relations in agricultural structure. Here we also see another shift of emphasis in the articles of Erdost and *the Aydınlık*. The national democratic revolution strategy is not necessarily justified by the predominance of feudal and semi-feudal relations in agriculture and democratic content of the revolution is not related simply with the domination of feudal relations in agriculture.

What is the other part of “semi-feudal” besides “feudal” characteristic? Does it also mean semi-capitalist? In the formation of money rent it is seen the initial emergence of capitalist ground-rent and the dissolution of the old agricultural relations of property. This problem is analysed by Marx in the genesis of the capitalist ground-rent. Erdost does not see any seeds of

capitalist formation of rent even though he observes the formation of money rent which is paid by the peasant who has already expropriated from the conditions of labour. Free small peasant, free wage-labourer, or a small or even a big capitalist farmer is the possible figures before the cropper and the leaser evolves into. These possible developments seem to be ignored for the sake of national democratic revolution strategy.

Erdost states that Boratav's "primitive capitalism" ignores "the proletariat", and the feudal, semi-feudal and capitalist landowners. The surplus products of the small peasants which form the majority of the population is exploited not only by the merchant and the usurer but also by the monopoly capital, the comprador bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie in the main. The "ruling classes" are not "the usurer" and "the town merchant (tacir and even the shopkeeper) one section of which is petty bourgeois and exploited by the dominant classes", but "the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal big landowners; the national bourgeoisie is within and between this hegemony; but it does not have power for an establishment of his hegemony and is weak". The "socialist" slogan suggested by Boratav, "Stop the exploitation of the merchant and the usurer!" for "particularly small peasant producers" implies that the enemy is the town merchant and the usurer. Putting aside the meaning of this slogan "in a country where in agriculture the natural **economy** prevails" in terms of the revolution, says Erdost, the targets of the national democratic revolution are hidden away by "new opportunism" (Erdost, 1970b:19).

Boratav argues that, quotes Erdost, "Erdost's contribution to the strategy debates is negative and even harmful since he erect the democratic targets of the national democratic struggle upon the **predominance** or even at large degree the **wideness** of the feudal and semi-feudal relations of production in Turkey" (*first emphasis belongs to Erdost*, Erdost, 1970b:20). It is sure here Boratav's argument is wrong. What is said about the agriculture is expanded to the production of the country in

general. Boratav continues to say that if it is said that “the dominant mode of production in **Turkey**” is defined as “semi-feudal” and the targets of the revolutionary struggle is defined as “anti-feudal”, the targets would be limited to “the liquidation of the feudal and semi-feudal **relations of production**” (Erdost, 1970b:20-1). This means that “the duties of the national democratic struggle” would be “superfluously” limited. Boratav says that “the democratic targets which aim to liquidate **feudal remnants, reactionary elements**” such as the trade union rights, “feudal property”, fascist penal codes, to the religious movements and the exploitation of usurers must not be limited with “anti-feudal” labels. Democratic targets are not limited with “the liquidation of the feudal and semi-feudal mode of production”, and to “anti-feudal” label must not be attributed more than it contains. Boratav adds that “if the feudal **relations of production** are defined as being more limited than predicted or if the **natural tendency of the economy is in the direction of the liquidation of the feudal and semi-feudal relations more and more**, will the socialist movement put aside its own minimum program?” Boratav’s claim is also supported by the argument of the PRA which claims that to some “the national democratic revolution strategy” lose its validity “if the feudalism is no longer **dominant** in agriculture” (Erdost, 1970b:21). It is enough to see that Boratav and the PRA argues that *the Aydınlık* and Erdost reduce “the democratic targets” of “the national democratic struggle” or “the national democratic revolution strategy” to the liquidation of the feudal and semi-feudal relations (Erdost, 1970b:21).

Before we follow the reply of Erdost about the relationship between the democratic program and the feudal relations, he recalls us that Korkut Boratav’s name passed first in the third issue of Emek journal in 2 June 1969. **Emek** here publicised “The Debates of Socialism in Turkey” which opposed Mihri Belli and the national democratic revolution strategy. This text referred to Boratav’s unpublished book “The Distribution of Income in 100 Questions” and with a reference to this book, argued that the semi-feudal distribution relation in agriculture did not “seem” to reach beyond 5 percent. In the fifth

issue of Emek, Boratav himself was referred against the national democratic revolution strategy. Afterwards Boratav's arguments would be used for this purpose (Erdost, 1970b:22-3). Erdost says that Boratav thinks that they erect the democratic targets only upon the prevalence of the feudal and semi-feudal relations. But he recalls that he had never connected "the national democratic revolution strategy" to "the existence of the feudalism" or the dominant existence of the feudalism. He recalls that in his article "Turkish Socialism and Socialism" (10 September 1968) he said that "anti-imperialist revolution is 'democratic' since **at the same time** it contains independency and anti-feudal revolution is **at the same time** 'national' since it completes the nationalisation". Anti-imperialism is connected to democratic revolution; "in a semi-dependent country we have clearly stated that the citizen did not have democratic freedoms and that not only national revolution but also democratic revolution was the revolution before the semi-dependent country (whether the country has been capitalised and completed nationalisation). It is indeed Boratav who has divided two from each other" (Erdost, 1970b:23). We here understand that for the national democratic strategy, capitalisation and nationalisation of the country are not substantial. But **what are the substantial elements of this revolution strategy are "anti-imperialism" and "the democratic rights" of the citizens**, in other words, the economic freedom of the state and nation and the establishment of a democratic state and the nation of the free citizens. These substantial targets of the revolution before Turkey will be valid **even if the country will have completed its nationalisation process and capitalist economic development. Semi-dependency becomes an independent category from the capitalist development.** In a semi-dependency, the citizens have not democratic freedoms completely. Complete democratisation depends on the independency.

Erdost says that Boratav connects "the democratic targets to 'social structure' rather than 'the backward relations of production', in other words, rather than the economic base, but the superstructure which is based on this base". He

quotes from Boratav who writes in the PRA: “For me, today the targets of the national democratic struggle originate from **the feudal remnants** which is existed in the superstructure and even in far more developed relations of production, the wideness of the primitive forms of exploitation of the capitalism (which is depressing and suffocating to the extent that it is primitive), reactionary elements which as a whole stamp over our political and social life, rather than the existence of the feudal and semi-feudal **relations of production** which has been rather limited today and is being liquidated more and more” (Erdost, 1970b:24). Erdost concludes that Boratav “isolates” the democratic revolution from “the imperialism”, and “the backward relations of production” and attributes the democratic targets to the feudal remnants which are existed in the superstructure (Erdost, 1970b:24).

As for the usage of the term “**democracy**”, I must recall that how **Marx** used this word in the context of the class struggles in France of 1848. In this period, Marx clearly observed that what is “social” and what is “democratic” begun to have different meanings. The former meant the proletarian order while the latter implied the bourgeois order. The workers in France **tried to overthrow the bourgeois order and replace it with “red republic”**. This target was not merely a democracy which was **indeed the targets of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois parties**. Social and democratic party implied the alliance between the proletariat and the petty bourgeois party. Turkish left we deal with here (Boratav and Erdost-*the Aydınlık*) understands from the term “democracy” either particularly the bourgeois democratic order of the free citizens or particularly the liquidation of the feudal order by the bourgeois or national democratic revolution. **As for Lenin, the bourgeois and democratic aspects of the revolution** are related with the peasant participation in the revolution before socialist revolution. For Lenin, bourgeois and democratic are used in the same meaning. Bourgeois and democratic characteristics of the revolution are caused by the peasant’s involvement into the revolutionary struggle. **Lenin said that** “To a Marxist, the peasant movement is not socialist but democratic movement. Just as in the other

countries, in Russia, this movement is a necessary part of the democratic revolution which is bourgeois in terms of its economic and social content. The peasant movement is in no way levelled to the foundations of the bourgeois order, to the commodity production or capital. Rather, it is levelled to the old, serf and pre-capitalist relations in the rural regions, to the landlordship which is the foundational pillars of the all remnants of serfdom” (Lenin, “The Working Class and the Peasantry” –*İşçi Sınıfı ve Köylülük*, in Turkish 1996, 181). For the proletariat, the purpose is the proletarian dictatorship and socialism. In addition to this particular peasant question, **Lenin exactly follows Marx who observed the division line between democracy and socialism within and after the 1848 revolutions.** For Marx and also for Lenin, democracy is not an integral and substantial part of the revolution strategy of the proletariat. This is valid also before the socialist revolution.

For Erdost (and *the Aydınlık*), both “national revolution” and “democratic revolution” can be realised by an “anti-imperialist revolution”. Erdost says when it is said that “Anti-imperialist revolution is at the same time democratic since it contains independency” it is also said that “in a semi-dependent country the citizen is not independent in political terms and thereby democratic rights becomes not only the question of the peasantry but becomes the question and the grand purpose of all classes and stratum of the nation- and it is so” (Erdost, 1970b:25). Erdost (*the Aydınlık*) extends the framework of the democratic revolution so much that we have no longer division lines between the anti-imperialism, independency, democracy, the citizen and the national classes. **Democracy** is presented as an **independency** in general. It is presented as **political independency** for the citizens and it is presented as **democratic rights** for all classes of the nation. Democracy can be brought into existence only with anti-imperialist struggle and revolution.

In addition to the political independency of the citizens and the democratic rights for all classes of the nation, the other democratic aspect of the anti-

imperialist revolutionary struggle is levelled to “the big landownership whether it has capitalist characteristic”. Moreover, “the question of the nationalisation of land is the question of the democratic revolution”. Unlike Boratav, Erdost says that the democratic revolution is not limited to the liquidation of the pre-capitalist remnants (Erdost, 1970b:25).

As mentioned above, Erdost quotes from Boratav who sees the old remnants in the embourgeoisment of the feudal elements: “as long as the dominant elements of the capitalism are made of the merchants who are transformed into industrialist, **as in the embourgeoisment of the feudal elements**, the new order has been born by carrying many backward elements of the old in its body” (Erdost, 1970b:26). Erdost says that Boratav’s feudal elements (“the merchant and the usurer, as agricultural bourgeoisie”) are turned into the bourgeoisies and the merchant are then turned into industrialist. The old element is both turned into new one with old remnants. Erdost suggests that these remnants are nothing but “feudal morality and understanding which continue within the capitalist relations of production” rather than “the remnants which determine the feudal relations of production” (Erdost, 1970b:26). The democratic targets of the national democratic struggle, for Boratav, are related with the feudal remnants which continue in the superstructure. Erdost rightly asks: “is the industrial bourgeoisie the feudal in its origination?” and “have the all feudals and even an important part of them become bourgeois, do they become bourgeois?” and last thing; is the struggle against “the old order’s morality” in accordance with Marxism? Moreover, Erdost points to the *evolutionist* perspective of Boratav who said that pre-capitalist relations were limited and being liquidated more and more in time. Hence, the target of the struggle (not revolution) had to “be levelled to the superstructure” (Erdost, 1970b:26). Are the religious sects and the reactionary movements in Turkey dealt with in the embourgeoisment of the feudal elements, or do they continue to exist “as a power which is independent and different from capitalism”? Erdost suggests that “feudal superstructure’s institutions have lived hitherto not within the factories but

within the backward relations of production". Their present power is not caused by the embourgeoisment of the feudal elements, but by "the embourgeoisment being **uncompleted**", i.e. by the existence of the feudalism and the prevalence of "the backward relations of production". It is particularly the "ideological reactionism" is caused directly by "the agriculture which is based on backward production", by the "backward relations of production" (Erdost, 1970b:27).

Although Erdost correctly points to the relationship between the economic base and the ideological superstructure, that is, a relationship between the reactionary ideology and the backward production existing particularly in the agricultural structure which is dominated by the small peasantry, there must be other causes behind the reactionary ideologies **such as** the solvents effects of the capitalist development, a reaction of the property owners against socialist and democratic movements, historical prevalence of the religion in the country and also the fact that national liberation war in 1920s and the Turkification of the Anatolia after the first world war defined the national bourgeoisie automatically as the Muslim bourgeoisie against the cosmopolite non-Muslim Greek and Armenian bourgeoisies. Another cause is possibly the Russian and then Soviet threats which create anti-Christianity and then an anti-communism on the reactionary base of Islam. Moreover, as *the Aydınlık* also observed, after the Second World War, Turkey meets fascist organisations and then a fascist terror which benefits much more from religious ideology. Furthermore, the religion is organised by the state in Turkey. Hence, the religion is one of the important parts of the state organisation in the country. This means that religion can be easily mobilised by the dominant classes against the oppositions. It is a tool in the class struggle. For this reason, the reason behind the formation and the existence of the reactionary ideologies cannot be simply either a manifestation of the backward relations of production or the embourgeoisment of the feudal elements. Firstly, **for Marx, the determination of the consciousness by the existence** is a general

ontological principle (see Marx's *The Theses on Feuerbach* in Marx and Engels, 1987). This determination is realised through the mediation of many factors which must be analysed empirically. Secondly, **the relationship between the economic base of society and the ideological, political and legal superstructure** is another general formula for the description of the *revolutionary change* which originates from the contradiction within the economic base of the society (both the productive forces and the property relations) and moves towards superstructure of the social relations (see Marx's *The Contribution to the Critique of the Political Economy, in Turkish*, 1993). **In Marx, there is no manifestation without mediation. It is a magic of idealist literature and the religion** (this is one of the main subject-matters in Marx' and Engels' *The Holly Family, in Turkish*, 1994).

The democratic targets of the national democratic revolution are limited with the feudal and semi-feudal relations, but also oppose all kind of big landownership. Erdost argues that "it is a reality that the elements which take their power from the big landed property is the counter-revolutionaries which ally with the imperialism". I think that although this argument seems to be plausible, it must be revealed. Erdost argues that "the development in the direction of the disappearance of the small property in the agriculture is not the result of the emerging prevalence of the capitalist production in agriculture, the concentration of the capitalist exploitation in agriculture but follows the direction of the swallow of the small property by the feudal and the semi-feudal powers". Small property is divided faster than the big property by inheritance. Its every division facilitates its swallow by the big landed property. An absence of the land reform facilitates the disappearance of the small property. Thereby Erdost rejects Boratav's argument that "as the capitalist relations develop, the semi-feudal relations are in a decreasing condition in general" and the logical conclusion of this argument: the capitalisation of the semi-feudal relations (Erdost, 1970b:27). The disappearance of the small property in agriculture is not the result of the prevalence of the capitalisation in the agriculture but a product of absence of

“a radical land reform” hitherto. The absence of the land reform “strengthens” “the semi-feudal property” (Erdost, 1970b:28).

Small property which is divided through inheritance becomes weaker in front of the big property. Small holder peasants as poor peasant become “semi proletarians”. Erdost says that Boratav thinks that the semi-feudal relations are in a decreasing condition and the struggle must be levelled to the superstructure rather the land property. However, he replies that “it is impossible that semi-feudal relations ‘decreases’ by its own way. Rather, semi-feudal relations become stronger ‘by its own way’ as long as a radical land reform is not existed” (Erdost, 1970b:28). Let us ask that how feudal relations can be dissolved into capitalist relations. Dissolution of this kind, according to Marxian framework, must follow the expropriation of the labour from the conditions of production, i.e. land, and an emergence in land or penetration of the capitalist farmer into the land. Capital must abolish the monopoly over the land. In sum, rural production in land must create the categories of profit and the ground rent in capitalist manner. Production in land must be the capitalist production. Trinity of the political economy, land, labour and capital must emerge. In Marxian term, “capital-relation” must develop in agricultural production. A “spontaneous” dissolution can be a product of the spontaneous development of capitalist production in agriculture. There can be such a development. However, a revolution strategy which cannot be contented with only the proletariat in a country where the small peasantry is prevalent cannot just hope a spontaneous capitalist development in agriculture. Boratav seems to have advocating “economism” in Lenin’s terms in his *“What is to be done?”*

Erdost observes that Boratav puts out the big landed property from the agenda of the revolution and puts out the democratic targets from the feudal and semi-feudal relations. Behind the ideas of Boratav, “his counter-revolutionary philosophy” is concealed. Erdost recalls that Boratav’s ideas are not new. Novel thing is the reproduction of these ideas by Boratav in the

fronts of the national democratic revolution strategy. In 1965, when the WPT advocated a land reform, the JP replied that there had been no so much land to be distributed and in 11 January 1970, Sadun Aren spoke to Milliyet newspaper and said that “The share of the feudalism in agriculture today is at most roughly 3-5 percent. Therefore, **making agricultural and land reform from now on is becoming a job which even the JP can attempt to**” (Erdost, 1970b:28).

Erdost says that when Boratav says that the semi-feudal relations are in a falling condition in general, he also means that semi-feudal relations “become **spontaneously capitalised**”. Therefore, he says that Boratav also advocates “the spontaneity of the democratic revolution”.

Erdost says that for Boratav, “democratic revolution” is “‘the minimum program of socialist movement’ ” and not confined to the feudal and semi-feudal relations which are both limited more than though and in a falling condition. This “minimum programme” is levelled to “the feudal remnants” and “reactionary elements” and “nothing but degenerated little and small reformist (if it can be called so) movement”. Erdost continues and refers to Mao and Nguyen Giap in terms of the relationship between “the national” and “democratic” revolution against the imperialism and feudalism. For Mao, democratic revolution is levelled to the feudal and semi-feudal relations and the imperialism. But these are also followed by “dependencies and superstructure’s institution which originate from the backward relations of production”. Yet, “the most dominant enemy” is determined by “the feudal powers” which are “the economically powerful watchmen of all backward relations rather than only the feudalism and semi-feudalism” (Erdost, 1970b:29). For Giap, democratic revolution is defined as “anti-feudal”. However, says Erdost, this does not mean that democratic revolution is confined to feudalism since democratic revolution confronts with “the basic forces which protect” the backward relations of production upon which dependencies and reactionary ideologies are erected (Erdost, 1970b:30).

Erdost recalls that the definition of the democratic revolution as anti-feudal was made before himself by **Reşat Fuat Baraner** and **Mihri Belli**. The former said that "... in the imperialist era... it is necessary in every respect that the liberation struggles level towards the imperialism and its pillars at home the comprador and feudal estates, for this reason, they carry a bourgeois democratic characteristic" (Erdost, 1970b:30, quoted from Baraner's article in the **Türk Solu**, 15. issue in 27 February 1968) and the latter said that "the realisation of the national independency and the abolition of the feudalism are two main duties of the democratic revolution" (Erdost, 1970b:30-1, quoted from Belli's article in the **Yön**, 5 August 1966).

Erdost says that feudal superstructure's institutions are closely connected with the imperialism and "the democratic revolution" "covers all dependencies including the imperialism" besides "all pre-capitalist relations of production" and all related superstructure's institutions and "all reactionary waves" which originate from "the pre-capitalist relations". However, he says that one point was not concerned in the previous articles. This is "anti-democratic" articles of 141 and 142 in the fascist penal code in Turkey. Erdost says that "to consider these articles of the law imported from the fascist Italy under the dicta of the finance-capital which fulfils the function in the hands of the imperialism and its compradors of a weapon which ensures to deprive the working class from its own political organisation in the context of the feudal superstructure's institution is completely opposed to scientific socialism which defines the finance-capital's domination, i.e. the imperialism as the last stage (the dying stage) of the capitalism" (Erdost, 1970b:31-2).

Here the class antagonism is placed between the imperialism, its compradors and the working class. The enemy is the finance-capital, the imperialism and its compradors in the country. **Even though the question is related directly with the working class**, we are still in the stage of the democratic revolution. But the difference is just to put forward the anti-imperialist side of the democratic revolution.

Erdost states that the small holder peasant who produce commodity is not exploited only by the merchant who buys the products of the peasant. “The town merchant mass which is in many times a petty bourgeois and exploited, too, time by time by the foreign capital and industrial bourgeoisie is an estate which takes relatively small share from the exploitation provided from the peasant which is small producer, and the industrial proletariat” (Erdost, 1970b:81). The large portion of the surplus value produced by all labourers belongs to “the foreign capital, i.e. the monopoly bourgeoisie”. The monopoly bourgeoisie “shares the exploitation with the comprador bourgeoisie (one extreme of which is extended to the commercial petty-bourgeoisie) whom it created”. Erdost says that “In agriculture, the feudal and semi-feudal elements appropriate one portion of the products produced immediately by the labourer without paying any equivalent in return” and he sums that “The dominant powers are not town merchant and usurer, but the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie, feudal and semi-feudal land owners... which are their allies that must be counted as the main watchmen, the police station of the backward production in agriculture...” (Erdost, 1970b:81). Erdost states that it is sure that the usurers and the wholesale merchants (“bezirgan”) are the problems for the rural labourers. They are inherited from feudalism in Turkey and hence their existence is based on the feudal relations. The national democratic revolution abolishes the feudal relations and hence these “parasitic class” (Erdost, 1970b:81).

5.2.1 Political fall of the petty bourgeoisie after 1848 June

From 25 June 1848 to 13 June 1849: Non-republican bourgeoisies (Orleanists and legitimists) was a minority power in the constituent assembly before June and they expressed themselves under the vain of bourgeois republicans. After June, anti-republican party acquired its independence. But, the state power was under the control of the republican bourgeoisie. This section of the bourgeoisie had been organised around the paper the *National* since 1830s. Cavaignac hold the executive power of the state and Marrast

the legislative body. The victory of June made the former protector (Marx, 1996, 62-3).

After June, the constituent assembly levelled its attacks towards socialists (like Blanc) and democrats (like Ledru-Rollin) and abandoned many progressive social and political laws (Marx, 1996, 63-4). As for the petty bourgeoisie of Paris, their position was rather ironical. Marx states that in June days, no one had so fight fanatically in order to protect property and to re-establish the credit as they did. But those against whom the shopkeeper went in the barricades were his customers. On the other side of the barricade, however, there were his creditors. Their goods did not belong to them. They tried to protect property. But their house and their shops did not belong to them. Marx states that petty bourgeoisies recognised that after they defeated the workers they had been defeated to their creditors. Their bankruptcy clearly appeared after June (Marx, 1996, 65). Since February, seven thousands shopkeepers did not pay their rents. After democrat representatives of the petty bourgeoisie in the constituent assembly had been liquidated by the republican bourgeoisie, this parliamentary action acquired its "*bourgeois economic meaning*" (Marx, 1996, 66).

However, in 19 September 1848, Prince Louis Bonaparte and communist Raspail were elected as the Paris representatives. The bourgeoisie, on the other hand, elected Jewish usurer and Orleanist Fould. Marx says that these events meant a counter attack against the constituent assembly, bourgeois republic and Cavaignac. These latter, meanwhile, were taking measures for financial crisis of the state by creating new state debts which was favoured by financial aristocracy (Marx, 1996, 67). In the foreign affairs, National (organ of the republican bourgeoisie) did not implement "a national" policy and allied towards the Holy Alliance. This policy, says Marx, was self-rejection of the National (Marx, 1996, 68).

In 20 December, the constituent assembly proclaims Louis Bonaparte the president of the republic. His cabinet was composed of the old ministers of Louis-Philippe such as Odilon Barrot. By doing so, Marx states, he tried to eliminate the effects of the change (Marx, 1996, 75). Old politicians sequentially gains state posts. Barrot was an old liberal, Orleanist and Volterist. He was the religious affairs. His deputy minister was legitimist and *Jesuit* Falloux. Internal affairs were given to Malthusian Leon Faucher. Marx states that in this unity of orleanist-legitimists only Bonapartists were not yet exist. As for the National's cadres, they were completely liquidated from the state posts, and were replaced by the men of the kingdom (Marx, 1996, 76). Barrot's cabinet restored the old state machine of the kingdom. Changarnier was given the most important military posts. As for the bourgeois republicans (three coloured republicans, the National), they continued their positions in the National Assembly and tried to attack Barrot's cabinet in order to take back their power (Marx, 1996, 77).

The first measure of Napoleon's cabinet was to introduce tax for salt in 27 December. But, Marx recalls that Napoleon had promised that there would not have been any taxation. The fact that the constituent assembly rejected the cabinet's proposal for salt tax and would decide to give the vote of disconfidence against Napoleon's cabinet was a good opportunity for the assembly to overthrow the cabinet. This also would be an opportunity to introduce itself as the advocators of the peasant interest in the face of their choices. However, Marx observes that this opportunist attitude of the Constituent Assembly just led to the maturation of Bonaparte's and his cabinet's decision about the assembly. After this time, a tug-of war begun between these two powers (Marx, 1996, 78).

From the beginning of 1849 March, France lived a political revival for the elections of the National Legislative Assembly. Marx states that "the *order's party*" and "democrat-socialist party, which is "red party", were main rival groups. Between them, the "*Friends of the Constitution*" of the *National* was

competing. The order's party represented the two rival fractions of the bourgeois class. The great land lords were sovereign in the period of restoration, and financial aristocracy and industrial bourgeoisie occupied "the monopoly of power" in the period of July Monarchy. The republic was nothing but a synthesis of these two sovereignties or common and single form of sovereignty of these rival fractions. The national fulfilled this function before republic and "the bourgeois republicans of the *National* did not represent the large parts of their classes that were based on economic foundations" (Marx, 1996, 91). Their merit only was to express "the republic's no name rule" as "the general regime of bourgeois class" in the period of monarch in which the rival fractions tried to impose their particular regimes (kingdom lines). They also saw this sort of republic as "the sovereignty of their own clique" (Marx, 1996, 91-2). Marx states that the National was liquidated after June 1848 when the order's party established itself (Marx, 1996, 91).

In the election campaign, the order's party proclaimed the conditions of the bourgeois sovereignty, that is, "the *preservation of the property, the family, the religion, and the order*". It introduced "its class sovereignty as the sovereignty of civilisation and as the necessary conditions of material production and subsequent social relations stemming from this" (Marx, 1996, 92).

From 13 June 1849 to 10 March 1850: On the other hand, the democratic petty bourgeoisie and the Montagne, after 12 June parliamentary fiasco looked for the solution outside the parliament by going to the bureaus of *Démocratie Pacifique* (a Fourierist newspaper). But, Marx observes that it lost its power outside the parliament (Marx, 1996, 102-3). Ironically, in contrast to its previous threats in the assembly, "it, by appealing to all measure *except with the armed force*, was determined to make forcefully the respect towards the constitution to be accepted". The Montagne's policy was supported by the "Friends of the Constitution", which was "the ruins of the clique of the *National*, the republican bourgeois party" (Marx, 1996, 103).

Meanwhile, in the summer, the assemblies in the provinces witnessed a debate for the amendment of the constitution which was put into the agenda by the majority of the National assembly. But the provincial assemblies, “the voice of bourgeois France”, explained its negative decision and showed the life span of the National assembly. There was an ever growing conflict between Orleanists and the legitimist, between the assembly and the Lois Bonaparte, even between the latter and his cabinet (Marx, 1996, 110-11). Tension increased with the royalist demands and claims of the Orleanists and the legitimist. The royalists need Bonaparte as “*a neutral man*” (Marx, 1996, 113), but he did not show any respect towards royalists’ demands for returning of the royal families in exile (Marx, 1996, 112-13). In 1 November, Bonaparte replied the royalist in the assembly by appointing new cabinet, which was composed of *clerks* instead of the previous one which had been “the royalist’s coalition cabinet” (Marx, 1996, 113).

From 1 November to 10 March 1850 was the third period of the constitutional republic. At this period, against the royalist claims, Bonaparte represented the republic, while Bonaparte’s claim for the throne, the order’s party represented the republic. One royalist represented the status quo, that is, republic, against the other royalist (Marx, 1996, 113). Each one put into the agenda “the common sovereignty of the bourgeoisie”, that is, the republic against its rival. In the form of republic, private interests were neutralised and hidden away (Marx, 1996, 114).

New cabinet of Bonaparte’s, Marx observes, also represented the restoration of the financial aristocracy by the ministry of finance Fould. Marx states that this restoration completed other restorations of the constitutional republic. Fould meant the surrendering of the national wealth by the stock exchange. Even under the rule of Louis Philippe, whose kingdom was “the ideal name of the sovereignty of the high bourgeoisie”, private interests had not been so much expressed. The bourgeois republic revealed everything which was secrets of different royal lines (Marx, 1996, 114). These explanations show

that, Marx states, the bourgeois republic, from the beginning, strengthened the financial aristocracy rather than overthrowing it. But, with Fould, the executive initiative went to the financial aristocracy. Marx asks that how the bourgeois coalition tolerated the sovereignty of financial aristocracy, which had excluded and made dependent the other bourgeois fractions in the time of Louis Philippe? First of all, the financial aristocracy was the significant part of the royalist coalition of the bourgeoisie. The vanguard Orleanists were the allies of the financial aristocracy. Secondly, the legitimist dealt with all sort of stock exchange gambling, with the railway and mining speculation in the time of Louis Philippe. Lastly, “the union of the great landed property and the high financial capital’s sovereignty is a *normal phenomenon*”. Marx points to the examples of England and Austria (Marx, 1996, 115). The sovereignty of the financial aristocracy also has such an economic environment. Marx states that in a country like France where the national production is below the national debt, the state power is the most significant subject of speculation, and where the most significant investment area is the stock exchange, many men coming from the bourgeoisie and “semi-bourgeois classes” have to participate to state debt, stock exchange and finance. These all “secondary participants” find their leaders and foundations in the sections which “represent these interests the most as a whole” (Marx, 1996, 115).

Marx asks how national wealth is subordinated by the financial capital. He answers: “with the ever increasing debts of the state” (Marx, 1996, 115). The state debts are caused by the increasing of the payments much more than the earnings. This imbalance is both the reason and the result of the state debts. To solve this problem, the state has to “simplify its governing mechanism” and “has to rule less as much as possible”. But, “as long as its class sovereignty and the existential conditions of its class are threatened from every point”, for the order’s party, whose “the means of pressure and the official intervention in the name of the state, and the ready existence everywhere through the state mechanism” has to be far more necessitated, these sorts of savings are impossible. The other solution is to charge heavy

taxes over the shoulders of the richest classes in order to reduce the state debts. But, asks Marx, why the order's party should give up its private wealth in favour of the country in order to save the country from the exploitation of the stock exchange. "*It is not so much foolish!*" (*Pas si bête!*) (Marx, 1996, 116).

The financial system was not changed in the ministry of Fould. But, the financial aristocracy did not behave as freely as it had behaved in the period of Louis Philippe because of the envy of the other fractions of the bourgeoisie. The state debt continued to increase, but it was hidden away. In time speculation started to increase. With "the official restoration of the financial aristocracy", French people got into a situation like 24 February 1848 (Marx, 1996, 119). In 20 December of 1849, the annual of the presidency of Bonaparte, the tax over the drink was reintroduced by the National assembly. Marx states that a Jesuit leader Montalembert addressed to the assembly by attributing to this tax a role in the preservation of the state, the order, the morality and the religion. Marx observes that "as Montalembert makes the tax a god, the peasant became irreligious and atheist and he jumped into the hands of the evil, that is, the hands of the *socialism*" (Marx, 1996, 119).

The tax over drinks had been always hated by the people since it represented all faults of the tax system. The tax rate was valid for bad and good wines and increases with the decreasing consumption. It promoted mixture and forgery and hence the poisoning of the labouring classes (Marx, 1996, 120). It directly influenced the wine producers and sellers. It decreased the consumption and narrowed the market. On the other hand, in France 12 million men were grape grower. Marx states that the French peasants traditionally knew that the tax over the drink had a subject of bluff for the governments for ages. The peasants protested Bonaparte with their petitions and Marx states that by doing so, they had been rejected their votes they had given to him in 20 December 1848 (Marx, 1996, 121).

In addition, the attack towards the general suffrage and the constitutional republic was weakening the power of the united bourgeoisie. The *constitutional republic* was “the only possible form of their *common* power” and “the most powerful and the most completed form of *their class sovereignty*”. But, what they were doing was to retreat to “the uncompleted, deficient and weak lower form of the *monarchy*” of their power and sovereignty (Marx, 1996, 135).

5.2.2 The “Middle Classes” in the WPT program

“Small merchants, the shopkeepers, the artisans”: This class was a product of old type of commerce and industrial activity. As the guild system of the shopkeepers and the artisans were broken up as the Ottoman Empire got into “the domination of the foreign capitalist economies” (note that the program said “the foreign capitalist economies” rather than “capitalist countries”), but the small shopkeepers in the commerce and the handcraftsmanship in the industry maintained themselves because of the weakness of the industrialization till then. These classes were still populous and important as a result of underdevelopment, but they felt the pressure of the big commerce and industry.

The retailer merchants had real estates in the towns and the cities and lived in better conditions than the artisans who dealt with handcraftsmanship much more. However, the conditions of the small shopkeepers were worse. Nevertheless, the division between the small and big commerce was more bearable than the division between the big industry and the handcraftsmanship. The latter division was hard to be passed. The small commerce tended to grow. The ones whose conditions were in danger were the small handicraftsmen. These small handicraftsmen were different from the, industrial units which were divided into small industrial workshops in order to escape fro the obligations of the working procedures and the taxation. The owners of the latter industrial units were not the masters who

laboured himself but the owners of capital and the labourers were not the masters and apprentices, but the workers working to a division of labour in industry. These kind of workshops prevented productive industrial production and the provision of the good conditions for the workers in terms of the working day, health conditions, the wages and the job security.

The program stated that in the mixed economy, small retailer merchant and the artisans dealing with handcraftsmanship fulfilled important functions. The former carried the goods to the consumers and the latter produced consumer goods before modern industrial workshops were established. Even more, the handcraftsmanship which required talent and art would continue even after the industrialization would be completed. The artisan strata suffered from the impossibilities of credit and raw material and good marketing conditions.

The problems of the small shopkeepers and the artisans had no hope about future. For this reason they were interested more and more with the economic and social developments. Just income distribution and taxation, the extension of social security system, and the development of the social services, the extension of the national market, in other words, the complete implementation of the principles and freedoms written in the constitution, and the economic development were in the interests of these strata. Here the program attributed to the Constitution so much importance that without this constitution and its temporal legitimacy, the WPT would necessarily be doomed to fall.

However, the program stated, since these strata are not powerful in their own way, only in the condition of cooperation and in the same fate with the working class and other labouring masses, by gathering and moving in or around the same political organization, they can be effective in the development ...of society and to obtain their own interests (emphasis in the program).

“Middle land owners”: The program said that in the recent period, like the big holders, the middle holder peasants also benefited from the

developments in agriculture and obtained new land parcels from the small holders through various ways. They also developed their economic conditions due to commercial activity in the villages. However, the important characteristic of Turkish agriculture was the absent of a populous, wealthy and hopeful stratum of the middle holder peasants.

A portion of the middle peasants lived in the towns and the cities and interested in the activities different from agriculture. They leased their land parcels or contracted with the croppers. Some of them left their land to their relatives and cut their interests in land tilling.

“The public servants, the salary owners and free professionals”: The salary- and wage-servants of the public and private sector and the free professionals were also mentioned under the title of “the middle classes”. These were educated in various degrees and were more intellectual in comparison to the other class and stratum of society. In general they are included in the middle classes, but some free professionals who had university degree and the wage and salary owners in the higher echelons of the private sector had the same fate with the wealthy upper stratum due to their revenues and hence their properties. The personnel in the higher echelons of the administrative cadres and in the political posts had the same position. However, the lower echelons which had less salary and age level and hence worse living conditions could be counted among the labouring popular masses. They lived in limited earnings and had an “internal status” as a result of that they were educated, public servant or free professional, for this reason, they lived their problems sharply. The free professionals who did not obtain enough work possibility and who had limited earnings were in this condition. For this reason, “these stratum of urban middle classes” were troubled and were interested with social development and change and took the side of “the social state” and “social justice”.

The intellectuals who were located in this stratum, i.e. “idealist officers and administrators, the writers, the scientists, the teachers, the artists and the youth” were particularly important. This intellectual stratum played a significant role in a degree which went beyond their numbers in history; the “idealist intellectuals” influenced the movement of the Ottoman Empire towards the western civilization through their struggles.

The program stated that “the Turkey of the Liberation War” was a also a product of the intellectuals. In our history the intellectuals firstly found the opportunity of cooperation with the people in the liberation war established the foundations of the Republican Turkey together with the people “under the leadership of the immortal ATATÜRK who is inspired by the people”.

The program said that today again “the progressive intellectuals” and “the youth of Atatürk” would play significant role for the emancipation of Turkey from backwardness to the extent that they cooperated with the people. For this reason this stratum had to emancipate from “loneliness” and establish “real relations” with the people. Thereby it could realize its thoughts and help “the working class” and the “popular masses” acquire “political consciousness”. The spread over of “the socialist thoughts” among the intellectuals and the development of “the working class as a political entity” drove the intellectuals and the youth of ATATÜRK to “this positive path” (for the WPT Program, see www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts).

5.2.3 The Kemalist Army

Erdost and Kaymak state that some institutions in the state have served the take-over of the political power by the counter-revolutionary forces. But some institutions maintained their revolutionary characteristic even after the counter-revolution. One institution as such is the army majority of whose officer cadres were composed of the Kemalist revolutionaries. The teachers were in the same situation formed a majority for a democratic and secular

education. The struggle of the members of the high courts and the public servants also pointed to the fact that the counter-revolution could not seize all parts of the state (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 301). Reactionary forces are opposed to Kemalist revolutionaries and the officers in particular. The all revolutionary of the army advocates the land reform, the liquidation of the religious reactionism and the national independency. For this reason, the majority of the army members contradict with the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal big landowners. Today, the American imperialism wanted to use the army for its own strategies (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 302). Moreover, the imperialism and the feudal big landowners try to make the Kemalist revolutionaries oppose the proletarian revolutionaries and to sabot the revolutionary action. This is one of the targets of the imperialism over the army. "The unity of the target in the national democratic revolution between the Kemalist revolutionaries and the proletarian revolutionaries objectively make these two significant forces get close to each other". Erdost and Kaymak state that the fact that the Kemalist sections of the army contradicts with the imperialism and the feudal big landowners was seen in the historical fact that the Kemalist revolutionaries whose power mainly come from the army defeated the imperialism in the national liberation war, destroyed the feudal state and attacked towards the reactionary elements. Today, Kemalist revolutionaries advocated a land reform and the destruction of the religious reactionism. "The imperialism contradicts with the national army; this is because the imperialism wants an army which is dependent on itself, in a direction of its interests" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 303).

5.2.4 The Relative Autonomy of the state and bureaucracy

The abandonment of the system of the general suffrage in 1850: The assembly went into the summer vacancy in the **August 1850**. During this vacation, the providential assemblies implied the restoration of the kingdom and expressed its decision for the revision of the constitution. The constitutional solution, in which 1852 May would be the ending time of

Bonaparte's presidency and the elections for new president with the general suffrage, was not acceptable by "the sovereign class" (Marx, 1996, 149). Such a solution would mean the meeting date of all rival parties. A new nominee would meet Bonaparte. In addition, the order's party needed more executive power in his struggle with the people. But, this meant the empowerment of Bonaparte as "the trager" of the executive power. The fact that the order's party increases its common power also strengthens the claims and the means of Bonaparte. Moreover, the constitutional solution, election of the new president in 1852 May and the revision of the constitution by a special assembly, was also unacceptable in the eyes of the citizen. For him, this solution meant the civil war, anarchy, political disorder. He saw that 1852 May would bring all contracts into the danger. Political disorder meant the disorder of all bourgeois society. "The solution in its bourgeois meaning is only the postponing of the solution". This implied the extending the presidential term with the surpassing of the constitution (Marx, 1996, 149).

The constitutional solution was at the end approved by the providential assemblies and then considered positively in the presses of the order's party. Meanwhile, Bonaparte saw himself as an inevitable man while even his party attributed his rising significance to the conditions. He made public meetings taking with him the lumpenproletariat (Marx, 1996, 150-1). On the other hand, the order's party put Changarnier into the agenda as his own "neutral man" instead of Bonaparte. Changarnier's power was increased by his contribution to the victories of 29 January and 13 June 1849. Like, Bonaparte, Changarnier also "became a power out of nothing". He was put forward by the National Assembly against Bonaparte. The press exaggerated his personality. But the struggle between Bonaparte and Changarnier ended with the simple signature of Bonaparte. The struggle between them was the last part of the war between Bonaparte and the order's party. At the end, the order's party was obliged to prolong the presidential term of Bonaparte (Marx, 1996, 151-2).

18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte: The distinctive features of *18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* can be seen in its analysis of the small peasantry in the context of the rise of Bonaparte and in its concern about the question of the relative autonomy of the state. For this reason, I will focus on this aspect of this study below.

Marx, in his preface to *the 18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* in 1869, states that: unlike the other interpreters of the rise of Louis Bonaparte such as Victor Hugo and Proudhon, “I am instead demonstrating how **class struggle** in France created the conditions and the situation which provided for an ordinary and crude man to be seemed as a hero”. Hugo saw the coup as a private force of Bonaparte, while Proudhon saw it as a product of previous historical development and repeated the failure of “our so called **objective** historians”, by advocating objectively the coup maker (Marx, 1990a, 8).

The distinctive features of *18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* can be seen in its analysis of the small peasantry in the context of the rise of Bonaparte and in its concern about the question of the relative autonomy of the state. For this reason, I will focus on this aspect of this study below.

Historical Information: Just as Napoleon Bonaparte had put an end to the French revolution and to the first French Republic in **9 November of 1799**, so Louis Napoleon put an end to the 1848 revolution and to the second French Republic with the coup d'état in **2 December 1851**. Each Napoleon also replaced the republic with an imperial system. The constitution that was approved after the 1848 revolution brought the principle that the president would be elected through general suffrage. This legal mechanism was to be the means of becoming the emperor for Louis Bonaparte. He also abused the fears of the conservatives towards any socialist revolutionary uprising and socialist parliamentary success and the memory of the Jacobean dictatorship **of 1793s**. General political problems were attributed to the general suffrage. In 1850, the assembly approved an amendment in the law of elections and

deprived more than 3 million voter of the electoral right. Louis Napoleon used this opportunity and tried to obtain mass support at the expense of the assembly. He tried to seem the voice of the people. The conflict between him and the assembly clearly started. These two powers of the state would enter into a mutual manoeuvre and would try to subordinate each other. The assembly, for instance, rejected the prolongation of the presidential post to the second term. Political crisis grew in the November of **1851** and Parisians talked about a possible coup d'état. Indeed, Louis Bonaparte decided a coup even in **17 November** and made an organisation for the coup with his ministers, head of the security forces and Paris' commander of the military guard. The republicans and the assembly, on the other hand, though that the army and the security forces would defend the republic unconditionally. But, in **2 December 1851**, the coup was realised and it was proclaimed that the council of the state and the assembly would be abolished and a new election would be held. Put aside some partial resistance, three days after the coup there would be no resistance. Louis Napoleon proclaimed himself the emperor of France in **1852** and would hold this position till **1870** (Altay, 1991).

Marx, in his preface to *the 18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* in 1869, states that: unlike the other interpreters of the rise of Louis Bonaparte such as Victor Hugo and Proudhon, "I am instead demonstrating how **class struggle** in France created the conditions and the situation which provided for an ordinary and crude man to be seemed as a hero". Hugo saw the coup as a private force of Bonaparte, while Proudhon saw it as a product of previous historical development and repeated the failure of "our so called **objective** historians", by advocating objectively the coup maker (Marx, 1990b, 8).

18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte summarises the development of the 1848 revolution till abolishment of the system of the general suffrage by which the order's party completed his sovereignty despite losing its parliamentary cabinet (Marx, 1990b, 128). Later on, the order's party subsequently lost the

military heads and the legislative majority. Then the party co-operated with the republican bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeois democrats. This period was followed by the rising break between the parliament and the bourgeois press and bourgeois masses. The order's party dissolved into its fractions. At the last months of the 185, the break between the parliament and the execution occurred. The parliament was abandoned by the bourgeoisie, the army and the other classes. The parliamentary system and the rule of the bourgeois collapsed. Bonaparte won the power and proclaimed his emperorship. If we summarised the period between 24 February 1848 and 2 December 1851, we see that: 1) the **defeat of the proletariat** was followed by the dictatorship of the bourgeois republicans and the bourgeois dictatorship; 2) the **fall of the republican bourgeoisie** was followed by the 3) **fall of the petty bourgeois democracy**. This fall was followed by the parliamentary dictatorship of the order's party; 4) **the order's party became weaker** and weaker after the abandonment of the general suffrage. It lost its legislative power, the press and the bourgeois masses and begun to dissolve and at the end, 5) **Bonaparte seized the absolute power**. In 1) all classes struggled against the proletariat. In 2) the fall was provided by the presidency of Bonaparte. In 3) the petty bourgeois democrats were defeated by the big bourgeoisie and Bonaparte. In 4) the order's party lost all power in its struggle with the masses and Bonaparte (Marx, 1990b, 128-9).

"The SOCIAL republic" was defeated by the fall of the Parisian proletariat in 1848 June. "Democratic republic" was defeated with the fall of the petty bourgeoisie in 13 June 1848. "Parliamentary republic" was defeated in 2 December by the unity of the royalists, and by the "lumpenproletariat in whose head Bonaparte was existed (Marx, 1990b, 130-31). The French bourgeoisie who feared of the threat of the red republic in the future put the lumpenproletariat and Bonaparte into the power. What the bourgeoisie had done against the public meetings, against the democratic National Guard, now these measures were put into action against itself (Marx, 1990b, 131).

2 December's coup d'état did not create any proletarian revolt since any revolt could produce a new bourgeois union with the possible support of the army, and because of the memories of the previous defeats in 1848 and 1849 Junes and since their leaders were arrested by Bonaparte's operation in the night of 2 December and also because the bourgeoisie easily gave up its arms to the soldiers. A conservative, Guizot, saw 2 December as a victory of socialism. But, Marx states that although the destruction of the parliamentary republic involves in itself the victory of the proletarian revolution, its direct results were the victory of Bonaparte over the parliament, the executive power over the legislative power, and the force over the verbal force (Marx, 1990b, 134-5). In the parliament, the nation makes the law of the sovereign class its own will. On the other hand, the executive power means an alien authority. France, with the force of Bonaparte, seemed to escape from the force of a class. The struggle seemed to be losing its energy. All classes were weak and silent before the force (Marx, 1990b, 135).

Nonetheless, Marx suggests that the revolution was not yet matured. It completed what it wanted to destroy. It develops the parliamentary power in order to destroy it and now, it develops the executive power and reduces it into its simple elements and isolates it (Marx, 1990b, 135). What was in fact wanted by the February revolution was performed by 2 December. The coup liquidated all men who had been disliked since the July revolution of 1830 (Marx, 1990b, 132). And the parliamentary republic revealed the class sovereignty of the bourgeoisie including all parts of it. The revolution developed the most extensive and the most general and the most completed form of the sovereignty of the bourgeois class (Marx, 1990b, 133). The immense power of the execution, with "its military and bureaucratic organisation", with "complex and artificial state mechanisms", with its army of the servants and soldiers, this "parasitic structure emerged in the destruction of feudality to whose destruction it contributed in the period of the absolute kingdom (Marx, 1990b, 135-6). The feudal privileges were turned into the qualifications in the state. The upper echelons of the feudality became state

personnel. The first French revolution established “the bourgeois union of the nation” with the central state, and Napoleon developed and completed this centralised state mechanism. The constitutional monarchy and the July monarchy added to the state mechanism only several divisions of labour because of newly emerged “interests groups”. The “superior interest” became the “general interest” and was rendered “the subject of government affairs”. “All political revolutions did not do anything than strengthening this machine instead of destructing it” (Marx, 1990b, 136).

For the peasants, “the historical tradition” of France created a condition in a way that a man named Napoleon could give them their bright past. Marx states that the thoughts of Bonaparte and the thoughts of the peasants coincided and together led into emperorship (Marx, 1990b, 139). However, Marx takes attention to the uprisings of the peasants in the many parts of the country and to the arrestment of the peasants, and violent behaviour shown to them in this period. This is not contradictory, however, when it is seen that “Bonapartes’ line does not represent the revolutionary peasants, but conservative peasants”. Their line does not represent “the rural people which wants to overthrow the old society with a close collaboration with the cities”. Their line does represent the peasants which try to protect the existing conditions in rural areas. Their line represents “the belief” and “the past” and “the prejudices” of the peasants rather than their “judgement”, “future” and “progress”. Their line represents the peasant which wanted privileges for their parcels and for themselves (Marx, 1990b, 139-40).

In the oppressive period of three years’ parliamentary republic, a part of the peasants became revolutionary at least in the surface level and “their modern conscious got into contradiction with their traditional conscious”. This contradictory process manifested itself in “continuous struggle” between “the teachers and the monks”, and then between “the mayors and the governors”. The bourgeoisie attacked the teachers and dismissed the mayors. The peasantry was first getting an independent attitude towards the government.

In some parts of the country, the peasants revolted against the army. The bourgeoisie introduced martial law and reacted with capital punishments. But, it is ironical that Marx observed that the bourgeoisie soon began to accuse the peasant of being “stupid” and having supported Bonaparte (Marx, 1990b, 140). However, all conditions of “this peasant religion”, “Imperialismus” had been “kept as it was” and even “strengthened” by the bourgeoisies itself (Marx, 1990b, 140-1).

Marx points to the condition of the free holder peasants which had been created by the first French revolution. The first revolution turned “semi-serf peasants into free land holders” and Napoleon arranged and developed their conditions. These holdings and the divisions of land, this form of property which had been strengthened by Napoleon now took the peasantry to destruction. “The material conditions which turned the feudal peasant into small holder peasant and made Napoleon the emperor are clearly these”. However, “the inevitable result was for the two generations after increasing debts of the agriculturalist and ever worsening of the agricultural conditions. This “Napoleonic’ form of property” which had been “the necessary condition of freedom and the wealth of the French peasant population” became “the very first reason” behind “the servitude and the impoverishment of the peasant” (Marx, 1990b, 141). Such a situation was the dilemma before the second Bonaparte. He was obliged to advocate new situation of the peasants and he did not see that the “destruction of the peasants” were caused by “the small land property itself” rather than stemming externally from “the effects of secondary ordinary conditions” (Marx, 1990b, 142).

Here we follow Marx about “**the contradictory task**” of Bonaparte” (Marx, 1990b, 149). “The bourgeoisie... had no choice but to elect Bonaparte. Force or the anarchy.“. It saw him the protector of “the bourgeois order”. Bonaparte, being the executive power which made it independent from the society, recognised that “his mission was to obtain “the trust of ‘the bourgeois society’”. But Marx states that “the strength of the bourgeois order is the

middle class". But he destroyed the political power of this class although he issued some decrees in its name. His power resulted from the fact that he had weakened the political power of this class. Nevertheless, he recreates, by "protecting the material power of the bourgeoisie", "its political power" (Marx, 1990b, 148). But, what he did and why he did was confused with each other (Marx, 1990b, 148-9). He saw himself against the bourgeoisie as a protector of the peasantry and the people in general. This attitude confused the minds of the "True socialists". On the other hand, he first of all saw himself, as "the representative of the lumpenproletariat" to which "he himself, his circle, the government and the army belonged". This "contradictory task of the man" explains why he sometimes support this or that class, or attack this or that class, or at the end why he confronts all classes. Industry and commerce has to develop as if they have good conditions for them. On the other hand, the lumpenproletariat has to be supported (Marx, 1990b, 149). The banks are forced to finance the railways. But at the same time they are wanted to be exploited. For this exploitation, they are forgiven from some obligations. The mass had to be employed. For this, public works are demanded. In order to prevent the state debt, the interest over the state debt is reduced at the expense of the rentiers. This is compensated by increasing drink taxes in the interest of the middle classes. The workings organisations were destructed. But the peasant has to be supported. But this is done with land credit banks which lead into the indebtedness of the peasant and into the concentration of land property. But since these banks are established for monetary returns, the decree about the land bank is left in papers (Marx, 1990b, 150). Bonaparte, says Marx, wanted to become the representative of all classes. "But he can give nothing to a any class without taking from other class" (Marx, 1990b, 150). In his period, everything, from the state posts to the public services became "the subject of buying and selling" (Marx, 1990ab, 151). Bonaparte, "under the pressure of the contradictions required by the condition", "infringers everything which seemed to be unbreakable for the 1848 revolution" and "creates anarchy in the name of order" by enjoying the state mechanism (Marx, 1990b, 152).

The relative autonomy of the state and bureaucratic tool: According to the schema presented by Marx, the relative autonomy of the state and its bureaucratic tool is closely related with the absence of the dominant ruling classes. No one could govern in its own way. There was a kind of power balance.

For Marx, the “bureaucracy was nothing but the means to prepare the class sovereignty of the bourgeoisie” from the period of absolute monarchy to Napoleon Bonaparte. In the periods of Restoration, of Louis Philippe and of the parliamentary republic, it was “a tool of the sovereign class whatever its attempts to form an independent power by itself were” (Marx, 1990b, 137). But, in Louis Bonaparte’s period, “the state seems to have been fully independent”. “The state machine gets stronger so much against the bourgeois society”, that, its head could be a man like Bonaparte who was the head of the Association of 2 December. But, Bonaparte was not made up of only Bonaparte himself. “Despite this, says Marx, the state power does not stand in the air. Bonaparte represents very certain and even the most populous class of French society, that is, the small holder peasants”. The Bonapartes are the line of the peasants, which is the popular mass of France, just as Bourbons had been the line of the great landed property and the Orleans the line of money. The election of 10 December 1848 was being completed by 2 December 1851’s coup. Between these two dates, the cities succeeded of changing the meaning of the 10 December’s election (Marx, 1990b, 137).

5.3. PROLETARIAT

Erdost and Kaymak said that: as the number of the proletariat increases in a natural way, some parts of the petty bourgeoisie is transformed into the proletariat and surplus population in the villages enter into the front of the proletariat. The working class is the most productive section of the society. Although its income increases “**relatively**” through economic struggle, it is

the most exploited class. It has the habits of organisation and struggle. It is the most revolutionary class. The main obstacle before its development is the imperialist exploitation and the imperialist system. When it overthrows the imperialism and feudal landownership, it liberates itself from the imperialist exploitation, weakens the world capitalism, the imperialism, clears the path before the development of the productive forces and the socialist revolution, and liberates itself from the imperialist pressure and reactionism, and obtains democratic liberties. Erdost and Kaymak conclude: "For this reason, the proletariat is the **foundational** and **leading** force of the revolution" (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 309).

If the proletariat is "the **foundational** and **leading** force", the poor peasantry is "the **foundational** moving force". The urban petty bourgeoisie is "the **ally** of the revolutionary classes". Finally, the national bourgeoisie is a force which must be "neutralised" during the struggle against the imperialism and the feudalism. It should be noted that these classes are counted under the name of the revolutionary classes. These are indeed *social classes*. The other elements of the revolution are the Kemalist revolutionaries, intellectuals, professionals, youth and the most importantly the proletarian revolutionaries. I will deal with them below.

5.3.1 The Struggle for a Normal Working Day

Marx's *Capital*, and particularly the *Volume 1 of Capital*, among others, analyses how the capitalist as the personification of capital disciplines labour and labourer. Machines are weapon against the freedom of labourer and instruments to prevent time loses and to increase productivity of labour. In Turkey, machines and industrial system are not considered from the question of disciplining labour power, freedom and class struggle of capital against its fellow capitalist and labourers. Machines are considered only in terms of economic independency of the country. So working time is not a subject

matter for analysis. On the other hand, for Marx, machines, time economics and class struggle are the different attributes of the same set of relationships.

Laws for the Compulsory Extension of the Working Day, From the Middle of the Fourteenth to the End of the Seventeenth Century: The “maximum of labour-time”, which is the only interest of capitalist, is attained by “shortening the life of labour-power, in the same way as a greedy farmer snatches more produce from the soil by robbing it of its fertility” (Marx, 1990a, 376). However, the extension of the production time of the workers is not only a risk for the reproduction of the worker, but also for “the continuing existence of the working class”. If so, states Marx, “the forces used up have to be replaced more rapidly”. For this reason, it is “the interest of capital itself” that “points in the direction of a normal working day”. This is similar case with the slave-owner who “buys his worker...as he buys his horse. If he loses his slave, he loses a piece of capital, which he must replace by fresh expenditure on the slave-market” (Marx, 1990a, 377). (“For slave trade, read labour-market”, see Marx, 1990a, 378). For the capitalist, there is always an excess of population and Marx observes that “the degeneration of the industrial population is retarded only by the constant absorption of primitive and natural elements from the countryside” (Marx, 1990a, 380). In the face of these possibilities, “Capital therefore takes no account of the health and the length of life of the worker, unless society forces it to do so”. Individual capitalist’s answer to the problems of labouring population is not based on his good or bad will. “Under free competition, the immanent laws of capitalist production confront the individual capitalist as a coercive force external to him” (Marx, 1990a, 381). The externality is ensured here by the requirements of the competitive relationship between individual capitalist. It is a relation rather than a mode of behaviour caused by the individual characteristic of the individual capitalist per se. Marx quotes in some capitalists who want to limit the working hours of children. He says, “Competition with other capitalists, they said, did not allow them to limit the hours worked by children voluntarily”. Furthermore, for any limitation of the working hours, or to say in general, a

betterment of the working conditions that can be the result of the agreement between the capitalists is impossible because of the same imperatives of competition as an external coercive force. Consequently, as commission reports about the question admitted that “some legislative enactment is wanted”. If there is an mutual consent of the capitalist, “the wealthier manufacturers” behave at the expense of the smaller capitalists. The latter also may agitate and support the workers for lower working hours (Marx, 1990a, note 82,381-2).

A normal working day is a product of “centuries of struggle between the capitalist and the worker”. Between the 14.century and the mid 18.century, factory legislation in England tries forcibly to lengthen the working day while the modern factory acts “compulsorily” shorten it. In the former period, capital is weak and “cannot yet use the sheer force of economic relations to secure its right to absorb a sufficient quantity of surplus labour, but must be aided by the power of the state”. The development of the capitalist mode of production creates the condition in which “free worker... makes a voluntary agreement, i.e. is compelled by social conditions to sell the whole of his active life, his very capacity for labour, in return for the price of his customary means of subsistence, to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage”. Marx states that it is not abnormal now to try to save children from excessive exploitation. The extra day which was imposed by the state upon adult workers of the previous period is now amount of reduction made by the state in the working day of the children (Marx, 1990a, 382). The role of the state changes according both to the power and requirements of capital accumulation and to the results of struggle between the capitalist and the worker. It is also seen that the low level of development of the capital entails the force of the state because of the absence of “the sheer force of economic relations”. The state, by using forcible measures, completes the power of the immature capital.

In the similar way of the establishment of a normal working day, “reasonable wages” are also fixed by law because reasonable wage and “reasonable quantity of surplus-value” forms an antinomy (Marx, 1990a, 383).

Before the formation of modern large-scale industry, English capital cannot completely control the whole week of the workers only by giving them weekly payments. Working only four days was sufficient for the workers to live whole week (Marx, 1990a, 385). A party of political economists defends the workers and another party replied in the opposite direction. The debate is not so distant from the ones that can be seen in the every ideological dispute over the working conditions and industrial relations of the present time. One party observes that over work and low wage level and the complete control of workers’ life by the capital makes man into an animal and leaves no free time and play for the workers. The other party replies by mentioning the conditions of the country in comparison with other rival nations, by rejecting the idleness, positive results of capital accumulation. Poor becomes poorer if there is no wealth produced by capital to the requirements of capital. What is suggested is “a spirit of industry”, and an “ideal workhouse”, and that working people “should never think themselves independent of their superiors”. What was seen as a cure to the antinomy between the reasonable wage and reasonable surplus labour time in 1770 is 14 hours-six working day a week in return of the same payment of the four days before. The debate was this. However, Marx states that, after 63 years, 12 hours working day for children is legally recognised by many parliaments in Europe. Nonetheless, what was demanded by the spokesmen of the capital in 1770s would be met in the context of a new workhouse, which is called “the factory” (Marx, 1990a, 388-9). The Antinomy would be changed into a dialectic contradiction that is to be surpassed in a higher level of accumulation, organisation and struggle of capital with labour.

The Struggle for a Normal Working Day. Laws for the Compulsory Limitation of Working Hours. The English Factory Legislation of 1833-64: We have seen

that as the capital struggles for the prolongation of the working day and for lower wages in order to *take the full control of workers' life*, it meets the workers' resistance (mainly in the form of strikes) from without and some attacks that are levelled by some parties of political economy (see the defenders of workers, Marx, 1990a, 386, note 8) and some legal restrictions from within (laws, regulations, reports of the inspectors of factory law, etc.). The result of capital's struggle would be the large-scale industry that emerges in "the last third of the eighteenth century". With the factory "Every boundary set by morality and nature, age and sex, day and night, was broken down". However, "As soon as the working class... had recovered its senses to some extent, it began to offer resistance, first of all England, the native land of large-scale industry". But, despite labour laws passed by Parliament between 1802 and 1833, children worked all night, all day. Marx observes that English factory legislation from 1833 to 1864 perfectly characterises the "spirit of capital" (Marx, 1990a, 390).

The Factory Act of 1844 was based on a special conjuncture in which workers' mobilisation was accompanied with the complaints of some manufacturers who applied the Act of 1833 in their factories against their "immoral" competitors capable of running the work places against the Act. In addition, the advocates of free trade were changing their attitudes towards workers and needed the help of workers in their struggle against the Corn Law. When the time of free trade could come into existence, share of workers would rise and working day was to be reduced to ten hours. The latter promises were among the demands put forward by factory workers since 1838. The factory workers issued a manifesto in may **1838 as called "People's Charter"**, which called for some political rights (universal suffrage, and some electoral reforms) and ten hours working a day. Marx observes that these manufacturers were content only with the full application of the Act of 1833. Free traders confronted sever attacks of the conservative Tories party (interest of the rent of land). The result would be an addition made to the Act of 1833, in 1844 June (Marx, 1990a, 393).

The working hours of women over 18 was limited to 12 hours a day. Their night work was forbidden. In addition, the labour of adult workers was to be controlled by legislative measures. The working hours of children was reduced to 6 ½. In order to prevent abuses, a detailed regulation system, which defines parts of working process (the duration, the limits and pauses of work, meal times) in terms of cloak, was accepted. Marx observes that these were “by no means a product of the fantasy of Members of Parliament. They developed gradually out of circumstances as natural laws of the modern mode of production. Their formulation, official recognition and proclamation by the state were the result of a long **class** struggle” (Marx, 1990a, 395).

Consequently, the Factory Act of 1847 (June 8) reduced the working day from 12 to 11 for the children (13-18) and females from 1 July 1847 on, and then to 10 hours from 1 May 1848 on. However, capital starts its campaign to prevent the complete implementation of the law in 1 May 1848. For the other groups of workers, the acts of 1833 and 1844 would be valid. On the other hand, Marx says that the workers were no longer inexperienced (Marx, 1990a, 395). The campaign of capital was based on the results of the crisis of 1846-7. They pointed to the economic conditions of “the factory operatives” who suffered from the closed mills, debts, and decreasing capacity of production that were the results of the crisis. To the claims made by the manufacturers, the workers (the factory operatives) would want to work longer to make up for their situation.

Capital goes on his propaganda. However, a new factory inspection reveals once that the workers preferred ten hour even though their wages were to be reduced. Nonetheless, “they had no choice” in the face of unemployment, says Marx. The choice was between longer working times with lower wages and unemployment (Marx, 1990a, 397). However, the general result is this:

The preliminary campaign of capital thus came to grief, and the Ten Hours’ Act came into force on 1 May 1848. Meanwhile, however, the fiasco of the Chartist party, whose leaders had been imprisoned, and

whose organisations dismembered, had shattered the self-confidence of the English working class. Soon after this the June insurrection in Paris and its bloody suppression united, in England as on the Continent, all fractions of the ruling **class**, land-owners and capitalists, stock-exchange sharks and small-time shop-keepers, Protectionists and Freetraders, government and opposition, priests and free-thinkers, young whores and old nuns, under the common slogan of the salvation of property, religion, the family and society. Everywhere the working class was outlawed, anathematised, placed under the '*loi des suspects*' (Marx, 1990a, 397).

The manufacturers go on their agitation against the restrictions over the exploitation of labour-power. Marx presents their attitude as a "pro-slavery rebellion" in that "the rebel capitalist risked nothing but the skin of his workers as in the case of the American Civil War between 1861 and 1865. But, none of the Factory acts in fact had changed the working hours for the adult male workers (over 18). For them, the legal 15 hours remained the same. After ten Hours' Act, manufacturers dismissed the young and women workers, by replacing them with adult male workers (Marx, 1990a, 398). When they replied to the inspectors, manufacturers argued that they were obliged to use the relay system for young workers and women because of the limitation of the working hours with 12 hours (Marx, 1990a, 400). In addition, this system allowed them to "pay higher wages" to their workers. Moreover, otherwise, the supremacy of Great Britain would be put under risk. Some irregularities had to be ignored when the interest of the country was concerned. However, some factory inspectors appealed to the courts for these irregularities realised by the manufacturers against the law. Nonetheless, 15-hour period of the factory day and relay system were restored throughout Scotland by the legal support of the Home Secretary (Marx, 1990a, 401). Inspectors appealing to the courts, on the other hand, described the courts as "judicial farces" in that some of justices consisted of manufacturers applying relay system in their manufactories (Marx, 1990a, 402).

Put aside over-work, says Marx, relay system indeed demonstrates the imagination of capital. Working personnel was sometimes divided into twelve or fifteen sets of workers and the composition of these sets underwent a

constant change. Marx says that this imagination went beyond even the imaginative power of Fourier (who suggested short sessions, which was “the passion for variety”, for the workers to make them more attractive, see editorial information, Marx, 1990a, 403) Marx narrates us the creativity of capital in factory: “During the 15 hours of the factory day, capital dragged in the worker now for 30 minutes, now for an hour, and then pushed him out again, to drag him into the factory and thrust him out afresh, hounding him hither and thither, in scattered shreds of time, without ever letting go until the full 10 hours of work was done”. In this system, “the hours of rest were turned into hours of enforced idleness” as the actors waiting for their roles behind the scene (Marx, 1990a, 403). By doing this, capitalist could run the factory for 12 or 15 hours without increasing the number of workers. In their reply to the ten hour’ agitation, they argued that the workers wanted 12 hours’ payment for the 10 hours’ work. Marx says that now “they reversed the medal” by paying “10 hours’ wages for 12 or 15 hours’ disposition over the workers’ labour-power” (Marx, 1990a, 404).

Capital’s revolt from 1848 to 1850 at the end was supported by a High Court decision, which decided that although the manufacturers acted against the Act of 1844, the act itself made the ten hour’s working day meaningless (Marx, 1990a, 404). This victory of capital was met by the workers’ counter-stroke. The massive meetings were organised for calling Ten Hours’ Act as “a parliamentary fraud”. Meanwhile, factory inspectors took attention of the government to the fact that “**class** antagonisms had reached an unheard-of degree of tension”. On the other side, some manufacturers participated in the chorus and pointed to the different court decisions in different regions. Moreover, manufacturers in big cities could eliminate the legal restrictions while the country manufacturers could not find adequate number of workers for shift system. Marx formulates these sorts of claims as that “the most fundamental right under the law of capital is the equal exploitation of labour-power by all capitalists” (Marx, 1990a, 405).

Marx gladly observes that “the principle”, that is the long-lasting struggle for a *normal* working day,

had triumphed with its victory in those great branches of industry which form the most characteristic creation of the modern mode of production. Their wonderful development from 1853 to 1860, hand-in-hand with the physical and moral regeneration of the factory workers, was visible to the weakest eyes (Marx, 1990a, 408).

This victory “had been wrung step by step in the course of a civil war lasting half a century” from the manufacturers. However, this defeat of capital expressed a contrast with “the areas of exploitation which were still ‘free’” (Marx, 1990a, 408-9). But, “capital’s power of resistance gradually weakened, while at the same time the working class’s power of attack grew with the number of its allies in those social layers not directly interested in the question. Hence, the comparatively rapid progress since 1860” (Marx, 1990a, 409).

Marx recalls that the English factory workers are the pioneer not only of the English working class, but also of the modern working class as a whole. For this reason, their theorists were also the first critics of “the theory of the capitalists”. Robert Owen, in the 1810s, reduced the working day to ten hours in his factory at New Lanark. Marx says that this was “laughed at as a communist utopia”. Similarly, his combination of education for children with production process and the workers’ cooperatives he suggested were seen as the parts of the same utopia. Marx ironically observes that, the first and the second “utopia” were now officially accepted in the factory acts, and the idea of workers’ cooperatives is “already used as a cloak for reactionary swindles” (Marx, 1990a, 413, and note 58).

As for the situation of the struggle of American working class (US), Marx observed that the independent movement began after the abolition of slavery. The slavery had paralysed the workers’ movement by dividing it into black and white, and rendering meaningless the emancipation of the white

workers. Nonetheless, the fruit of the civil war (1861-65) would be the movement for the eight hours' working day, which also agitated the Europe. Marx quotes from the August 1866 declaration of the General Congress of Labour held in Baltimore: "The first and great necessity of the present, to free the labour of this country from capitalistic slavery, is the passing of a law by which eight hours shall be the normal working day in all States of the American Union. We are resolved to put forth all our strength until this glorious result is attained" (Marx, 1990a, 414). and the September 1866's resolution of the Congress of the International Working Men's Association (drafted by Marx and proposed by the London General Council) declared that "the limitation of the working day is a preliminary condition without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation must prove abortive ... the Congress proposes eight hours as the legal limit of the working day" (Marx, 1990a, 415). Marx says that this declaration echoes the words of an English factory inspector (R.J. Saunders) in October 1848: "Further steps towards a reformation of society can never be carried out with any hope of success, unless the hours of labour be limited, and the prescribed limit strictly enforced" (Marx, 1990a, 415).

Marx says that worker's entrance to the production process is rather different from its emergence from the same process. In the market, he as an owner of a commodity, labour-power stands equal with the other commodity owners. In his selling activity, the stage of contract, he is free to dispose of his labour-power. Once the transaction (selling and buying act) was complete, it was revealed that the worker was no longer a "free agent" and that the period of free contract is "the period of time for which he is forced to sell" the labour-power (Marx, 1990a, 415). The capitalist, "in fact the vampire will not let go 'while there remains a single muscle, sinew or drop of blood to be exploited'" (quoted in Engels by Marx) (Marx, 1990a, 416). Against the vampire like capital, or capitalist, Marx's suggestion is this: "the workers have to put their heads together and, as a **class**, compel the passing of a law, an all-powerful social barrier by which they can be prevented from selling themselves and

their families into slavery and death by voluntary contract with capital". The limitation of the working day is a modest step, for Marx, but "which at last makes clear 'when the time which the worker sells is ended, and when his own begins'" (Marx, 1990a, 416).

As stated above, Marx observes that as the workers movement develops, it finds out allies that are not directly in production process. Apart from the parties of some propertied **classes**, the English factory inspectors gave useful official statements that could be used in favour of the analysis of the workers struggle and their plans. Among others, 1859 *Reports of the Inspectors of Factories* said that

Moreover, Marx states that the inspectors' reports ironically hint that

the present Ten Hours' Act also frees the capitalist from some of the brutality natural to a man who is merely an embodiment of capital, and that it has given him time for a little 'culture'.

Impact of the English Factory Legislation on Other Countries: Marx observes that capital's extension of the working day first appeared in the "revolutionised" industries and in the early "creations of the modern mode of production". "The changed material mode of production" and "correspondingly changed social relations of producers" first leads into extremes (Marx, 1990a, 411), but then to a "social control, which legally limits, regulates and makes uniform the working day and its pauses". The control begins first by a partial legislation in the form of Factory Acts, for instance, and then spreads over the other branches of industry that are entering the influence of the factory system (Marx, 1990a, 412). The development of the regulation of the working day demonstrates that "the isolated worker, the worker as 'free' seller of his labour-power, succumbs without resistance once capitalist production has reached a certain stage of maturity". In this situation in which the worker is *isolated* while the capitalist production is in a certain stage of maturity, regulation for the normal working

day could be “the product of a protracted and more or less concealed civil war between the capitalist **class** and the working **class**” (Marx, 1990a, 412-13). It should be noted that Marx does not use the term “**class war**”, or “**class struggle**”, but the term *civil war* between two **classes**. The reason of this is stated above as that, “the isolated worker...succumbs without resistance once capitalist production has reached a certain stage of maturity”. In addition, the term “civil” implies that the war has not yet reached a *political* stage.

As for the other countries, Marx points to the situation of France. As demonstrated above, English Chartists called forth the ten hour’s working day since the end of the 1830s and achieved this result partially in 1847-48. On the other hand, Marx says “France limps slowly behind England”. France demanded twelve hours in the 1848 February revolution (Marx, 1990a, 413). Nonetheless, the advantage of France was its “revolutionary method”. Only in one case, France

dictates the same limits to the working day in all shops and factories without distinction, whereas the English legislation yields reluctantly to the pressure of circumstances, now on this point, now on that, and is well on the way to creating an inextricable tangle of contradictory enactments. Moreover, the French law proclaims as a principle what in England was only won in the name of children, minors and women, and has only recently been claimed, for the first time, as a universal right”(Marx, 1990a, 414).

France, despite its slowness, can create more universal changes in a short period and can proclaim the products of his success as a principle, as a universal right. France is not a country of gradual change, i.e. reformism. Its relative backwardness, its internal tensions in the face of fierce international competition deprive it from the possibility of gradual-reformist change.

5.3.2 Uncompleted Proletarian Revolution: 1848 February

From 25 February to 25 June 1848: The state suffered from financial crisis. The solution was to tax the hegemonic section of the bourgeoisie. However, state debts, public works and speculation were the sources of the wealth of this section (Marx, 1996, 34-5). Marx states that the July Monarchy was nothing but a “joint stock company established for the exploitation of the French national wealth” in favour of the ministers, assembly, the limited electorate and their supporters. However, this system threaded “commerce, industry, agriculture, maritime business and the interests of the industrial bourgeoisies” (Marx, 1996, 36). Defects of the system affected all levels of social life since financial aristocracy dominated the assembly, public administration, public opinion through press and other means. “Financial aristocracy, said Marx, was “nothing but the renewal of the lumpenproletariat at the top of the bourgeois society” (Marx, 1996, 36). On the hand, in addition to moral degeneration in society and to the devaluation of national money, foreign policy of the state led into the national disappointments (Marx, 1996, 37).

The constituent government was a totality of different sections of society who shared the victory. “It could be only *a consensus between various classes* who together thrown away the July throne but whose interests were antagonistic”. Majority of its members was composed of the representatives of the bourgeoisie. “Republican petty bourgeoisie” was represented by Ledru-Rollin and Falcon, and “republican bourgeoisie” by the circle of National. Put aside the opposition of the feudal lines, the working class had only two representatives, Louis Blanc and Albert. Lastly, Lamartine did not represent directly any class at the beginning. But, Marx states that he belonged to the bourgeoisie in terms of his position and ideas. This Lamartine rejected the workers’ demand for the proclamation of the republic. Republic had to be established only by the general suffrage rather than any forceful class action.

“Bourgeoisie recognised only the right for the forceful action to the proletariat: force of the war” (Marx, 1996, 39).

It is ironical that the proletariat greeted this patrol guards and saw them as its “pioneer” and “*proletarian* warriors against the bourgeois national guards. Marx observes that “Its mistake was unforgivable mistake”. In addition, the government recruited another army from industrial workers to employ them in the so called national workshops. It thought that it had formed another army against the proletariat. But, as Marx says, in this time, the bourgeoisie erred. “The bourgeoisie had created *an army that was to rebel*” (Marx, 1996, 51). These workshops were rather different from the workshops of Louis Blanc. But since their labels were the same, they were considered as first examples of socialism. Nonetheless, they became the means for the workers to protest bourgeois republic. For this reason, as far as the bourgeoisies gained power so as to able to break from the imaginations of the February revolution, it started its attacks against these workshops. Besides these bourgeois attacks, the petty bourgeoisie saw these workshops as the source of their economic problems. The workers movement, workshops and the words of Luxembourg were the reasons they found behind their poverty. Marx states that “nobody had been as much fanatical against the so called provocations of the communists as the petty bourgeois who did not have any hope in a squeezed position before bankruptcy” (Marx, 1996, 52).

16 April witnessed a provocation organised by the government and the bourgeoisie. There was a rumour circulating that the workers gathered in hippodrome and Champ-de-Mars and would proclaim the communist government instead of the constituent government under the leadership of Blanc, Blanqui, Cabet and Raspail. Immediately, the National Guard surrounded Hotel de Ville and whole Paris shout slogans “Down with Blanc, Blanqui, Raspail, Cabet!”, “Down with Communists!” But, the workers had appeared in Hotel de Ville to offer money collected with the homeland loving feelings to the constituent government. This event became a pretext for the

re-introduction of the army to Paris. Marx states that this provocation, like reactionist federalist demonstrations in the countryside, aimed at this result (Marx, 1996, 54).

General suffrage is not a magical thing as republicanism attributed to it. These saw French voters only the citizens who have same interests and same distinguishing capability. They preyed to the people. But elections revealed “the real representatives in which people was divided into various classes rather than into their *imagined people*”. Marx says that peasants and petty bourgeois had to vote for old order under the leadership of big land owners. and again for him, even if the system of general suffrage has not any magical tool to create magnificent results, it had some merits in that it reveals real relations of dominations and real interests of the dominating exploiters and in that it demystify relations of domination (Marx, 1996, 54-5).

From 25 February to 25 June 1848: Marx suggests that before 1848 revolution, that is the period of Louis Philippe after 1830 July revolution, dominant class in France was a section of bourgeoisie rather than the bourgeoisies as a whole. It was financial aristocracy. On the other hand, industrial bourgeoisie was a part of the formal opposition. It was a minority in the assembly. The hegemonic position belonged to the former section (Marx, 1996, 33). As for the other classes, Marx observes that petty bourgeoisies as a whole, and peasantry were deprived of the political power. The ideological representatives of these classes also lived the same fate (Marx, 1996, 34).

Two economic events ripened general dissatisfactions towards general uprising in the worldwide level. In 1845 and 1846, the worldwide economic problem was seen in the fall of agricultural production. The scarcity of 1847 led into bloody riots both in France and in the continent. These events, says Marx, increased the solidarity within the masses (Marx, 1996, 37-8). The other development was the general commercial and industrial crisis in England. In such a conjuncture, the February revolution broke out.

The bourgeois opposition put into the agenda a voting reform in order to throw away the financial aristocracy with the support of majority. All bankrupted bourgeoisies would participate in the revolutionary actions in February. In this month, action of the people and the passive attitude of the army resulted in the establishment of a constituent government instead of the July Monarchy (Marx, 1996, 38-9).

In February of 1848, even before the proclamation of the republic, political posts were shared among the bourgeois members of the constituent government (Marx, 1996, 39). However, the workers were determined to impose the republic and general suffrage. This occurred with the treat of the arms. However, this event made the bourgeoisie forget even the limited aims of the revolution. The seemingly independent appearance of the state before the bourgeois society was disappearing. "By dictating the republic to the Provisional Government, and through the Provisional Government to the whole of France, the proletariat immediately stepped into the foreground as an independent party" (for translation, www.Marxists.org/archive/Marx, in Turkish, Marx, 1996, 40). But, what it won was only a scene rather than its liberation. Rather, what the revolution had to make was to "*complete the bourgeois supremacy*" by driving all bourgeois classes into the sphere of political power besides financial aristocracy (Marx, 1996, 40-1). With the revolution, the peasants who were seemingly the property owners obtained the decisive position over the fate of France. In addition, the revolution made clear the bourgeois domination which had been hidden behind the throne before. The difference for the workers between the July revolution and the present one was, for Marx, that in the former they fight for the bourgeois monarchy encircled with the republican institutions, while in the latter they fight for the bourgeois republic encircled with social institutions. But, the product of this social demand was only the establishment of Luxembourg's commission by which the problems of working life would be ineffectively handled. Marx observes that the real power of the state was transferred to the bourgeois members of the government (Marx, 1996, 41).

The workers made the February revolution with the collaboration of the bourgeoisie. They tried to secure their interests near the bourgeoisie...". But this only meant the organisation of the labour within its bourgeois context". Considered the other bourgeois ministries, a proletarian working ministration did not imply anything and any power, as in the case of Luxembourg's commission of Louis Blanc and Albert. Marx states that "if wage labour does not exist, so capital and bourgeois society does not exist". Liberation of the workers was impossible side by side with the bourgeoisie, just as completion of proletarian revolution within the context of France was impossible side by side with the other bourgeois nations. Unlike the workers thought so, "the relations of production of France, says Marx, were conditioned by its foreign trade and by its condition within the world market and by the laws of this market". For any possible success, a revolutionary war in European level, which could influence England that was the tyrant of the world market, was needed (Marx, 1996, 42). Here the problem is not to start a proletarian revolution, but to complete this revolution and this is impossible when the position of the workers in the February revolution is considered. The proletariat was not yet mature for the representation of the revolutionary interest of the society, for a suitable position in terms of the enemies to be overthrow, and in terms of the essential requirements of warriorship and the forwardly oriented results of its action. It knows by practice what it is its own special task. However, "The French working class did not arrive at this point; it did not yet become capable of completing its own revolution" (Marx, 1996, 43).

The reasons Marx offers behind this incapability of the proletariat in the completion of its own revolution are related with the connection between the development of industrial capital and proletarian revolution. Now let me quote a long passage from Marx:

The development of the industrial proletariat is, in general, conditioned by the development of the industrial bourgeoisie. Only under its rule

does the proletariat gain that extensive national existence which can raise its revolution to a national one, and only thus does the proletariat itself create the modern means of production, which become just so many means of its revolutionary emancipation. Only bourgeois rule tears up the material roots of feudal society and levels the ground on which alone a proletarian revolution is possible. French industry is more developed and the French bourgeoisie more revolutionary than that of the rest of the Continent. But was not the February Revolution aimed directly against the finance aristocracy? This fact proved that the industrial bourgeoisie did not rule France. The industrial bourgeoisie can rule only where modern industry shapes all property relations to suit itself, and industry can win this power only where it has conquered the world market, for national bounds are inadequate for its development. But French industry, to a great extent, maintains its command even of the national market only through a more or less modified system of prohibitive duties. While, therefore, the French proletariat, at the moment of a revolution, possesses in Paris actual power and influence which spur it on to a drive beyond its means, in the rest of France it is crowded into separate, scattered industrial centers, almost lost in the superior number of peasants and petty bourgeois. The struggle against capital in its developed, modern form — in its decisive aspect, the struggle of the industrial wage worker against the industrial bourgeois — is in France a partial phenomenon, which after the February days could so much the less supply the national content of the revolution, since the struggle against capital's secondary modes of exploitation, that of the peasant against usury and mortgages or of the petty bourgeois against the wholesale dealer, banker, and manufacturer — in a word, against bankruptcy — was still hidden in the general uprising against the finance aristocracy. Nothing is more understandable, then, than that the Paris proletariat sought to secure the advancement of its own interests side by side with those of the bourgeoisie, instead of enforcing them as the revolutionary interests of society itself, that it let the red flag be lowered to the tricolor. The French workers could not take a step forward, could not touch a hair of the bourgeois order, until the course of the revolution had aroused the mass of the nation, peasants and petite bourgeois, standing between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, against this order, against the rule of capital, and had forced it to attach itself to the proletarians as its protagonists. The workers could buy this victory only through the tremendous defeat in June (*for translation; see [www.Marxists.org/archive/Marx in Turkish](http://www.Marxists.org/archive/Marx_in_Turkish), Marx, 1996, 43-4*).

It is seen that the workers had not adequate support from the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry. They lacked adequate ideological consciousness apart from objective conditions of development. They

attacked against the secondary forms of exploitation of capital, rather than against capital proper. This is not surprising since capital proper could be possible only when industrial capital and industrial bourgeoisie becomes dominant fraction of the ruling classes. In the minds of the proletariat for whom there was no difference between the financial aristocracy and bourgeoisie and in the imagination of the republicans, who ignored even the existence of the classes, "*bourgeois domination*" had been abolished with the establishment of republic. In those days, advocates of the kingdom became republicans and the millionaires of Paris became worker (Marx, 1988, 44). Class relations were abolished only in thoughts, which corresponded to the expression of "universal fraternity" (Marx, 1996, 44-5). The fact that fraternity was put over the real class war was a real parole of the revolution as if class division were a mere "*misunderstanding*" (Marx, 1996, 45). Parisian proletariat were drunk with this fraternity (Marx, 1996, 45).

The constituent government modifies the republic in favour of the bourgeoisie and the country. For them republic was only a changed form of the old bourgeois society (Marx, 1996, 45). On the other hand, since other people of Europe upraised, and since Russia and England themselves get into a movement and since the former country had a crisis, the revolution did not confront with any enemy nation. There was not any external force which would change the position of the constituent government. Parisian proletariat get into a consensual mood even in the debates for wages and for the preservation of private property. The republic did not confront any resistance at home and at outside. Marx states, "that is what disarms it". "Its task was not to change the world through the means of revolution but only to adapt to the conditions of the bourgeois society" (Marx, 1996, 46).

As for the economic background of the revolution, Marx observes that public and private credit was shaken. Before revolution broke out, circulation had slowed down and production had stagnated and, the revolutionary crisis strengthened the commercial crisis (Marx, 1996, 46). Marx states that "Public

and private credit are economical thermometers which measures the strength of revolution. *As long as these credits fall, the burning heat and the creative power of revolution raise*". The constituent government wanted to undress the republic from its anti-bourgeoisie looking. For this, it tried to increase the exchange level of this form of the state in the stock-exchange and the confidence for the payments and morality of the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, financial crisis was deepened because of the cash payments to the debtors of the state. The price would be charged over "*the petty bourgeois, civil servants and the workers*". Deposits in the banks were transferred into the state debts which would not be paid later. Petty bourgeoisie got angry at the republic (Marx, 1996, 47). The banks which had been threatened by the revolution cut down the credit in order to lower the respect towards the republic. It delivered all credit to the bankers, factory owners and the merchants. Capitalists took back their money from the banks in order to devaluate the banknotes. Marx suggests that the constituent government had to attack the bank (The Bank of France) and enforce its bankruptcy through legal means and by doing so; it could destroy the financial aristocracy of the July monarchy. With this measure, the bourgeoisie had to accept the establishment of a national bank by the government and the national credit under the control of nation. But, the government did the reverse. It circulated the banknotes and made all country banks the branches of the Bank of France. Even more, it became indebted to this bank in return of the state forests. The revolution strengthened the bankocracy rather than overthrowing it (Marx, 1996, 48).

Financial crisis and the need for new money sources made the state introduce four direct taxes and an additional tax of 45 cent per frank. The proletariat was believed that the additional tax would be charged over the big landed property. However, Marx states that this tax was charged over "middle class", which was the majority of the French people: "Those who had to pay the price of the February revolution became the peasants; and the counter-revolution recruited its soldiers from the peasants". The peasants

reduced the republic to this 45-cent tax and it “saw the Parisian proletariat as an extravagant that was enjoying itself over its shoulders”. Marx observes that while 1789 revolution had emancipated the peasants from feudal obligations, 1848 revolution demonstrated itself in a tax that was imposed over the rural population for the interests of capital and for the operation of the state (Marx, 1996, 49).

The constituent government did not break itself from the previous order. This was seen in the fact that it recognised the previous debts of the state. However, from what it had to take away it was things conceded and promised to the proletariat. Therefore, the bourgeoisie had to emancipate from the proletariat (Marx, 1996, 50). However, the conditions of war against proletariat were limited since the revolution had thrown the army to outside of Paris. What it had in its hand was only the National Guard, which is “the bourgeoisie in any sort”. It was weak alone in comparison to the proletariat. Marx states that the only solution was “*to make some part of the proletariat confront the other part of it*”. For this purpose, the constituent government formed 24 patrol guards whose members were recruited from the young members of “*the lumpenproletariat*” (Marx, 1996, 50).

It is ironical that the proletariat greeted this patrol guards and saw them as its “pioneer” and “*proletarian* warriors against the bourgeois national guards. Marx observes that “Its mistake was unforgivable mistake”. In addition, the government recruited another army from industrial workers to employ them in the so-called national workshops. It thought that it had formed another army against the proletariat. However, as Marx says, in this time, the bourgeoisie erred. “The bourgeoisie had created *an army that was to rebel*” (Marx, 1996, 51).

Meanwhile, the waves of the February revolution were felt in all over Europe (Marx, 1996, 52-3). However, even in such a suitable international conjuncture, “the bourgeoisie”, in the close confrontation with the proletariat,

“kept all superiorities, all critical points and all middle stratum of society in its hand” (Marx, 1996, 53). The bourgeoisie as represented both in the constituent government and by the National Guard. In 16 and 17 March, in a proletarian demonstration, the liquidation of the bourgeois members in the government was demanded and an attempt was made to drive the government to the path of revolution. However, the bourgeoisie represented by the National Guard replied these demands by making demonstration against the Constituent government in a hostile manner. It is ironical that the people replied by saying “live Ledru-Rollin, live the Constituent Government” in 17 March. They had to take side of the bourgeois republic against the bourgeoisie. This is a tactical error for Marx. The proletariat strengthened rather than oppressing the government. The bourgeoisie inside and outside the government was made far more determined to destruct the proletariat (Marx, 1996, 53).

The assembly which gathered in 4 May was not the republic which had been imposed by the proletariat in 25 February but the one recognised by French people. In this assembly, the words of the National’s republicans were decisive. This was real bourgeois republic. All republican and anti-republican bourgeois press and representatives approved this fact and Marx observes that all France was opposed to the proletariat in assembly (Marx, 1996, 55). The national assembly would proclaim the bourgeois republic after it broke its relation with the illusions of the February revolution. The first measure was immediately to liquidate the proletarian representatives, Blanc and Albert from the executive committee of the national assembly. However, the workers with the passive support of the bourgeoisie had won the revolution of February. For this reason, the worker saw themselves as real victors of the revolution. Accordingly, their defeat had to be shown to themselves at the streets. Marx summarises the development by saying that “the real natal place of the bourgeois republic is *the defeat of June, not the victory of February*” (Marx, 1996, 56). The socialist concessions of the February’s

republic that had given by the bourgeoisie to overthrow the kingdom had to be compensated with the defeat of the socialists (Marx, 1996, 56).

The proletariat scheduled its defeat in 15 May when it was trying to acquire its revolutionary affectivity. The constituent national assembly took some measures to provoke the proletariat. It attacked against the national workshops and limited civil freedoms for the workers. There was no chance for the workers other than revolt or death (Marx, 1996, 56-7). In 22 June of 1848, the workers replied with a revolt in which “the first great fight between two classes which divides modern society occurred. This was fight for either the abolishment of the *bourgeois* order or the continuation of that order. The vain which hid the republic was being set apart” (Marx, 1996, 57). The result was a cruelty. But the interesting point was that “formal representatives of French democracy were so faithful to the republican ideology, says Marx, they had to wait for many weeks to understand the meaning of June’s fight” (Marx, 1996, 57).

“The one who had to *force* the proletariat for its insurrection in June was the bourgeoisie”. The defeat of June thought the proletariat that the bourgeois republic could not bring into an even a small betterment in its own conditions. After this defeat, the bourgeois demands of the workers would be replaced by the slogans of the revolutionary struggle: “*Overthrowing of the bourgeoisie! The dictatorship of the working class!*” (Marx, 1996, 59). “The proletariat, by making its own graveyard the cradle of the bourgeois republic, enforced the bourgeois republic to appear in its purified form as the state whose open aim was to continue the domination of capital and the servitude of labour”. In addition, “as far as the bourgeois domination emancipates from all fetters, it had to be turned into a *bourgeois terrorism*. However, now, middle stratum of the bourgeois society, petty bourgeoisie and peasantry, had to move towards the proletariat since their interests conflicted much more with the bourgeoisie. Just as they had to see their crisis as a result of proletarian uprising, they now saw their poverty as a result of the defeat of

the proletariat” (Marx, 1996, 59). The June insurrection united bourgeoisie with feudal kingdom against the people and made it far more self-confidential. However, the first victim of this union was the continental bourgeoisie. The defeat of June avoided it from strengthening its supremacy in the lowest stage of the bourgeois revolution (Marx, 1996, 59-60).

The another lesson of the June defeat taught the despotic forces of Europe that France had to be unconditionally peaceful towards foreign countries in the face of civil war. This implied that “the people who started their national salvation wars were submitted to the superiority of Russia, Austria and Prussia. At the same time, the faith of these national liberation wars had been connected to the faith of the proletarian revolution and lost their seeming autonomy and independence in the face of great social up and down. As long as the worker continues to be left as a slave, neither Hungarian, nor Polish and nor Italian will not be free”. For Marx, the formation of the Holy Alliance implied that “each proletarian revolt in France would be sign of the *world war*. New French revolution would have to go away immediately from the national sphere and to *conquer the sphere of Europe* which was the sphere in which the social revolution of the 19.th century would gain superiority”. In addition, Marx concluded, “the conditions in which France would take the *initiative* in the European revolution had been created with the defeat of June” (Marx, 1996, 60).

5.3.3 The Working Class In the WPT program

The Turkish Working class and the peasant who does not have land: In the empire, despite privileged position of the foreign capital, the working conditions were bad and the daily wages were low. The bad working conditions and the new factory conditions led the workers to first collective resisting actions because of the awareness about their common problems and interests. The program stated that, despite the lack of certain information, the first collective actions of the working class in order to obtain

its rights were seen before 1845 for the betterment of the working conditions, to increase the wages. These actions were realized through collective work stopping and the state thought that the actions of the workers were the beginning of “a revolution”. However, the “first known collective action” was seen in the strike of the Istanbul Shipyard’s workers after they did not take their wages and then they sent their representatives of 500-600 workers to the Sultan and the Sadrazam (prime minister) in order to give their petition in 1872’s January.

“Democratic leadership of the working class” was “a reality” which manifested itself more and more in time. It did not mean that all workers would participate in “the movement of development”. Many workers could be deviated from the movement as seen in those days. However, “the popular class and stratum who gathered around the historical and democratic leadership of the working class will realize the radical transformations which are required to be able to save our country from backwardness”. According to the program, the working class had the leadership of the popular masses, but not any superiority or privileged position over them. However, this is a paradox since the class leadership is directly related with rising domination or hegemony of a class in a revolutionary or proto-revolutionary movement. The program of the WPT seems to have written only in terms of political democracy and social reforms in a **social-democratic perspective**.

“The industrial worker”: The program emphasized the backwardness of the country, and underdeveloped capitalism in Turkey. However, in the section of “the industrial worker”, it mentioned a long history of the working class movement. It stated, “The Turk working class movement has rather old and rich history”. It was born with the collapse of the national industry at the beginning of the nineteenth century and with the establishment of the first factories. The first state factories were formed between 1816 and 1845 in order to meet the needs of the army. After 1845, “foreign” and “non-Muslim local capital” opened some factories. Thereby in some cities such as

Istanbul, Bursa, Izmit, Adana, Izmir and Tarsus there rapidly emerged “industrial worker communities”. In addition, cotton production in Adana witnessed “agricultural workers community” in this region after 1820s.

The railway privileges given to “European capitalism” (note that “European capitalism” rather than “imperialist countries, etc.) and the operation of the mining particularly coal mining increased the working class in numbers and diffused the workers into the country.

However, since the factories and new workshops were not so many to be able to digest all apprentices and masters who became unemployed due to the collapse of the national handcraftsmanship, the labour supply exceeded enormously the employment possibilities.

The first workers associations also emerged in these dates. They seemed to have been established for solidarity purposes. These attempts were followed by the other professionals’ attempts. Meanwhile, some “clever worker leaders” acquired “political consciousness” and participated in “secret organizations” in order to fight against the authoritarianism. Then, some intellectuals attempted to some organizational activities in order to advocate the working class in parallel with the socialist movement in Europe. In addition, these attempts were culminated in the establishment of the Ottoman Socialist Party in 1910. In the second constitutional period (1908), publications concerning socialist views and thoughts appeared.

The working class which had been exploited excessively by both foreign and local capital in the period of authoritarianism (meant the period of Abdulhamid before) believed in that the new government established in the second constitution period would realize the principles of justice, freedom and hence started its actions against excessive exploitation and in order to acquire the minimum rights. For this reason, the sequential strikes appeared from Selanik to the Black Sea coasts, from the Mediterranean coasts to the

Aegean coasts. The strikes, however, were confronted with the hard measures of the government which had come into power for freedom. One of the first acts of the government would be to abolish the right of striking and establishing union with the encouragement of the local and foreign capitalist circles.

The working class could not resist against these arbitrary measures because of its weakness in numerical and political terms. This situation was also supported by the inner and outer political conditions such as Balkan War and the attack towards the prime ministry (Babıali event). However, after the first world war, in the period of treaty and “National Liberation War” (meant the period between 1918 and 1922), the workers movement re-emerged.

The working class which had been reorganized within professional associations, the trade unions, strove against the foreign privileged companies. The working class on one side tried to weaken the power of the foreign capital and on the other side fight for the defence of the country with arms. In parallel with this act of the working class, some “socialist intellectuals” made some socialist publications and established socialist parties for the organization of the working class. However, some measures were taken to “prevent or degenerate” the attempts of the working class to organize the trade unions and the actions through becoming political force “by the dominant classes” “even in that period”. After the proclamation of the republic (1923), no possibility was left for the working class to establish either professional or political organizations.

After the law was issued in 1925 (Tahrir-i Sükun Kanunu) only the worker associations under the control and support of the government (the state) could survive. They were already some security founts. After the death of ATATÜRK (1938), “free thought” was more and more put under attack and “all kind of socialist publication” was absolutely banned. Even any talk about the working class, the rights of the workers, the trade unions, strikes and total

bargaining became the subject of crime for a long while. Especially after the adoption of “fascist legal articles” through translation, the basic rights of the working class were rejected fiercely. Between 1938 and 1946, the working class had no organization in order to advocate itself and was exploited enormously in the public and private sector.

This situation was consolidated during the second war conditions. Even more, some who were inspired from fascist examples tried to organize the working class within the single party of the time in “a corporative spirit”. However, they did not succeed in this.

After the second war was over with “the victory of democracy” and the fact that the single party regime at home faced with fierce opposition forced the government introduce the multi-party regime. The foundations of the opposition, which seemed united, stated the program, and had in fact two pillars: one was the opposition of the land ağas who had troubles about the state intervention to the economy and the big merchants. These sections became far richer during the war and advocated the replacement of “the estatism” with “liberal system”. The other one was the opposition of “the working class” and “the all popular classes and stratum” who had become far poorer during the war. The people wanted only good living conditions and humane attitude.

The WPT and its program, it should be noted, saw the developments between 1946 and 1960 as a stage in the bourgeois revolutionary development in the country rather than a counter-revolutionary period which formed an opposition to the Kemalist revolutionary period of 1920s and 1930s.

However, despite the existence of two sources behind the opposition against the single party regime before 1946, each foundation of the opposition could not manifest itself equally in the multi-party regime and obtain equal

organizational possibilities. Although some trade unions and so-called socialist parties were established because of the change in the 9.article of the Law of Associations, many of them were put under the police controls and confronted with legal claims and some of them put the end to their activities in the conditions of terror and oppression. New law for the trade unions constrained to a large degree the trade union rights and fascist laws were consolidated and turned into undetermined conditions far more than before, the trade unions got into the control of the government de facto and the parties which would advocate labour could no longer be established with the exception of several ones. For this reason, the multi-party regime was put under the monopoly of the parties which advocated the interests of “the land ağas” and “the big capital circles”. Consequently, the “popular class and stratum” that did not have the opportunity of having their own parties to defend their rights and freedoms and hence acquiring “political consciousness” were obliged to prefer one of the parties. Because of the fact that they had lived under the single party regime for ages, the majority of the people leaned towards “the party which represented the opposition formally”.

Nevertheless, “the government” and “the dominant classes” saw that the working class movement could not have been prevented completely appointed some persons who were faithful to them to the heads of trade unions. These persons were usually not workers. Nonetheless, it was seen that it was impossible so much to “use these sorts of rulers” and then some “indirect paths” were preferred in a way that some key persons in the trade union movement were to be presented a high level of living conditions and so that the working class would be prevented in terms of the development of its consciousness. However, the program stated that once the workers were organized, it was impossible in the long term to prevent them from finding their own real interests and fulfilling “the historical tasks” for the development of society and the consolidation of democracy after it acquired “class consciousness”. It was already the fact that the working class took steps

gradually towards the acquirement of “class consciousness” between 1946 and 1960 despite all heavy pressures and tricks.

The program stated that the experience of the multi-party regime between 1946 and 1960 clearly demonstrated “democratic regime” would be not be able to be operated and absolutely “bankrupted after degeneration” if the organization of “the working class” and “the popular class and stratum who live with their labour” into “independent political force” was not permitted. **“This is because the multi-party democracy is a regime of balance which is established by the forces which represent the labour in the face of the forces of capital”** (*the program’s emphasis*). This “balance” was permanently changed balance in the direction of labour. Any constraint over the legal organization of the working class as an “independent political force” and over its rights prevented the development of society and created troubles to be caused by the constraints over this development. The program stated that the last 15 years demonstrated this fact.

After the 27 May movement, which was a “turning point” in terms of social and political life of the country, all social and political problems became clear and social and economic problems begun to be debated explicitly, and the working class became an increasingly dynamic force. After 27 May, many successful actions of the working class took place. The most effective of them was the Sarachane Meeting in which all trade union leaders and 150 thousands of workers participated in 1961 December. The other symbolically important action was the march of the construction workers of Ankara in 1962 spring. To these the meetings which had been realized against the foreign capital and the strikes which had been put forward by the workers after the constitution recognized the right of strike in order to obtain their rights could be mentioned.

The program took into account the fact that the workers were related not only with their immediate problems but also with the important problems of the

country and they wanted to have power over the solution of these problems. The program stated that **“These events all clearly demonstrate that the Turkish working class has reached in the threshold of the political consciousness”** (*emphasis in the program*). It continued to state: “Those who had any doubt about the existence or the power of our working class found the opportunity of seeing in through their eyes both the existence and the power of the Turkish working class in Sarachanebası”.

Above statements belonged to the date of 1964 and pointed to the workers movements in 1962 rather than the 1970 June events. The emphasis made on and the priority given to the working class by the Turkey Workers’ Party is may be its most important aspect in the history of the left in Turkey.

However, besides the events in 1961 and 1962, **“The most important event which demonstrates that the Turkish working class is acquiring political consciousness is the establishment of the Turkey Workers’ Party”** (*emphasis in the program*). The program pointed to the popular base of this event: “this establishment is the first example of political organization originating from bottom to top, i.e. from the people in our history”. Besides all surface appearances behind it, the important reason behind it was “the level of consciousness the Turkish working class has acquired with the more than one century old pains and struggles”. The program saw the establishment of the WPT as a product of one-century-old experience. It also pointed to its form of development from bottom to top. The emphasis on the working class was important for the WPT: “The fact that the first political organization originating from the people came not from the other popular class and stratum but from our working class is an event which has to be insisted importantly. **Our working class proved its democratic leadership de facto since it established the people’s own party**” (*emphasis in the program*).

The term “democratic leadership” meant the leadership of the working class to the masses without claiming privileges. It also meant an opposition to the terms “proletarian dictatorship”, etc.

The establishment of the WPT in 13 February 1961 was a culminating point in 1961 of the movement of the Turkish working class beginning in the years of 1820, rising to the surface in the years of 1845, 1872, 1903, 1919-1925 and 1946 and developing through this long period. The working class established the party and presented the opportunity to “the socialist intellectuals”, “the intellectuals of ATATÜRK”, “the youth” and “all citizens who earn their life through their labour” of gathering in their own party and to “the labouring popular masses and the socialist intellectuals” who had been isolated from each other of cooperating with each other.

The program on the other hand pointed to the fact that the working class was “under the impact of the conflicting forces”. Some forces tried to drive back the working class from its forward development. The main forces as such were some trade union leaders who were commanded by “local and foreign capital”. They tried to prevent the organization of the working class into “an independent political force”. However, the pressure to be put forward by the working class could not be absolutely postponed to the end by “the dominant classes and the yellow trade unionists who serve them”.

The other factor, which obstructed the development of the political consciousness of the working class, was “the peasant workers”, i.e., the significant weight of “the workers who maintained their relations with the village within the working class”. In addition, the fact that a great number of the workers worked in the small and no permanent workshops obstructed the development of the consciousness of the working class.

However, the program stated that the main problem was the fact that the “dominant circles” tried to prevent this development through various ways.

There were still many indirect attempts to obstruct the attempts in order to become a political force of the working class whose organization was prevented for ages and was confronted with fascist laws.

However, the crisis emerging in the country and the conditions of the world increased the number of “the clever workers”. The other supporting factor in the development of the political consciousness of the working class was existence of “the socialist intellectuals” inside and outside the party who tried to enlighten and urge the workers who were not yet aware of the realities. It was also self-evident that industrialization, which was the necessity for the development of Turkey, created “the objective conditions which give consciousness to the working class”. The conditions of the working and living in modern industry within the capitalist order, “takes the workers to the consciousness of the fact that they are a certain social class which has common interests and rights within the national entity”.

The concentration of the workers into the workshops and the neighbourhoods, and the same living conditions facilitated the solidarity and organization. In addition, the contradiction between the social characteristic of labour and working and the private property over the means of production was another important reason, which ensured the consciousness for the working class. The workers also suffered directly from the waves of capitalism, misery, unemployment, and (social) disasters, which turned men into non-human.

At least the cleverest sections of the working class were aware that it was not alone. Not only the working class, the peasants who had not or inadequate land, the middle peasants, the artisans, the small shopkeepers, salary and wage owner, i.e., all labouring popular class and stratum “cannot take the rightful equivalent of their labour” and were “exploited degree to degree” within the economic system which was based on the private property and profit making.

The program stated “the clever leaders of the workers” saw that the people had to vote for its own party to seize the power and realize the radical transformations predicted in the constitution by itself. These leaders were supported by “the cleaver worker masses”.

The working class advocated and represented the interests and freedoms of all people with its economic, political and social actions. **The “last” phase of the consciousness of the working class**, the program stated, pointed to the idea that “all labouring class and stratum” had common interests and that democratic order had to be established cooperatively in order to prevent the influence and the domination, which were dangerous for the nation, of “the land ağas” and “big capitalists who were the agencies of the foreigners”. To realize “democracy”, “social justice” and “security” and to win “the majority” with “the alliance of the all popular class and stratum” and to realize the idea of “Peace at Home, Peace in the World” were “**the high point of class consciousness**” in which the worker would reach

The program continued to state “in this stage, the essence of the class consciousness, becoming rich to a large degree, acquires a real national consciousness and a consciousness of humanity”. The statements such as “real national consciousness”, “consciousness of humanity” points to the level of consciousness of not only working class but also of the socialist intellectuals of the time. “The interests the working class won are no longer the interests peculiar to the working class in narrow sense and become national interests in the widest and highest sense”.

The program stated that the driving force for the development of the country was mainly the working class among the other labouring popular class and stratum. Since the politically organized labouring people could realize the radical transformations which rapid development required, the working class was “the most talented popular class” in terms of organization and scientific guidance for the radical transformations. The working class deserved the

leadership because of not only “its social structure” but also with “moral and political values” it presented and “its social point of view in general”. The program stated that “this” never pointed to any “superiority” or “privilege” of the working class in relation to “the other popular class and stratum” or that it would be taken to such a position. **These statements belong to the program of a workers party which also described itself “socialist”. I think that they also implicitly pointed to the rejection of class struggle as the most important aspect of a socialist workers’ party.**

The program justified this argument by saying that “in such a condition”, as the working class would have negated itself, and also as the solidarity and mutual respect between “the popular class and stratum” would have destroyed, “the popular class and stratum”, by forming “an independent political force”, would not be able to seize the power. **Thereby we have learned that the program of the WPT did not predict any proletarian power in any time. What was wanted was nothing but a democratic popular republic, or a social democratic republic.**

“The agricultural Workers , the Peasants owning no or little land”: “The agricultural workers, the day labourers, the poor peasants owning no or little land forms the majority in the population of agricultural sector” (*emphasis in the program*). Mechanization led into the unemployment of the share cropper peasant families. These either became the workers in the land, or begun to operate less productive marginal lands near the forests or migrated to the cities in order to find job. The small holder peasants begun to suffer from the falling productivity of the lands and shortage of capital and they were obliged to sell their properties to big farmer, lease or to the croppers. These peasants were working as workers in the lands they no longer owned or migrated into the cities to find a job.

The number of the agricultural workers exceeded 1 million. Some of the peasants who were disconnected from the land settled down again as

croppers in the properties around the towns and cities. However, because of the dramatic shortage of land and demand for land, cropping farms in these lands were increasingly divided, the conditions of cropping got hard and the peasants had to spend much labour in these small farms in order to earn their life. The program continued to state that since “a radical land reform” had not been realized, these peasant family owning no or little land could not benefit from the state aids such as credit, irrigation, and so on. For this reason, misery became apparent among the peasant masses. It was predicted that “secret unemployment” in agriculture exceeded 3, 5 million. The “socialist” intellectuals and “the intellectuals of Atatürk” “by collaboration of the labouring masses” had to “educate the masses”, to “organize” them “in the fronts of the Turkey Workers’ Party” and to make them into “a conscious political force”. These were “the foundation and single key of realising the reforms and the development of the country”

In the case of “The Political Structure of Turkey”, it was stated that the “**emancipation**” could be possible only through political means. The party would educate the working class and all other labouring masses for their rights, freedoms and tasks, create the conditions to merge “the socialist intellectuals” with “**the labouring popular masses**” and thereby “**come to the power through democratic path**” “**from bottom to top**” and “**with a wide popular community**”. “**The real implementation of the constitution requires the existence of the Turkey Workers’ Party**”. Only with the WPT, the rights written abstractly in the constitution could be concrete and living orders in the interest of the labouring citizens. Only in such condition, “**DEMOCRACY** which is a regime of balance between the social classes” could be a meaningful word (*all emphasizes in the program*) (for the program of the WPT, see www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu).

What was suggested was that the labouring masses and the progressive intellectuals (Kemalist and socialist) had to come together in the fronts of the party and try to realize the reforms and the economic development of the

country. The party was not concerned as a party of the workers under the socialist guidance of the intellectuals, a party of revolutionary change. It was envisaged as a progressive, reformist, democrat umbrella.

According to the WPT the conditions of the country were not suitable for revolution. The main problem was the organization and the consciousness of the workers and the people. This pointed to a requirement of “massive preparation”. In addition, the path of development would be the struggle for democracy. New society could be demanded through this struggle of democracy. For the party, democratic transition to socialism was possible. These conditions had to be prepared. This meant a long period of preparation. There was no way of out. The alternative paths were obliged to doom. For this reason, the party invited every one to advocate the 1961 Constitution. This constitution, said Atalay, was adopted by the masses and turned into “a revolutionary weapon in the hands of the masses” (for the program of the WPT, www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts).

5.3.4 The Trade Unions: the RTUCT and the TUCT

The Aydınlık rarely concerns the proletariat and the proletarian struggle as a distinctive subject matter although it sees it as the leading force of the national democratic revolution and counts it within the revolutionary classes in Turkey. The exceptions are three articles written by Mustafa Harman about the RTUCT and the TUCT. The third article which deals with distinctively the proletarian class is the editorial article about June 1970’s workers uprising in Turkey. *The Aydınlık*’s interest in the trade unions and the working class as a distinctive subject matter unfortunately appears after 1970’s March exactly one year before the military intervention and three months before the greatest workers event Turkey had witnessed up to then.

The RTUCT: Harman started his analysis of the RTUCT by pointing to the debates and conclusions of the congresses of the RTUCT and its member

trade unions held in the early months of 1970. He claimed that the congresses concerned with the revolution strategy and the split of the left movement but it did not conclude anything about strategy. He also argued that the trade union members did not escape from “petty bourgeois ideology” and “right deviations” (Harman, 1970a:339).

Harman observed that the RTUCT had some claims about the national organisation, but its present level of organisation was perfect. It did not work within many branches of production. It was said that it had approximately 100 thousands members, but it could collect only the fees from 30-40 thousands members. Education and strike funds were not sufficient. The education expenses were very low. The level of organisation according to the branches of production was also very low. 36 branches of workshop for the trade union organisation were defined by the state. Although the RTUCT correctly reduced this branches to 16, it could not organise itself in 8 branches of workshop. This amount of seats was also kept empty in the general executive committee of the RTUCT (Harman, 1970a:340). Harman stated that the RTUCT had not organised itself in 13 branches of workshop such as agriculture, mining, timber, construction, paper industry, shipping, energy, health and general services, transportation, national security, and so on (Harman, 1970a:340-1).

The RTUCT either organised or begun to organise in eight branches of workshop and did not organise at all in 13 branches. That it did not organise itself in Zonguldak’ coalmines demonstrated that the RTUCT was very far away from its targets and the revolutionary aims in general. The leader cadres of the RTUCT presented themselves as “the most conscious elements of the working class”. However, the situation of the confederation pointed to the reverse. Harman suggested that the members who did not pay their membership fees to the trade union should be ignored in terms of organisational considerations. The RTUCT was a confederation, which could be financially supported by 40 thousand members. In addition, it was not

organised in 13 branches of workshop. It spent only 800 liras to education studies in two years. However, in the country there were 1 million 200 hundred thousand workers who were registered in The Institute of Social Security. For this reason, the executive members of the confederation had to think of how they claimed, “We will rescue Turkey”, “We will alone establish socialist Turkey” (Harman, 1970a:341).

It is sure that the self-confidence of the RTUCT’s leaders did not come from the number of their members and the financial structure of the confederation. *The Aydınlık* (here Harman) exaggerates even a little peasant event in the country. However, it seems to reduce the status of the first socialist claims of the Turkey’s working class to a mere self-illusion.

Harman stated that the RTUCT had been still a new organisation which could not make itself adapt to the large part of the working class (Harman, 1970a:341-2). The member trade unions were organised mainly in İstanbul, and then Kocaeli and Sakarya. The RTUCT either did not enter into the cities such as Zonguldak, Kırıkkale, or did not go beyond formal existence in some cities such as Adana. These were the cities where the workers concentrated. Harman pointed to some constraints before the organisational possibilities of the RTUCT. Public sector had implemented high wage policy and put forward some pressures against the revolutionary trade unions. The TUCT was financed by the American Economic Cooperation Organisation (briefly AID). The greater part of the working class was not aware of the revolutionary ideology and the RTUCT was financially weak. However, the claims of the RTUCT about revolutionary syndicalism could not already be easier than this. Harman refers to some delegates who witnessed that the leaders of the RTUCT even did not organise the trade union consciously. Harman said that they did not even remember the revolutionary youth who tried to link with the workers. Even more, some leaders of the RTUCT (Harman refers to Kemal Türkler in the footnote) tried to prevent the possible connection between the workers and the youth (Harman, 1970a:342). Harman made a connection at

this point with the leaders of Turkey' Workers Party. He argued that the party conception ("isolated") imposed by Aybar-Aren-Boran cliques was repeated also by the some trade union leaders who were also the members of the same party and influenced by Mehmet Ali Aybar (Harman, 1970a:342).

Harman quoted from the head of the RTUCT, Kemal Türkler who addressed to the delegates: "The University teachers talk about scientific socialism. As far as we know, the scientific socialism has three principles. The first is the proletarian dictatorship. We are opposed to the dictatorship. This is because, dear friends, we have a constitution which is open to socialism, and allows us to seize the power through election. However, even when the conditions change, we are still opposed to the dictatorship. We will seize the power absolutely through democratic ways. We will be opposed to the dictatorship of the working class after we seize the power, too. Our principle is democracy" (Harman, 1970a:342). Türkler seems to be a European sort of socialist. It is difficult to find such a democratic leader for a revolutionary organisation. He is rather faithful to democracy. His ideas are pure and clean in front of the concrete realities of socialist politics. He seems to be socialist. However, he rejects "scientific socialism".

Harman correctly says that Türkler advocates democracy in the name of the proletarian power even when the democratic possibility for power disappears (Harman, 1970a:342-3). He hides in the shadows of the articles 141 and 142 of the anti-democratic penalty code. Any who could have opposed Türkler would be under the threat of prison. Harman correctly sees that a trade union leader who presented himself as "revolutionary" advocated parliamentary system, rejected scientific socialism without having logical justifications, and used anti-communism just as the leaders of the TUCT did (Harman, 1970a:343). The leaders of the RTUCT opposed to scientific socialism although they talked about "the power of the working class", "inadequacy of the economic struggle", the necessity to carry a "political consciousness to the working class". Harman summed up that the RTUCT was not a perfectly

organised confederation which was not aware of scientific socialism and led by the leaders who had not serious ideas about the world events (Harman, 1970a:343).

The differences between the RTUCT and the TUCT: According to the claims of the TUCT, this confederation had 800 thousand members. However, the members who paid fee were 371 thousands. The execution of the confederation decided that they would make “supra-parties trade unionism”. Harman says that this confederation was under the exact control of America and adopted the line of the parties which were in power. Between 1964 and 1965, the TUCT collected approximately 2 million fees from its members. But in the same period, it obtained more than 7 million liras in the form of aid from AID. The wages of half of its personnel was met directly by AID. In addition, the same institution gave more than 2 million liras for education purposes to the TUCT (Harman, 1970a:343). In the seminars of this confederation, anti-communism was injected to the workers and it was propagated that the workers were not a distinctive class. It was argued that industry seemed to be a body whose head was the employee and whose body was the workers (Harman, 1970a:343-4).

Harman pointed to an interesting survey for the professional trade unionists. 55 percent of the trade unionists who had not yet been in America due to AID’s organisations thought that “economic struggle was adequate for the working class”. 45 percent of them thought that “political struggle was, too, necessary”. The same survey revealed that the trade unionists who had been in America thought that 92, 5 percent thought that “economic struggle was adequate” (Harman, 1970a:344). Harman observed that the TUCT was an agent of the imperialism and was not faithful to the working class. It poisoned the working class (Harman, 1970a:344). Harman gave some examples of the unfaithfulness of the TUCT. It blamed a trade union which tried to make collective bargaining with AID for “serving extreme purposes”. It also broke

down some strikes. It blamed the workers and claimed that the communists produced the events (Harman, 1970a:344).

Harman stated that the RTUCT was established for good purposes against the TUCT, which was dependent on the imperialism and did not support even the economic struggles of the workers. The members of the RTUCT organised the factory occupations. A member of it was murdered. Harman quoted from the head of Lastik-İş and the parliamentary member of the WPT, Rıza Kuas: "The imperialism and its compradors will increase their pressures in order to close the revolutionary trade unions, to prevent the awakening of the working class" (Harman, 1970a:344). However, Harman stated that the situation for "the real trade unionism" was newly developing in Turkey. The RTUCT was a stage in this development. The workers of the RTUCT demonstrated that the proletariat rapidly begun to gain consciousness. Harman says that the RTUCT guards the constitution and adopts correct principles in its regulations. Harman quotes from 3. Article of the RTUCT's regulation: "the RTUCT sees as a necessity firstly the fact that Turkey becomes independent in every aspect and enters into the path of a rapid development in order for the working class to develop economically, socially and culturally and to become sublime. For this reason, it sees as a necessity the fact that the movements of Turkish workers are provided a revolutionary essence which is to ensure the realisation of the radical transformations which are predicated in the Constitutions". The regulation follows that "The fact that the working class reaches in a revolutionary characteristic and get consciousness depends only on the fact that the events of the country and the world are evaluated in the view of the labourers and through scientific road. Science is the most important means of struggle of the working class". "The fact that the labourers can obtain their all rights is not possible only through professional struggle. Besides this, they must make political struggle as well by using their democratic rights in the constitution. This struggle puts forward an opposing aim against the principle of the exploitation of man by man by giving the working class existence its complete consciousness".

Harman argued that these examples demonstrated that the RTUCT and the TUCT could not be put into the same place. The former suffered from “the deficient consciousness”, and incorrect “strategy” and the influences of “the Aybar-Aren-Boran clique’s view of administration” whereas the latter followed “a complete line of unfaithfulness” (Harman, 1970a:345).

I can add to Harman’s analysis that even these parts of the regulation of the RTUCT carries rather idealistic, democratic, constitutionalist ideas apart from clear revolutionary ideas such as the abolishment of the exploitation. The paradigms such as “economic development” and “independency” are presumed as the prerequisites of the welfare of the proletariat. It is also wanted from the proletariat that it must have a revolutionary consciousness in order to realise the transformations predicated by 1961’s Constitution. I think that the RTUCT seems to have been established in order to transform the rising workers mobilisation into bourgeois socialism or to say, into Euro-communism. The working class is attributed completely bourgeois missions such as the independency and the economic development of the country and bourgeois means of struggle such as the constitution. What Harman saw as positive in the regulation of the RTUCT stated above is indeed the most bourgeois characteristics of the RTUCT.

Harman points to the critiques of the RTUCT’s leaders of “the proletarian socialists”. In these criticisms, it is said that the TUCT is fed by America, sells the workers and prevent the bringing political consciousness to the working class. They go on to say that “We are socialists. There is no robber among us. We try to give political consciousness to the worker. On the other hand, the young university revolutionaries strive with us rather struggling with the TUCT. Certainly, we, too, oppose to them” (Harman, 1970a:346). Harman replied that to take attention more to the deviations within the organisations which had revolutionary claims was a result of their revolutionary understanding. To liberate the workers from an organisation and then to present them to another organisation which would not be able to struggle

against the imperialism due to deviations and faults meant just a waste of time, said Harman. The purpose was to make revolutionary ideology become dominant in the RTUCT. The criticisms they had levelled to it was only “warning”. The RTUCT was established as a reaction to the understanding of trade unionism of the TUCT and adopted the name “revolutionary”. For this reason, the leaders of the TUCT had to benefit from these criticisms. Harman also stated that they wanted an alliance between the workers, intellectuals and youth besides the development of the RTUCT in a true path. However, this support was dependent on the continuation of the RTUCT’s anti-imperialism (Harman, 1970a:346).

In the statements above, the criticism of the RTUCT of the TUCT may seem to be that the RTUCT advocated Leninist idea of “bringing consciousness from without” to the working class. The RTUCT advocated the development of the political consciousness of the working class. However, this consciousness was a spontaneous consciousness of the economic struggle of the working class. Harman quotes from Kemal Türkler who addressed to the delegates of the congress as such: “It is said that consciousness to the working class is given from without. Consciousness to the working class is not given from without, but comes spontaneously from without. Has these intellectuals taught to the workers of Türk Demir Döküm Fabrikası that they occupy the factory?” (Harman, 1970a:346). Harman correctly pointed to Lenin’s book “What is to be done?” which stated that in a spontaneous way the working class can develop only a consciousness of trade unionism (Harman, 1970a:346-7).

Harman stated that the greatest resistance of the workers in the last years took place in Türk Demir Döküm Fabrikası which was also pointed by Kemal Türkler above. 2230 workers struggled for their economic rights, rejected “yellow trade union” and then entered into another trade union, Maden-İş. Harman said that the main representative of the trade union of these workers answered the question which was about the idea that the workers should not

be interested in politics as such: “Yes I agree. Political aspect of it is false. Trade unions are supra-party politics and the backbone of the industry. They make pressure over every party in accordance with the condition of the country” and this representative of the workers answered the question which was about the meaning of socialism *exactly* as such: “Socialism is not Turkish language, I do not understand anything. It is not related with our thing today. Everybody has an art, let everybody be interested in it” (Harman, 1970a:347).

Harman asked whether Kemal Türkler who stated that “the revolutionary stage before us is “socialist revolution” and that “consciousness to the working class cannot be given from without” would establish “Socialist Turkey” with the support of these sort of workers or whether Kemal Türkler saw adequate this “spontaneously acquired consciousness” (Harman, 1970a:347). We have seen that *the Aydınlık*’s evaluations of the RTUCT have been influenced by the fact that the RTUCT adopted “socialist revolution thesis” of the WPT of the late 1960s.

Other Classes for the RTUCT: Harman argued that the RTUCT did not give any importance to the forces outside the working class. Some claimed in a general conference of the RTUCT that “urban petty bourgeoisie” was nothing but the shopkeepers etc., and “rural petty bourgeoisie” was nothing but the peasants who used capitalist methods and had some purposes searching for exploitation. Harman stated that the RTUCT confronted with a danger of being dominated by **Lasalle’s** idea that demonstrated all classes outside the working class as reactionary mass. Harman observed that the RTUCT’s conception of the other classes was caused by its fear from “losing hegemony in the revolution” and “the return of the imperialism”. However, these fears were not “scientific” (Harman, 1970a:347). But the RTUCT seems to be rather realist”. His fear can also be erected upon the history of the Turkish Republic. In addition, Harman is not patient when he extended the

RTUCT's observation about urban and rural "petty bourgeoisie" to "all classes".

In the working paper of the RTUCT, Harman said that struggle for national independency also meant anti-imperialist struggle. However, it was followed that only anti-imperialist struggle could not be successful since the ones who had an interest relation with the imperialism would be able to invite it to the country. Harman replied that return of imperialism after "The First Liberation War" was not something which had not been foreseen in advance. It was "a natural product of the objective conditions" (Harman, 1970a:348). Harman asked whether second return of the imperialism after the national democratic revolution would take place. He followed that the proletarian socialists pointed to "the revolutionary potential" of "the military-civil intellectual estate". They also argued that "this" was "necessary for the proletarian revolutionary movement not to be isolated" and they gave "an absolute importance" to "the leadership of the working class" (Harman, 1970a:348).

About the meaning of "this", I must say whether "a revolutionary potential" had been attributed to the military-civil intellectual estate or this estate had already had such a potential. It is sure that the revolutionaries in every sort had the memory of 27 May movement which had occurred ten years ago. But a revolutionary movement had to base itself on the experience and the lessons of the past rather than the memories of the revolution of other classes. Thanks to Harman, we have also learned that the emphasis over the military-civil intellectual estate during the national democratic revolution was based on a real political situation and a realistic analysis. This estate was suggested as an instrument to eliminate the weakness and possible isolation of the revolutionary forces during revolution. Isolation from what? Is the isolation of "the proletarian revolutionary movement" from Kemalist revolutionaries? Does this mean that Kemalist revolutionaries protect the proletarian revolutionary movement from being isolated from themselves? If the purpose of the alliance suggested by *the Aydınlık* with the military-civil

intellectual estate is a mere *measure* against *isolation*, it can no longer be talked about “the revolutionary potential of the military-civil intellectual estate”.

In the same conference of the RTUCT, “single proletarian socialist trade unionist” Bekir Çiftçi, Harman said, responded to the criticisms about “the bourgeois follower-ship” as regards with the national democratic revolution strategy. This trade unionists told the delegates that **“the leadership is a result of power balance”** rather than a negotiation matter. He followed that **“if”** their organisation adopted a correct **“strategy”**, **“organise”** the proletariat and bring to it **“consciousness”**, **“the leadership will surely remain in our class”** (Harman, 1970a:348). But the question seems to have been related with the danger that this “power balance” could be destroyed in favour of the bourgeoisie. Organisation and consciousness can be presented to a strategy which would lead into “bourgeois follower-ship”. Question is already related with “strategy”. I think that the ***Aydınlık* sacrifices every kind of analysis for national democratic revolution strategy. The strategy determines the analysis of concrete and historical.**

Harman said that although *the Aydınlık* had emphasised the leadership of the proletariat during and after the national democratic revolution, i.e. socialism, the trade unionists blamed the proletarian socialists (*the Aydınlık*) for they did not use the word “socialism” and that they did not believe in “the leadership of the working class”, and that they advocated “bourgeois follower-ship”. Harman claims that national democratic revolution is “a scientific road” which had been based on the experiences of the backward countries which searched for liberation. He claims and warns that “The trade unionists who see as necessary ‘the anti-imperialist struggle’ must know that they will not able to do this only with the power of the working class- only 1 out of 30 workers have yet been organised” (Harman, 1970a:349).

Here Harman is correct about one point: the RTUCT seems to be ideologically developed while it is politically undeveloped. But have not we already talked about ideology? The other side of the debate is what the RTUCT understood from anti-imperialist struggle. According to Harman who quoted from the working paper of the RTUCT, “struggle put forward against the land ağas, the local capitalists, the importers who make intermediary works for foreigners, the bureaucrats who brings the imperialist to our country, i.e. the struggle for national independency, will be at the same time a struggle, too, which will have been put forward against the imperialism” (Harman, 1970a:348).

Harman argues that “anti-imperialist struggle is realised by the alliance of all national classes. National fronts are established and national democratic revolution strategy is implemented”. This is the experience which originates from “the world peoples” which have struggled against the imperialism. Anti-imperialist struggle requires “national fronts”. But although anti-imperialist struggle is predicated, a rejection of the concept of “national front” is something irrational (Harman, 1970a:349).

We have learned that the RTUCT rejected the idea of “national front” though it accepted “anti-imperialist struggle” and now we learn that Kemal Türkler, the head of the RTUCT in that time (1970) had asked whether “with whom the national front is established since there is no other class which has an interest in socialism” and then said that “the united front” could be established with the teachers, intellectuals, the peasants, the youth. Harman stated that “the united front” was not different from “national front” (Harman, 1970a:349).

Harman recalled that the trade unionists called the proletarian socialists as “democratic revolutionary” and “the bourgeois follower”. But these labels were a product of misunderstanding (Harman, 1970a:349). A possibility for the return of the imperialism is meaningless since the proletariat which is “the

most progressive, the most powerful, the most organised class of the national front” will not allow this possibility (Harman, 1970a:350). In addition, the possibility for the fact that socialism cannot be followed after the national democratic revolution is not a problem of “choice”, but “a development related with the decision and action which the proletariat will make in “Fully independent and truly democratic Turkey”” which will be established. Moreover, in a country which is freed from the imperialism and weakened the power of the compradors, nothing can prevent the working class which has also developed its consciousness and strength through struggle from establishing socialism. Harman addressed to the trade unionists by saying that national democratic revolution was a preparation for “socialism”. The other fault of the leaders of the RTUCT, said Harman, was the place of the alliance of the national forces. The alliance will be made outside the WPT. The party of the working class will be cleaned from the petty bourgeois elements and ideology. The political organisation will be equipped with the proletarian ideology, which is “the scientific socialism” and its governing posts will be dominated by “the vanguard units of the proletariat”, which are “the ruling cadres developed from within the working class struggle”. Harman said that “In sum, the WPT will be the essential organisation of the working class and the poor peasant, will be purified from all kind of deviations, the alliance will be established through anti-imperialist action unity outside the political organisation” (Harman, 1970a:350).

Harman stated that the leaders of the RTUCT thought that their proclamation of supporting the WPT before the last election demonstrated their revolutionary characteristics. In this proclamation, it was suggested, quoted by Harman, that the workers should identify themselves with the party and leave from “the bourgeois parties”. Harman argued that leaving aside the workers’ votes given to the WPT, Kemal Türkler had said that “If we gave the opportunity to our members to participate in this congress, the next day dissolutions and resignations would begin”. Harman added that Türkler’s statement was a proof of the fact that the RTUCT could not bring

consciousness to its base. Harman referred to Lenin who had observed that the trade unionists could also be interested in politics and could make politics. But they did this politics without nearing to “socialist struggle” (Harman, 1970a:350).

Harman stated that on the one hand the leaders of the RTUCT claimed a leadership in the direction of the political power for the workers; on the other hand they rejected “scientific socialism” and the idea of “consciousness from without”. They thereby followed “trade unionist politics” (Harman, 1970a:350-1). However, despite the incorrect ideas proclaimed during the general conferences of the trade unions (Basın-İş and Lastik-İş), in the working papers “national democratic revolution strategy was suggested -with one or two faults”. Harman argued that this “awakening which started in the member trade unions” would necessarily influence the RTUCT (Harman, 1970a:351).

Harman asks “What is to be done?” He suggested that political activity should be done even in the right oriented trade unions and “organics ties” had to be established with the working class. The RTUCT was a trade union whose revolutionary road had not yet been drawn. It was “a revolutionary task” patiently to tell the realities to the trade unionists, their bases, members and to the workers who were open to “become conscious”. Newly beginning actions had to be leaded and new actions had to be created to develop consciousness (Harman, 1970a:351).

Harman stated that on the one hand, the leaders of the RTUCT supposed “the actions of the workers which put pressure on the bourgeois laws as socialist struggle”; and on the other hand, they limited “the heroic actions of the workers with ‘economic struggle’”. However, these leaders had not to be labelled as “opportunist trade union lords”, but to them it had to be told that (Harman quoted from Lenin): a struggle directed towards each single “comprador patron” to develop the conditions of labour and to increase wage levels are not “political struggle”. This was “economic struggle”. “The workers’

struggle becomes class struggle only when the main representatives of the working class of the whole country as a single class get their own consciousness and only when they begin to strive against the whole capitalist class and the government which supports that class rather than each single patron” (Harman, 1970a:351). Finally, Harman stated that the revolutionary task before “the proletarian socialists” was to “to fill the RTUCT with real revolutionary identity”, “to bring class consciousness to the proletariat through an organised effort” (Harman, 1970a:351).

It is not surprising that *the Aydınlık*'s analysis of the RTUCT begins and ends in a similar way of its analyses of the WPT. Read, “to fill the RTUCT with real revolutionary identity” as “to fill the WPT with real revolutionary identity”. Addressing point of *the Aydınlık* is again **the leaders** rather than the organisation itself. The leaders of the RTUCT and the leaders of the WPT are distinguished from the RTUCT and the WPT.

Harman analysis has demonstrated us that there was a gap between the militant workers organisation, that is, the RTUCT and the national democratic revolutionaries, and the youth movement which was close to this strategy. We have also seen that socialist revolution strategy of the RTUCT (as in the case of the WPT) had nothing to do with Leninist revolutionary perspective. But it was very interesting that the working class in the case of the RTUCT advocated a “socialist revolution strategy” rather than “national democratic revolution strategy”. The gap between the national democratic revolutionaries and the workers seems to have been caused by this division. The working class in the case of the RTUCT seems to be ideologically far more progressive in comparison to *the Aydınlık*'s national democratic revolution strategy. *The Aydınlık* and the national democratic revolution strategy move backward from the working class. Kemal Türkler did not want the youth in the socialist trade union politics and rejects the petty bourgeoisie as a revolutionary ally. Nevertheless, Türkler suggested a “united front” which was to be composed of teachers, intellectuals, peasants, and the youth. I think

that “the united front” of the proletariat with the teachers, intellectuals, the peasants, and the youth is not the same with “the national front” of *the Aydınlik*, that is, the proletarian revolutionaries. Harman stated above that “the united front” was not different from “national front”. Türkler’s “united front” points to educated, intellectual sections of society rather than social classes in the national front suggested by *the Aydınlik*. The peasants which were counted in this “united front” have not any specificity. The workers in the case of the RTUCT seem to have had a great self-confidence in the late 1960s.

The TUCT: Harman article’ *The TUCT the Satellite of the Imperialism* is published just before the June events in 1970. I will deal with this workers action below. The article presents the TUCT as an enemy of the working class and as an agent of American imperialism and the comprador governments.

The TUCT was the biggest institution of the workers. It was claimed that it represented roughly one million workers. But number of its members which paid fee was 427836. Harman stated that the last congress of the TUCT demonstrated one more time that it was an ally of the Justice Party’s government and American imperialism. The congress did not take any decision which would develop the consciousness of the working class (Harman, 1970b, 159).

The working paper of the the TUCT’s last congress had statements which were put forward against all events realised by progressive elements of society, the workers, the peasants, and the youth. Class concept was rejected. It presented the “ultra left” as the enemy of the political and social order which was brought into existence by new constitution. The ultra-left was dogmatic and rejected class compromise and all kind of reform. The ultra left saw class conflict as a necessary process for the rights of the working class.

The general president of the TUCT, Seyfi Demirsoy manipulated and provided the rejection of the proposal about “general strike”, which had been presented to the congress by Bülent Ecevit and then accepted by 96 delegates (Harman, 1970b, 160).

The working paper presented to the congress propagated about the International Confederation of The Free Trade Unions (briefly ICFTU) of which it was a member and cursed the Soviet’s intervention to Czechoslovakia, refereed to “the compradors of Red imperialism in our country” and talked about “human rights and freedoms” (Harman, 1970b, 160). Vietnam War was mentioned in passing (Harman, 1970b, 161).

Harman stated that the TUCT had been dominated by the trade unionists that supported the JP. The trade unionists that supported the RPP could win the seats in the executive committee of the confederation only through negotiations. They could present themselves as a minority. In the last congress, it was stated that trade unionists of the RPP forms 129 delegates within total 227 delegates. Harman said that this situation was transmitted to the government by the trade unionists of the JP. Afterwards, the JP intervened into the congress. The RPP could not play a decisive role for changing the composition of the executive committee of the confederation. Harman here recalled that anti-democratic regulation prevented the transmission of the base of the trade unions to the top positions. In addition, the workers saw the trade unionists activity as very hard and dangerous since such an activity might lead into dismisses from work. Harman said that a trade union of the TUCT informed against a worker to the employee and then wanted to make him dismiss from his work. Moreover, the some lower echelons of the trade union cadres did not want to behave in a different way in order not to lose their positions (Harman, 1970b, 161).

Harman presented us the members of the executive committee of the TUCT: The general president Seyfi Demirsoy did not have any consistent

characteristic and had good relations with powerful positions (Harman used the word “eyyamcı”). The general secretary Halil Tunç was “the most conscious representative of American imperialism” and sometimes wanted to look like a supporter of Ecevit. Ömer Ergün was the finance secretary and did not relate himself to anything. The education secretary Selahaddin Erkap became a trade unionist after he had worked for a religious paper. Finally, Etem Ezgü, the organisation secretary, was a “typical” advocator of the JP. He had been attacked by the workers after he “sold” a strike (Harman, 1970b, 161). Harman stated that the team of “the left of the centre” in the RPP tried to change Ezgü or Erkap because of the existing balances (Harman, 1970b, 161-2).

Meanwhile, Harman talked about interesting relationships within Maden-İş. The president of this federation was Kemal Özer. He was known as an advocator of the RPP. Over, during the general conference of the TUCT, wanted to liquidate Oman Percy, the president of Zonguldak Trade Union of Mine Workers (Zonguldak Maden İşçiler Sendikası). İpekçi defeated his rival Mehmet Tezer in the congress of April 1970. After this result, there occurred workers’ resistance which protested the result of the election. Kemal Özer wanted İpekçi to be elected to the executive committee of the TUCT and Tezer to seize the power in the local trade union. The interesting point is the background of the conflict: the struggle between İpekçi and Tezer was not caused by ideological differences. İpek was from Trabzon, that is, “foreigner” as called by the local men while Tezer was from Zonguldak, that is, “local” as called in the area. The struggle was caused by this division and became a significant event. Harman added that Tezer like Özer was an advocator of the RPP and İpekçi was an advocator of the JP. Özer tried to solve two problems at the same time. An election of İpekçi to the executive committee of the TUCT was assumed to have stopped the events in Zonguldak and Tezer’s seizing power in Zonguldak trade union would imply the success of the RPP in the area. However, Harman stated that there did not take place any change in the congress of the TUCT. Özer could not make İpekçi be elected

in the congress since he could not get the support of Seyfi Demirsoy (Harman, 1970b, 162).

The left of the centre did not make a serious opposition to the congress. Its members did not nominate themselves. With one unimportant exception, 24 members of the executive committee of the TUCT were re-elected (Harman, 1970b, 162).

Only opposition in the congress came from a delegate who had said that “**the youth was shot due to the decisions taken in the mosques**” and this single opposition was eliminated by the Nationalist Action Party’s (hereafter briefly NAP) fascist commandos which were sitting in the balcony, and the other delegates (Harman, 1970b, 163).

The most important aspects of Harman’s observations about the TUCT and its last congress is about the debates over the general strike and direct connection of this confederation with American imperialism through AID (American Economic Cooperation Organisation) and ICFTU (International confederation of Free Trade Unions) and also with OECD (Organisation for International Economic Cooperation Development).

In 29 November 1969, a right for general strike had been proposed as a law to the parliament by the trade unionist members of the parliament of the RPP and had been adopted by the JP’s trade unionist members of the parliament. However, the minister of working Seyfi Öztürk and the general president of the TUCT Seyfi Demirsoy collaborated to prevent any decision of the TUCT about the general strike. They succeeded in this. In a press meeting a trade unionist member of the RPP stated that general strike had to be a right for “the Turk workers” to be able to influence the social and economic policies of the governments and rejected “supra-party politics” of the trade unionists. In addition to general strike, law proposal predicated also “solidarity strikes” for 8 days. The same proposal was also presented to the parliament by the

members of the JP. It is striking as Harman stated that both the RPP, the JP and the TUCT had seemed to want the right for general strike for the working class (Harman, 1970b, 163). Famous Bülent Ecevit, Harman aid, did not do anything else from adopting this law proposal (Harman, 1970b, 163-4).

However, the minister of working Seyfi Öztürk seemed to have not known that the proposal and claimed that supporting the general strike was “communistic”. His speech in the congress was clapped by the delegates. He said that general strike was rejected in all democracies and made to paralyse the regimes and made for political aims. Öztürk continued to say that advocating general strike with ideological purposes was to support “the youth movements” (Harman, 1970b, 164). Harman said that this speech was met with a reaction of half of the delegates. The president Seyfi Demirsoy prevented the proposal to be debated in the congress as if he did not know that there was a law proposal about this subject in the parliament and this subject was also concerned in the working paper of the confederation. His speech about the subject was so clever that the delegates would be influenced. He said that the question had to be concerned in the executive committee of the confederation rather than in the conference. He thereby wanted to eliminate the problem in the direction of Seyfi Öztürk and could seem to have not rejected the general strike as a right (Harman, 1970b, 164).

The TUCT put forward some progressive ideas in order to create an image as if it was a progressive organisation and in order to prevent the attacks of the progressive forces towards it. The idea of general strike was one of these ideas. The TUCT was not honest since its parliamentary members gave their law proposal to the parliament just before its closing and did not watch their proposal in the commissions (Harman, 1970b, 164).

The more striking aspect of the subject was the fact that the RPP’s parliamentary group did not adopt this proposal. Even more, the president of the discipline committee of the party blamed Bülent Ecevit and said that the

party would not be responsible to this action. Harman said that the RPP's group was composed of "conservative persons" so that they did not tolerate even the left of the centre. They certainly would not adopt the proposal about the general strike. Furthermore it was nothing but the RPP which signed the proposal which would limit the trade union freedoms and the total negotiations and thereby sharing the responsibility for closing all revolutionary trade unions. Harman asked whether such a party would advocate the general strike. Harman stated that even if they had advocated that, they would not be successful without having the support of the TUCT and their groups behind themselves. The strange thing was that a trade unionist representative from the RPP did sign a law proposal which would ban even his own trade union (Harman, 1970b, 165). Harman stated that in such a condition Ecevit's action would be ineffective. As for the government, a proposal which was not supported by the TUCT could be easily rejected. About a law proposal, The minister of working, Seyfi Öztürk told Rıza Kuas and Kemal Nebioğlu who were the parliamentary members of the WPT that **"What do you advocate? This law has been adopted by the TUCT"** (Harman, 1970b, 165).

In his speech in the congress of the TUCT, Ecevit suggested only that for certain questions, neutrality of the trade unions would be not valid. Harman said that Ecevit did not want the rejection of "supra-party trade unionism" (Harman, 1970b, 166). Süleyman Demirel" wish for **"staying away from class conflict"** was accepted by the TUCT's general conference. This Demirel blamed the youth "anarchist" and said that **"We know better than everybody the awful scene laying behind the words the worker without patron"**. He came to the congress in order to offer his gratitude to the attitude of the general congress of the TUCT. Meanwhile, Seyfi Demirsoy called Demirel as **"The politician who understands us the most"** (Harman, 1970b, 166).

The fact that anti-imperialist youth movement was labelled as “anarchist” by the notables of the state may be one the reasons of the distance between the workers and the youth. The youth which advocated and followed national democratic revolution strategy seemed to be “anarchist”. This term has no relation with the anarchist school of thought and action in Europe. In Turkish the term means “any opposition levelled by the left to the state and order”. I think that the state thereby isolates the workers from the youth and intellectuals. The militant workers, or to say socialist trade unionism of the RTUCT confronted with the TUCT on its *right* side, and with “anarchist” youth militancy on its *left* side. The WPT was already dissolving and coming to the end. Meanwhile I must recall that Marx would use the term “**order’s party**” instead of “**the state**” in this context. What I mean by the state I mean the party of order ruled by **Süleyman Demirel** between 1965 and 1980.

Harman presented the fact that the TUCT was financed by AID, ICFTU and OECD and the leading cadres of the TUCT was invited and educated by AID. The TUCT rejected “class reality”, propagated American imperialism. In its education seminars, films such as “Communism’s Massacre in Vietnam” were shown to the workers. Seyfi Demirsoy stated that “**We appropriated our trade unions in 1946 by expelling communists**” (Harman, 1970b, 166) He also said that “**Irwing Brown who played the role in the establishment of the free trade unionisms in Turkey is my personal friend**” (Harman, 1970b, 166). As for the driving away the communists, Harman recalled that some trade unions which were established in 1945 were led by progressive persons and even socialists. But, the the RPP’s government of the time arrested these men for they were “communist” and made some men attack towards these trade unions and created “yellow” trade unions. Seyfi Demirsoy was one of the trade unionist of this generation (Harman, 1970b, 166). As for the case of Irwing Brown, Harman stated that this man was “the right hand” of G. Meany, the president of AFL-CIO (briefly “American Confederation of Worker Trade Unions”) (Harman, 1970b, 166). Harman said that Meany said about the visits of the trade unionists to America which were

organised by some like Irwing Brown, that **“These delegations has been priceless source of power in our great struggle against the danger of communism which is our common threat”** (Harman, 1970b, 166-7). Harman made clear what Meany understood from struggle against communism. Firstly it meant anti-communism which was directed against liberation struggle and the organisation of “yellow strikes”. Secondly, it meant supporting imperialist wars. Thirdly, it meant supporting counter-revolutionary forces. Fourthly, it meant personnel and financial support of the imperialist interventions. Fifthly, it meant supporting the organisations which were not faithful to their countries. Sixthly, it meant liquidation of the communists from the trade unions, meant preventing the mobilisation of the workers for anti-imperialist struggle. Seventhly, it meant the education of the trade union leaders who would reject anti-imperialist struggle for liberation (Harman, 1970b, 167-8). Harman correctly stated that the intellectual leaders of the TUCT were these kinds of men who were nothing but the agents of CIA. The TUCT was inspired from AID, American Confederation of the Worker Trade Unions (briefly AFL-CIO) and ICFTU and hence CIA, American governments and American monopolies. This fact was also explained by the director of international relations of Trade Union of the American Automotive Workers, Victor Reuther. Harman quoted from him who said that **“AFL-CIO fulfils the function of paravana for secret action which CIA realises for foreign countries”** (Harman, 1970b, 168).

In the date Harman’s article was published (June 1970), the RTUCT confronted with danger of banishment by new legal regulations. This danger was also expressed by Seyfi Öztürk, the minister of working. Harman said that the RTUCT was “nation-ist, progressive in its essence” despite its incorrect strategy and its “agreement with imperialism in the final analysis” (Harman, 1970b, 168). He added that the TUCT was in fact an organisation which begun to fall (Harman, 1970b, 168). He gave many examples of trade unions which left the TUCT for the RTUCT (Harman, 1970b, 168-9). He claimed that if the game was played according to the rules of today, the

RTUCT and other independent trade unions would lead into the collapse of the TUCT. If this extension of the RTUCT continued in the same rules of the game, “the Turkish workers movement” would possibly acquire “revolutionary, anti-imperialist, scientific socialist” characteristic. However, the rules of the game would be changed at the expense of the RTUCT (Harman, 1970b, 169).

More interesting aspect of the struggle against the RTUCT was the fact that the legal regulation was carried by the trade unionists of the JP and the RPP together with the government of the JP to the parliament. Harman stated that this regulation aimed to destroy “revolutionaryism” (Harman, 1970b, 169). The regulation briefly changed the representative capability of the RTUCT in the branched of working for total agreements for wage. Harman stated that only one trade union that was, Lastik-İş from the RTUCT, had the majority in the branch for total wage agreements. In other branches of working, the TUCT had the authority for negotiations. In a period after the issuing of new law, the workers would move from the RTUCT to the TUCT for total wage negotiations and then many branches of the RTUCT therefore would be closed. The other regulation was to limit the establishment of confederations. To establish a confederation it was predicated that at least one-third of the workers in the country had to be registered to the trade union. This minimum number was minimum 300 thousand members (within 1 million 200 thousands of workers registered in the social security institution). But the members of the RTUCT were 104 thousands according to their leaders. Harman sated that if the legal regulation was made, the RTUCT would be closed (Harman, 1970b, 171).

“What is to be done?” Harman asked. He portrayed the situation as such: The condition of the TUCT was not hopeful. It was the agent of the imperialism. The left of the centre movement in the RPP could not put itself forward. the RTUCT was nearly to be closed. “The level of consciousness in which our working class stays is evident”. The trade unions which would lose

their authority for wage negotiation would possibly be closed. Some trade uniond within the RTUCT could maintain itself in hardest conditions. Small ones would disappear. Harman argued that here this time was the point where the proletarian socialist had to start their works:

1) When the revolutionary trade unions enter into a prevalent war in order to live, they will take far more curious steps in the road of bringing down consciousness to the base. In these steps they will willingly or unwillingly look for the support of the proletarian socialist youth which they pushed away hitherto. It is those proletarian socialists who now represent 90 percent of the revolutionary youth.

Thereby organic connections between the proletarian socialist and the working class will increase, will be stronger (Harman, 1970b, 171).

2) The trade unions which did not have right for negotiation would possibly make agreements with other trade unions and could make realise agreements outside the legal framework. This requires a consciousness for the workers. The proletarian socialists would use this possibility to establish organics connections with the working class (Harman, 1970b, 172).

3) The trade unions which confronted with an end would attempt to resistance in the base of the trade union. These actions of resistance would create a consciousness for the working class (Harman, 1970b, 172). The proletarian socialists would participate in all kind of trade union action and would search in establishing organic relations with the workers (Harman, 1970b, 172)

4) Harman predicated that the social and economic conditions of Turkey would not allow a higher level of welfare for the worker through total wage negotiations. The liquidation of the trade unions and rising costs of life would lead the working class into actions and at the end into consciousness. The workers lead into actions “in order to live” “pushing away the trade unions to another side” (Harman, 1970b, 172).

In the date this article was published (June 1970) Harman referred to the predictions made by the State Planning Organisation for 1972. In this date, the number of the workers in mining, industry, energy, construction, commerce, transportation and services would rise to 5 million 729 thousand. Harman claimed that “We will bring scientific socialism to this 6 million’s mass”. They would make “organic relations” with all workers in all production spheres, workshops and in all provinces. They would also decipher the real essence of the TUCT from within it. They would help the workers seize their own “reactionary trade unions”. As for the agricultural workers, Harman said that their number would rise to 10 million 130 thousand in 1973 according to predictions, source of which is not told us. Majority of these agricultural workers were not a member of any trade union. Harman said that they had to breed “proletarian socialist militants” to organise, educate these workers and to make “action plans” (Harman, 1970b, 172).

And last is the slogan: “The victory will not belong to the, imperialism but to the working class” (Harman, 1970b, 172).

Harman did not make any division between the wage-labourer and the labourer in general. He also did not use any division for the workers of different sectors and different branches of production. I think that here we see that a division between “blue colours” and “white colours” had not yet become important in that time. What he said about agricultural worker is nothing but what Muzaffer Erdost said about dependent poor peasantry. and who the proletarian socialist militants were are the proletarian socialist youth which was claimed by Harman above to represent 90 percent of the revolutionary youth. These militants were a mass which emerged independently from the workers movement and there were not an objective necessity for that to integrate with the workers and the workers struggle. Revolutionary militancy which stamped over the period between late 1960 and 1980 were importantly the militancy and actions of the socialist youth, leaving aside the rising militancy of the workers. And last point is the fact that

Harman's analysis of the TUCT, including his analysis of the RTUCT, did not concern with the patrons of the workers of Turkey. The imperialism seems to lead into an ignorance of the capitalist classes of the country. This was an error even if it will be replied that the local capitalist classes are mere comprador or agents of the imperialist monopolist bourgeoisie. For this reason, the last statement made by Harman is a slogan: "The victory will not belong to the, imperialism but to the working class". The imperialism is *an imperialist paradigm* in the national democratic revolution strategy of *the Aydınlık* which dominates and exclude all other contradictions and conflicts. The imperialism as a paradigm hides away the capitalist classes of the country from our vista. The struggle is between the working class and the imperialism. At least, I would hope that *the Aydınlık* should analyse the local capitalists as a mediation of the imperialist penetration and domination.

5.3.5 Worker Resistance in June 70: A Sign of Maturation

The Aydınlık's analysis of and observation about 15-16 June events of 1970 follows the logic of national democratic revolution strategy. The events are not seen in anti-capitalist framework. Let me follow the presentation of the events through the eyes of *the Aydınlık*.

In 15 and 16 June of 1970 the workers of many factories and workshops in İstanbul and Kocaeli strike and occupied their workshops and then marched in the massive form. The workers who participated in marches were approximately 100 thousands. Although there was no command centre of the action, the action was realised in a disciplined way. The target of the action was clear when it was considered that the workers attacked towards the buildings of the TUCT which was the representative of American "yellow trade unionism", the JP, the NAP, the Association of Struggle against Communism and lastly a factory which belonged to the brothers of Süleyman Demirel, head of the Justice Party and the prime minister (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:193).

The violent events were caused and created by the social police whose members were recruited against the revolutionary youth and the workers and the government of the JP which commanded the police. There were hundreds of dead or injured workers (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:193). In the confrontation of the workers with the police, the formers destroyed the barricades and the latter ran away (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:194).

But the ones who understood the changing characteristic of the working class were also understood by the dominant forces, politicians and their American consultants (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:194-5). The revolutionary youth had led into actions in the trade unions were the important sign for them. They reacted with new law for the trade unions. All trade unions with the exception of the TUCT would be banned. The workers would be united by force within the TUCT. The law proposal were criticised by the legal specialists that it was opposed to the principle of freedom of organisation as defined in the constitution. *The Aydınlık* also claimed that the law proposal was also opposed to the constitution in terms of “**nation-ism**”; “a law which leads into any result which is not national must be opposed to the Constitution”. The TUCT was not a “national” organisation because it was commanded and financed by American imperialism. The law cannot have national characteristic since it will bring a non-national trade union to a monopolist condition in the country (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:195).

The Aydınlık made a comparison between Argentina and Turkey. The differences underlie economic conditions and the characteristics of the army in two countries. Like Turkey, Argentina was under “the American tutelage” and the dominant powers there was “the trio alliance of the imperialism, the comprador capital and big landowners”. Argentina, too, had yellow trade unions which were similar with the TUCT and which were supported by America. The workers of the revolutionary trade unions and Peronist trade unions, which had “national characteristics” in a certain degree resisted against “the American-ist yellow trade unionism”. However, Argentina differs

from Turkey in that it had better foreign commercial balance, important export goods. Argentina imported labour power in many times. It had better conditions than the other exploited countries in the imperialist system. Turkey was in front of an economic collapse. "Argentina is ruled by a fascist junta which is under the command of American imperialism". This junta was composed of some officers of "an army which had not war tradition". But *the Aydınlık* said that "In Turkey, there is an army in the history of which there is Dardanelle, which defeated the imperialism in the first time in a national liberation war, which is the inheritor of Mustafa Kemal's national liberationist tradition". The future of the officers who would imitate the juntas of Latin America would not be good (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:196). *The Aydınlık* stated that the dominant forces and American consultants had predicated that their policy would be easily realised. But the result was the inverse because of the hopes and aspirations of the working class in Turkey towards "honest" trade unionism (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:196).

The resistance of 15-16 June 1970 demonstrated that the workers began to be aware that economic struggle could not be divided from political struggle. This "political" consciousness was "the concrete result of the activity of the proletarian revolutionaries in the fronts of the workers". In the banners prepared by the workers there were not only the statements about the unity of the workers and the rights of the workers, but also statements for the "independency" of Turkey, opposition to America, and the demands for the unity of the army and the workers within a "national front". In the marches, it was stated that "torture" would be stopped in one day; "people" would break the chains (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:196). In addition, the song of Ankara was sung with some new words such as Morrison Süleyman (referring to a photograph of Süleyman Demirel taken in America and presented to the newspapers as an expression of American support to himself before the elections started) (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:197). (This song was a popular ballad which portrayed Ankara in the liberation war of 1920s).

The Aydınlık stated that revolutionary consciousness was transferred from the youth to the worker and peasant masses. The target of the action of 15 and 16 June was not only economic. It also included “political targets”. It was turned into “anti-imperialist” and “anti-fascist” characteristics. In this change, the intellectuals and especially the revolutionary youth had played an important role. The revolutionary youth was together with the workers during the marches and the confrontation with the police forces. “The revolutionary youth, in the days of the great worker resistance, successfully passed the exam of proletarian revolutionism” (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:197).

The action nullified the game which Demirel wanted to play in the last days. It was the game in which the army was confronted with the revolutionary youth, the workers and peasants. The army would be demonstrated as if it was the supporter of the JP’s government. A gap would be created between the army and the revolutionary forces. *The Aydınlık* observed that this game could not be played by the workers to a large degree. The soldiers and officers unlike the social police generally rejected shooting the workers. *The Aydınlık* observed again that the soldiers and the workers established friendly relationships with each other everywhere. The actionists called for a national front of the workers and soldiers. “The Turk Army remained faithful to its historical tradition”. It did not behave against its people (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:198).

The great worker resistance is a great step towards the path of Turkey’s national claim, of the claim of creating fully independent and truly democratic Turkey. Revolutionary solidarity with the ones who took these steps is a duty of patriotism (*the Aydınlık*, 1970:199).

5.3.6 Objective existence of the proletariat, the leadership

The proletariat, the leading class of the revolution: Now we face another shift of emphasis in the case of the national bourgeoisie: “The bourgeoisie is afraid of the movement of the masses, of the proletariat and it is either not independent in front of the foreign capital or cannot be a dominant class by

side of it". Which bourgeois is this, it is understood that it is *the national bourgeois ie*, or *the national section* of the bourgeoisie in Turkey. Erdost (*the Aydınlık*) here seems to have given up his hopes about the national bourgeoisie in the national democratic revolution. "The petty bourgeois is faltering, uncertain class". But "the proletariat" is "the unique class which is directly and completely opposed to the bourgeoisie and hence a unique class who is capable of being revolutionary to the end". These statements which originally belong to the Manifesto are quoted from Lenin by Erdost (Erdost, 1970:262).

"In Turkey today, the proletariat represents the most certain revolutionary force". It "rescues the petty bourgeoisie and the peasants from the influence of the dominant classes and their reactionary and conservative parties and is obliged to earn it to its own side". Erdost here suggests a very controversial point for the party organisation of the proletariat: "The proletariat by organising not only the proletariat but also all labourers under the roof of its own party and organising particularly the poor peasantry wins them to his side" (Erdost, 1970:263). All labourers including the poor peasants have a place in the proletarian party. We understand that this party is the party of the national democratic revolution which already tries to build a front. In other words, **it is indeed a popular party under the class leadership of the proletariat**. These sorts of organisational problems have been important lines of division among the Turkish left. Doğu Perinçek in his article "*Class Structure of the WPT's Members*" (Perinçek, 1969), observed that the class structure of the party membership was similar with other bourgeois parties and then criticised that such a situation could not be tolerated in a workers party. Mahir Çayan also advocated a party of the vanguards at the beginning of the revolutionary movement. I will deal with the organisation debates later in the case of *the Aydınlık's "The Outline for the Programme of the Proletarian Revolutionary Movement"* (Program, the *Aydınlık*, 1971).

We have again a quotation from Lenin made by Erdost: “Can a worker who has a socialist consciousness forget the democratic struggle for socialist struggle or socialist struggle for democratic struggle?” “No...a worker who has a class consciousness has understood the relationship between these two struggles. He knows that there is no path leading to socialism outside the democracy and the path passing in political freedom. For this reason, he struggles for the realisation of a complete democracy in order to reach in the ultimate aim, the socialism” (Erdost, 1970:263) (Lenin writes these words in 25 October 1905. In Turkish, see “The Working Class and the Peasantry” – *İşçi Sınıfı ve Köylülük*, 184; 1996). Lenin writes these statements during the 1905 revolution in Russia and about the democratic revolution. Erdost continues to say: “In the same way, when the proletarian revolutionary struggles for national democratic revolution, he does not forget the struggle for the socialist revolution. He does not see the national democratic revolution as ‘an end’, but as a part of the socialist revolution, as a stage”. He adds that “Lenin who defined the relationship between the bourgeois democratic revolution and socialist revolution said that: ‘The former turns into the latter’” (Erdost, 1970:263). Here I must take attention to some points only in the context of the quotations of Erdost. Firstly, Lenin talks about the socialist struggle and democratic struggle or struggle for socialism and struggle for democracy through the eyes of a socialist worker. He understands from the democracy “the political freedom”. This socialist worker struggles for socialism and hence struggle for the completion of democracy. At least in this context, Lenin does not point to a democratic revolution, leaving aside a national democratic revolution. In addition, what Lenin understands from “democracy” and “democratic revolution” is related mainly with the “bourgeois” demands of the peasantry in Russia. The bourgeois and democratic characteristics of the Russian revolution in both 1905 and 1917 February was caused by the peasant participation in the revolution and by the peasant-worker alliance later on.

The objective existence of the proletariat and its class ideology: One of the merits of Turkish socialist movement is that it conceives “ideology” as “class consciousness” due to the Leninist readings of Marx and the socialist debates. It is possibly for this reason that the spokesmen of the dominant classes always label any socialist argument as “ideology”. But on the other side, one of the merits of the spokesmen of the dominant classes labels all socialists “anarchist” or “revolutionary”. Both are objectively true since although Turkish revolutionaries have won an ideological identity after 1960 they could not achieve in an organisational unity and solidarity. Below, Erdost points to the existence of the proletariat with class consciousness in Turkey of the late 1960s.

Previously, Şahin Alpay in his article “*On ‘The Order of Turkey’*”, which criticised Doğan Avcıoğlu’s book “*The Order of Turkey’*) (Alpay, 1969; 465) argued that “In Turkey today a struggle for winning the leadership in the revolution of the proletarian revolutionaries and the proletariat takes place. In these conditions, Avcıoğlu’s statement that ‘in the present stage of development of our country, the nationalist revolutionaries seem to be nominee one more time in playing the leading role’ is not wrong at least for a while”. The proletariat and its representatives, the proletarian revolutionaries could not yet become the leader of the national democratic revolution. Let me recall that Şahin Alpay and his friends had begun to publish their own journal after the dissolution of *the Aydınlık* after its fifteenth issue. Erdost implicitly refers to their ideas below when he says that “it is said”.

Erdost says: “it is said that “‘the objective and subjective requirements of the leadership’ of the proletariat in the revolution ‘is not completely existed’. Is this correct?” Erdost accepts only the “wage-labourers” as the proletariat. In Turkey, the number of the wage-labourer, including the state servants, was 3037968. But this number had to be more than the wage-workers in the capitalist production including brain workers. According to the 1967 statistics, there were 1069387 registered labourers in the social insurance institution.

But this figure is also non confidential since in 1968 the persons who did look for job but did not find any were 167152. This registered unemployed persons and unregistered mass was a part of the proletariat. In addition, the agricultural wage-labourers were 376866 in the official statistics in 1968. Erdost suggests that these figures are possibly defective and that many of them are probably not registered in the social insurance institution. Moreover, there is more than 300 thousands' mass of workers in the foreign countries. These are not contained in the statistics above. Erdost concludes: "In Turkey there exists at least a proletarian mass reaching to 2 millions. Let me says that the proletariat is objectively existed" (Erdost, 1970:263).

These statements belong to February 1970 of Turkey three months before the first and the most militant workers action in Turkey, "June 1970 events". But it also belongs to a time a year before the military intervention in March 1971. In the same month when this article is published, some young revolutionaries within the circle of *the Aydınlık* establish a guerrilla party among the others for the purpose of "a peasant revolution" as conceived as "the national democratic revolution".

Erdost continued to say: for the working class to obtain "political consciousness, i.e. socialist consciousness", the intellectuals have to fulfil some functions as stated by Lenin in his "What is to be done". Erdost says:

The fact that the intellectuals who have admitted the proletarian socialism as an ideology attempt to transfer the leadership of the revolution through a complex language to the other class and stratum by forgetting the duty of equipping the proletariat with its class ideology and that they forget this duty is an unforgivable mistake (Erdost, 1970:264).

Whom does Erdost mean in our two successive quotations is here a different subject matter which must be concerned in the context of the various figures of the left of the time: from the left Kemalists such as Doğan Avcıoğlu to the PRA, from the military circles which still remember the memories of the May

1960's military intervention to the guerrilla parties of Mahir Çayan and Deniz Gezmiş.

5.4. PEASANTRY: AS AN INTERMEDIARY CLASS

The searches for the worker-peasant alliance in a Leninist framework are designed by *the Aydınlik* through a Maoist revolution strategy. The alliance as such is suggested by Lenin for socialist revolution. However, the Maoist strategy suggests it together with the support of the other “national and democratic” classes for a popular democratic revolution, which is also called “peasant revolution”. An acceptance of the Maoist NDR strategy logically gives an important place for the peasantry and its problems, which could be met only in a NDR. *The Aydınlik*, because of its strategic choice, does not evaluate well the position of the peasants in a developing capitalist framework. Dissolution of peasantry is conceived only in the elimination of the feudal and semi-feudal relations of production. However, there can be many paths for this dissolution according to Marxian framework. Marx's observations about the western model of primitive accumulation, the genesis of the capitalist farmer, and the genesis of the capitalist ground-rent, I have tried to deal with them above in the 3. Chapter, permit us to see many alternative paths of dissolutions. For example, ever-growing misery of the small peasant's production, this is inevitable for Marx, concentration of landed property in rural areas, development of urban industry, possibilities of increasing wealth in some conditions for the peasants and landlords, urbanisation through which rural areas are depopulated and urban economy is supplied with new fresh labour are all possible features of a dissolution. *The Aydınlik* does not see the development of the capitalist domination if it does not see clear categories of capital such as wage-labourer, capital investment and capitalist ground-rent. However, domination of capital follows some stages from formal domination to complete domination as I have presented in the case of the *Volume 1 of Capital* in the 2. Chapter. In addition, the peasant masses, the most miserable parts of which in particular, are

related with the question of industrial reserve army in Marxian framework. Turkish model of capitalist development also have such an opportunity. *The Aydınlık* does not apply to the Marxian categories since it sees Turkish agriculture mainly and exclusively in the framework of semi-dependent semi-feudal backward agricultural economy.

5.4.1 “The Foundational Moving Force”

The inner class differentiation of the peasant class in Turkey is proposed by Erdost and Kaymak as such: “Besides personal and legal dependencies, the village labourer has class differentiations in terms of property”. The peasantry is divided into “**semi-peasant** (or agricultural semi-proletariat)”, “**small peasant**”, “**the middle peasant**” and finally “**wealthy peasant**”. First two categories and one portion of the third category works in the backward, primitive and small lands. They are getting poor in time. Although the working class increases its income relatively, the majority of the peasants gets smaller share from the national wealth in proportion to the commodities it produces. In the areas where “natural economy” prevails, the living conditions are nearly the same with the 300-500 years before. Especially the peasants of the Eastern Anatolia and the South-Eastern Anatolia produce for its own consumption and the landowner. The surplus product is exchanged. The peasants do not have a share relatively from the increased national wealth. For the peasant to have a share from the national wealth, public investments which will increase the productivity of labour and an equal redistribution of land through land reform are needed. Public investments can be meaningful for the peasants only when a land reform is realised. The imperialism and the feudal landowners are the main obstacles before the development of the small producers. However, the small scale production in which land and the means of production is divided and dispersed itself is also an obstacle before the development of the productive forces. For this reason a concentration of the lands and the means of production are necessary (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 310). For this unity of the conditions of

production, there are two possibilities. The one is the capitalist private property under which divided lands are united (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 310-1). The capitalist private property on land means the disappearance of the small properties and the destruction of the majority of the peasants. Another path for the transformation of the small scale production in agriculture to the large scale agriculture is “the first stage of transformation into socialist production in agriculture” through which “the land is united into the collective property of the peasants”. Erdost and Kaymak suggest that before the capitalism destroys the peasantry, the large-scale production is possible only in socialism. For this reason, the semi-peasant, small peasant and the majority of the middle peasantry can escape from destruction only if they move towards socialism after the national democratic revolution (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 311). This characteristic of the peasantry implies that it will not content with the democratic revolution and tries to complete this revolution. As a result, “the poor peasantry is the **foundational** moving force which change the semi-dependent and semi-feudal order that has become the main obstacle for its development” (Erdost and Kaymak, 1971: 311). While “the proletariat is the **foundational** and **leading** force of the revolution”, “the poor peasantry is the **foundational** moving force” during the stage of national democratic revolution.

5.4.2 Primitive Accumulation and Peasant

Western Model of Primitive Accumulation in “Capital”: *Letter to Mikhailovsky (1877)* dealt with the problem of the possibility of surpassing the capitalist mode of production and the applicability of the Western development experience to the other, particularly to the backwards countries in economic terms. Marx said in his reply to populist Russian Mikhailovsky that his analysis of “primitive accumulation” in *Capital* “does not pretend to do more than trace the path by which, in Western Europe, the capitalist order of economy emerged from the womb of the feudal order of economy. It therefore describes the historical movement which by divorcing the producers

from their means of production converts them into wage workers (the proletarians in the modern sense of the word) while it converts those who possess the means of production into capitalists". Marx quoted from his *Capital* that "the basis of this whole development is the expropriation of the agricultural producer. This has been accomplished in radical fashion only in England...but all the countries of Western Europe are going through the same movement". He said that in the same book, the chapter related with the historical tendency of production explained that as it stimulated "the productive forces of social labour and "the integral development of every individual producer", "capitalist property" rested on "a collective mode of production" and was obliged to transform itself into "social property" (SW; 617). Marx stated that what Mikhailovsky made of "this historical sketch" was this: if Russia became to a capitalist country after the example of Western European countries, she would not be successful unless it had not transformed her peasants into proletarians. Marx said that: "He feels he absolutely must metamorphose my historical sketch of the genesis of capitalism in Western Europe into a historico-philosophic theory of the general path every people is fated to tread, whatever the historical circumstances in which it finds itself". Marx rejected such metamorphose by giving the example of Roman plebeians. These initially "free peasants" were expropriated as big landed property and big money capital appeared. However, Marx said "What happened? The Roman proletarians became not wage-labourers but a mob of do-nothings more abject than the former 'poor whites' in the South of the United States". The emerging mode of production was not capitalist but based on "slavery". Marx concluded that "Thus events strikingly analogous but taking place in different surroundings led to totally different results". He said that studying each cases of evolution and comparisons could give some clues, "but one will never arrive there by using as one's master key a general historico-philosophical theory, the supreme virtue of which consists in being supra-historical" (SW; 618).

The origination of the capitalist mode of production presupposes a primitive accumulation. The accumulation of capital presupposes surplus-value under capitalist production that requires certain amount of capital and labour-power in the hands of commodity producers. This “never-ending circle” departs from a point, which is called primitive accumulation (Marx, 1990a, 873). The process is simply the formation of capital and capital-relation. It “operates two transformations, whereby the social means of subsistence and production are turned into capital, and the immediate producers are turned into wage-labourers” (Marx, 1990a, 874). The transformation of money and commodities, the means of production and subsistence are transformed into capital. The owners of capital and “free workers” who are free in the sense that they are neither “slave” or “serfs” nor “self-employed peasant proprietors” and who are free from the means of production, as two different sorts of commodity owners, form two **classes** of the commodity market. The polarisation of this market as such offers “the fundamental conditions of capitalist production”. “The capitals-relation presupposes a complete separation between the workers and the ownership of the conditions for the realisation of their labour. As soon as capitalist production stands on its own feet, it not only maintains this separation, but reproduces it on a constantly extending scale (Marx, 1990a, 874).

The freedom of worker, as stated above, also requires the freedom from the regime of the guilds and their restrictions in the general context of feudal society. The industrial capitalists, says Marx, not only displaced the guild masters but also feudal lords; “the rise of the industrial capitalists appears as the fruit of a victorious struggle both against feudal power and its disgusting prerogatives, and against the guilds, and the fetters by which the latter restricted the free development of production and the free exploitation of man by man. The formation of wage-labourer and the capitalist was “the enslavement of the worker”. The only difference between the old and new system was “the transformation of feudal exploitation into capitalist exploitation” (Marx, 1990a, 875).

Marx observes that “the first sporadic traces of capitalist production” traces back to the Mediterranean towns in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But “the capitalist era” begins in the sixteenth century. Wherever the capitalist era begins, the serfdom has long since been abolished and “independent city-states” of the middle ages have begun to disappear. The formation of “the capitalist **class**” and of “free, unprotected and rightless proletarians” presupposes the expropriation of the peasant from the soil and the classical example of this process, says Marx, is England (Marx, 1990a, 876).

The Reformation, on the other hand, contributes to the transformation of the old property relations. The church property was spoiled, and monasteries were dissolved. The people who lived in there turned into the proletariat. The properties of the Catholic Church were sold to speculator farmers and townsmen (Marx, 1990a, 881). The rights of the poor over “the church’s tithes” were ignored (Marx, 1990a, 882). But, the long lasting result of the Reformation was the decisive attack over “the religious bulwark of the old conditions of landed property” (Marx, 1990a, 883).

Under the Stuart line, between 1603 and 1714, “the landed proprietors” realised the “act of usurpation” through “legal means” and also abolished the feudal rights over land. They compensated the loss of the state that was the result of this abolishment by charging the taxes on the peasantry and the rest of the people (Marx, 1990a, 883). In this way, they got “the rights of modern private property in estates”. At the end of the seventieth century, the “‘glorious Revolution’ brought into power...the landed and capitalist profit-grubbers”. Since he demonstrates how capital’s primitive accumulation begins in the context of the public or state properties, we follow Marx:

The “the clearing of estates” was the “last great process of expropriation of the labourer from agricultural lands. When “independent peasant” disappears, “cottages” were cleared. So, the agricultural labourers were

expropriated from both the conditions of working and living (Marx, 1990a, 889-90).

Another way for the formation of great private property took place in the Highland Celts where nominal right of the clan's chiefs over the land were transformed into a right of private property. The titular ownership of property was changed into a real private property. When clansmen resisted, the force was set in motion (Marx, 1990a, 890).

The process is summarised by Marx in that way:

The spoliation of the Church's property, the fraudulent alienation of the state domains, the theft of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and clan property and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of ruthless terrorism, all these things were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation. They conquered the field for capitalist agriculture, incorporated the soil into capital, and created for the urban industries the necessary supplies of free and rightless proletarians (Marx, 1990a, 895).

Bloody Legislation against the expropriated since the end of the fifteenth century: The formation of free proletarians is not sufficient for the primitive accumulation of capital. The means for the preservation and reproduction of this freedom also was to be created by all legal and political mechanisms. The free and rightless proletariat "could not immediately adapt themselves to the discipline of their new condition". After the end of the fifteenth century, "a bloody legislation" was enforced against the immoral and illegal attitudes of the proletariat throughout Western Europe. Beggars, vagabonds, idlers, slaves, rascals, poor begun the subjects of legal regulations. Marx observes that the mid seventeenth century's Paris had been "a kingdom of vagabonds". Discipline was only a cure: "Thus were the agricultural folk first forcibly expropriated from the soil, driven from their homes, turned into vagabonds, and then whipped, branded and tortured by grotesquely terroristic laws into accepting the discipline necessary for the system of wage-labour" (Marx, 1990a, 899). The system of wage-labourer,

Marx states, requires not only the concentration of capital at one pole of society and the sellers of labour-power, “grouped masses of men who have nothing to sell but their labour-power”, at the other pole. “Nor is it enough that they are compelled to sell themselves voluntarily” (note to the statement, compulsion for voluntary sell). Adequate conditions are these:

The advance of capitalist production develops a working class which by education, tradition and habit looks upon the requirements of that mode of production as self-evident natural laws. The organisation of the capitalist process of production, once it is fully developed, breaks down all resistance. The constant generation of a relative surplus population keeps the law of the supply and demand of labour, and therefore wages, within narrow limits which correspond to capital's valorisation requirements. The silent compulsion of economic relations sets the seal on the domination of the capitalist over the worker. Direct extra-economic force is still of course used, but only in exceptional cases. In the ordinary run of things, the worker can be left to the 'natural laws of production', i.e. it is possible to rely on his dependence on capital, which springs from the conditions of production themselves, and is guaranteed in perpetuity by them. It is otherwise during the historical genesis of capitalist production. The rising bourgeoisie needs the power of the state, and uses it to 'regulate' wages, i.e. to force them into the limits suitable for making a profit, to lengthen the working day, and to keep the worker himself at his normal level of dependence. This is an essential aspect of so-called primitive accumulation (Marx, 1990a, 899-900)

What we are introduced above is the historical determination of the capitalist mode of production in its advance stage. The working class sees the requirements of the capitalist mode of production as *self-evident natural laws*. The capitalist process of production *breaks down all resistance*. The constant generation of *a relative surplus population* keeps the law of the supply and demand of labour within narrow limits of capital's valorisation requirements. *The silent compulsion of economic relations* completes the domination of the capitalist over the worker. Direct extra-economic force is used only in exceptional cases. In the ordinary run of things, the worker can be left to the '*natural laws of production*' since the worker's dependence on capital springs from the conditions of production themselves, and is guaranteed in perpetuity by them. On the other hand, in the stage of primitive accumulation, the *rising*

bourgeoisie needs the power of the state, and uses it to 'regulate' wages, i.e. to force them into the limits suitable for making a profit, to lengthen the working day, and to keep the worker himself at his *normal level of dependence*.

The formation of the working class is the same thing with the domination of the capitalist over the worker. *The silent compulsion of economic relations* replaces the *direct extra-economic force*. The laws of capitalist production are conceived as natural laws rather than social historical laws. The fully developed capitalist process of production breaks down all resistance. When its operations begin to be seen as the natural state of affairs and when direct force is replaced with the silent economic compulsion, any resistance against it becomes meaningless.

"The **class** of wage-labourers", that came into existence in the second half of the fourteenth century, occupied then a small portion of the population and was protected by the existence of the independent peasants in the countryside and guilds in the towns. The domination of capital over labour was only formal, that is, the mode of production was not "specifically capitalist character". The demand for labour was high and the variable portion of capital was higher than the constant part. A large portion of the national product entered into "the consumption-fund of the workers". But this golden age is also the age of primitive accumulation. The statute of Labourers in 1349 fixed wages and regulated piece-work and day-work. High wages were forbidden but not lower wages (Marx, 1990a, 900). In 1360, besides increased penalties against the wages that are higher than legal rates, combination of workers were forbidden and accepted as a crime until 1825. In the sixteenth century, the condition of the workers became worse than the previous times. Their real wages fell with the legal force. Labour regulation, including the law against the workers' combinations, was extended to the other possible categories of worker (Marx, 1990a, 901-02).

The legal minimum wage was proposed for the agricultural labourers in 1796. But in 1813, the legal regulation of wages was repealed when “the capitalist began to regulate his factory by his own private legislation” (Marx, 1990a, 902). On the other hand, in 1825, laws against the workers’ combination partially collapsed “in the face of the threatening attitude of the proletariat”. Finally, the act of 29 June 1871 removed “the last traces of this **class** legislation by giving legal recognition to trade unions”. But, another act compensated the loss by re-establishing the old situation in a new form. Marx observes that “only against its will, and under the pressure of the masses, did the English Parliament give up the laws against strikes and trade unions, after it had itself, with shameless egoism, held the position of a permanent trade union of the capitalists against the workers throughout five centuries” (Marx, 1990a, 903).

5.4.3 Small peasants in *Capital*

Small-Scale Peasant Ownership: In this case, “the peasant is the free proprietor of his land, which appears as his main instrument of production, as the indispensable field of employment for his labour and his capital”. The peasant does not pay any “lease-price” and hence “**rent does not appear as a separate form of surplus-value**” even if there is a surplus-profit compared with other production branches and this surplus profit, like the entire product, is appropriated by him (Marx, 1991b, 940).

Marx observes that “this form of ownership” like the earlier ones “presupposes that the agricultural population has a great numerical preponderance over the urban population” (Marx, 1991b, 941). Marx relates this population concentration in agricultural production to the fragmentation of capital. He says that “even if the capitalist mode of production is dominant it is relatively little developed, so that the concentration of capitals is also confined to narrow limits in the other branches of production, and a fragmentation of capital prevails”. The preponderance of the agricultural

population also means that large part of the agricultural product goes to consumption of the peasants and only the excess over this consumption left for “trade with towns as a commodity”. Here, a differential rent, “an excess portion of commodity price”, must necessarily emerge for “better or better-located lands, just as there is in the capitalist mode of production”. This rent is existed independently from the formation of the average market prices for the agricultural products. This means that “the peasant whose labour is realised under more favourable conditions pockets this himself” (Marx, 1991b, 941).

It is sure the peasant may buy or sell land. Here, “the land price makes up an element of the peasant’s production costs. In the conditions where the price of land, which is capitalised rent, is given in advance, rent appears independent from the fertility or location of land. Here Marx also says that it is assumed in the average case that absolute rent is not existed, that is, “the worst soil does not pay any rent; for absolute rent assumes either a realised excess value of the product above its price of production or an excess monopoly price for the product above its value”. However, because of the preponderance of the agricultural economy, “the governing market price of the product only reaches its value under extraordinary conditions; this value, however, will stand as a rule above the price of production, on account of the preponderant element of living labour, even though the excess of the value above the price of production will be limited again by the low composition also of non-agricultural capital in countries where a smallholding economy prevails”. In the previous definition, Marx observed that rent seemed to exist independently from any differences of land in terms of fertility and location. Here he has also included the assumption that absolute rent is absent since the preponderance of small holding economy (“the rural economy here is largely one of agriculture for immediate subsistence, with the land being an indispensable field of occupation for the labour and capital of the majority of the population”) meant that there was no significant difference between the composition of capitals of the agricultural and non-agricultural production,

that is, there is no excess value of the product above its value and that there is no an excess monopoly price for the product above its value as described as the conditions of the existence of the absolute rent. In the small holding economy, the exploitation pursued by the peasant is “not limited by the average profit on capital, in as much as he is a small capitalist; nor by the need for a rent, in as much as he is a landowner” (Marx, 1991b, 941). According to Marx’s definitions, the smallholder peasant seems to be his own capitalist and his own wage-labourer; “The only absolute barrier he faces **as a petty capitalist** is the wage that he pays himself, after deducting his actual expenses” (Marx, 1991b, 941-2). He maintains his cultivation provided that the price of product is adequate for this wage. He is a landowner and does not confront with any property barrier. The latter is not in opposition to capital or labour. The only barrier is the mortgage and the “interest on the price of land”. It is sure that this payment is met out of a portion of surplus labour, which would be profit under capitalist conditions. Marx observes that in the case of mortgage, “The rent anticipated in the price of land and the interest paid on it, therefore, can be no more than a part of the capitalised surplus labour of the peasant over and above the labour indispensable for his own subsistence, but this surplus labour does not have to be realised in apportion of commodity value equal to the entire surplus profit, and still less in an excess above the surplus labour realised in the average profit, i.e. a surplus profit”. This “rent anticipated in the price of land and the interest paid on it” is not a surplus profit which is to be obtained by the peasant and then to be transferred to the mortgagee. Rather it “may be a deduction from the average profit or even the only part of this that is realised”. For this reason, Marx observes that the maintenance of cultivation or the purchase of land by the peasant does not necessarily mean that market prices yield him the average profit or an excess over and above this average profit that is “fixed in the form of rent”. The market price is not necessarily the same with the value of his product or with its price of production. Here Marx observes that “This is one of the reasons why the price of corn in countries where small-scale ownership predominates is lower than in countries of the capitalist mode of

production. A portion of the surplus labour performed by those peasants working under the least favourable conditions is presented to society for nothing and does not contribute towards governing the price of production or forming value. This lower price of corn in countries of small-scale ownership is a result of the poverty of the producers and in no way of the productivity of their labour” (Marx, 1991b, 942).

In the statement above, Marx observed that since the price of land, which is capitalised rent, is given in advance, rent appeared independent from the fertility or location of land. In addition he also assumed that there was no absolute rent and interest paid to the mortgagee was a part of the capitalised surplus labour of the peasant. The “wage” of peasant, of this “petty capitalist”, on the other hand, points to an “absolute barrier”. He pays himself after deducting his actual expense. He maintains his agricultural activity “as long as the price of the product is sufficient for him to cover this wage; and he often does so down to a physical minimum” (Marx, 1991b, 942). Hence, this minimum is the last point where his activity may stop.

It is interesting that Marx has used the concept of “the economic basis of society”. It is indeed that he does not see the free smallholding economy as only a form of ownership. He states that “the free ownership of the peasant who farms his land himself is evidently the most normal form of landed property for small-scale cultivation, i.e. for a mode of production in which possession of the land is a condition for the worker’s ownership over the product of his own labour, and in which, whether he is free or a dependent proprietor, the tiller always has to produce his means of subsistence himself, independently, as an isolated worker with his family” (Marx, 1991b, 943). The statements of “the free ownership of the peasant”, “possession of the land”, “the worker’s ownership over the product”, “whether he is free or a dependent proprietor”, “the tiller”, “an isolated worker with his family” all demonstrate that the free smallholder peasant of Marx can be seen in various periods of history from slavery to late feudal time. In addition, an ownership may be only

a possession, rather than a property in legal terms. The form of ownership, the scale of production, the position of the actual producer in their dominant forms indeed point to the existence of a mode of production. However, **none of them imply a specific historical category**. Rather, they can be witnessed in various and different periods of history. Even Marx accepts that this form is seen in the conditions where this free ownership is existed with dependent proprietor. The question is similar with the existence of money and capital throughout history. Hence, this mode of production, if any, does not have any historical specificity just as in the case of money and commodity production which can be observed throughout history.

The other causes or dynamics is suggested as external causes of the decline of the smallholders. Large-scale industry against the rural small scale domestic industry connected with peasant economy, large-scale agriculture against the small scale cultivation and the technological developments, against the tools of the peasants, are the *specific* products and the conditions of the development of the capitalist mode of production.

The smallholding economy is “always” impoverished by usury and taxation, says Marx. The capital laid out for the price of land also means the withdrawal of capital from agriculture. Another limit of the development of this cultivation is “Incessant fragmentation of means of production and isolation of the producers themselves”. Marx sees here a “Tremendous wastage of human labour” (Marx, 1991b, 943). **“The progressive deterioration of the conditions of production and the increase in price of the means of production is a necessary law of small-scale landowning. The disastrous effect of good seasons for this mode of production”** (Marx, 1991b, 943-4). Marx sees “this mode of production” outmoded. With the development of large-scale industry, large-scale agriculture and the development of agricultural technology, accompanying with its internal limits, it is obliged to dissolve.

Marx states that “One particular evil of small-scale agriculture, where this is combined with the free ownership of land, arises from the way the tiller lays out capital in purchasing land” (Marx, 1991b, 944). It should be noted that the small-scale agriculture is not necessarily combined with the free ownership as in the case of share-cropping or any small scale cultivation that is realised on the plots of land of feudal landowner, for instance. But where it is combined with the free ownership (or where “the owner of the large estate lays out capital first to buy land and then again to cultivate it himself as his own farmer”) (Marx, 1991b, 944), capital is withdrawn from the agriculture itself. In addition to this, the transformation of land into a mere commodity implies that “changes in possession multiply” and that land becomes “a predominant element of overhead costs, or the cost price of the product for the individual producer” (Marx, 1991b, 944).

In **agriculture pursued on a capitalist basis**, “the landowner simply receives the **annual rent** and the farmer pays nothing for the land besides this”. Where the capital is invested by the farmer to purchase land, this is “**an interest-bearing capital investment**” for him, but not “capital invested in agriculture itself”. Here rent is capitalised and hence anticipated in the price of land. The capital invested in purchasing land is included neither in the fixed capital nor in the circulating capital. It provides only “a title for the purchaser to receive the annual rent” (Marx, 1991b, 944). Capital is handed over by the buyer to the seller of land, and “the seller thereby renounces his property in the land”. It is indeed that the capital invested in purchasing land is included neither in the fixed capital nor in the circulating capital since it “no longer exists as the capital of the buyer”. It is not a part of capital that is to be invested in the land itself (Marx, 1991b, 945). If the buyer bought a slave, the situation would be the same. “The fact that he has bought the slave does not enable him immediately to exploit him. He is only able to do this by putting further capital into the slave economy” (Marx, 1991b, 945). Marx states that “The same capital does not exist twice over”. In the case of the purchaser of land, “The buyer now has no capital, but a piece of land instead”. But what

occurs in terms of rent is this: “The fact that the rent obtained from the actual investment on this piece of land is now reckoned by the new landowner as interest on capital that he has not invested on the land but has parted with in order to obtain it, does not change the economic nature of the land factor in the slightest, any more than the fact that someone has paid 1000 & for 3 per cent Consols has anything to do with the capital from whose revenue the interest on the national debt is paid” (Marx, 1991b, 945). This is an interest-bearing capital investment for the purchaser of land and the price of land is the capitalised or anticipated rent. Marx observes that capital which is paid over in the purchase of land or of “government bonds” is “capital *in itself*, just as any sum of value is potential capital on the basis of the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 1991b, 945). The payment is a mere “sum of money” (Marx, 1990a, 945-6). For the buyer, what he has bought does not function as capital, but “functions in his accounts as interest-bearing capital, since he reckons the income he receives-as rent from the land or as debt interest from the government- as interest on the money that it cost him to purchase the title to this revenue” (Marx, 1991b, 946). The land can be transformed into capital only when it is re-sold. But for the new owner of land, too, the money spent is not “actual capital” (Marx, 1991b, 946).

We have seen that the price of land or the capitalised rent is the interest-bearing capital for the buyer of land. In the case of the smallholder peasant, rent and the price of land can enter into the determination of the price of the agricultural product in two ways. Firstly in the conditions where the composition of capital leads into the fact that the value of the agricultural product is higher than its price of production and the fact the landowner therefore can valorise the difference between them. Secondly, in the conditions where there is a monopoly price. However, these cases are limited for the smallholder and petty landowner since production is pursued by them for their needs in the main, and realised without having the determination of the general rate of profit. In the conditions where smallholding economy is realised on “leased farms”, “the lease-price includes far more than under any

other conditions a part of the profit, and even a deduction from wages; it is then only nominally rent, not rent as an independent category vis-à-vis wages and profit” (Marx, 1991b, 946). **Rent is rather limited for the smallholder and petty landowner and is a part of profit or a part of wages in the leased farms of the smallholding economy, hence “only nominally rent, not rent as an independent category vis-à-vis wages and profit”** (Marx, 1991b, 946). But in the latter case, it is dependent on wage and profit.

Again in the case of the small peasant, money capital for purchasing land reduces the amount of capital which can be used for actual production and limits the reproduction. In addition, “It subjects the small peasant to usury, since in this sphere there is always less credit proper. It is a constraint on agriculture, even when the purchase of large estates is involved” (Marx, 1991b, 946). Marx suggests that the investment of loaned money capital on the purchase of land “actually contradicts the capitalist mode of production, for which the indebtedness of the landowner, whether his estate is inherited or bought, is on the whole immaterial”. Marx seems to say that this is only related with the fact that whether money capital is invested for the capitalisation of rent or invested as interest-bearing capital. If the producer becomes landowner thanks to loaned money, and hence indebted landowner, he gets the rent himself and then hands it over necessarily to the money lender: “whether he pockets the rent himself or has to pay it over to a mortgagee in no way affects the cultivation of the property leased” (Marx, 1991b, 947).

For the normal conditions, Marx states that “once the ground-rent is given, the price of land is governed by the rate of interest”. There is an inverse ratio between them. A low rate of interest means that the price of land is high. However, in the smallholding economy, this relation is not valid because of the absence of “the general laws of credit” on the part of the peasants. These laws require that producers be capitalists. In addition, where this sort of economy predominates and “the smallholding peasant forms the backbone of

the nation”, capital formation, social reproduction, and money for loan are weak. This sort of capital formation necessitates “the concentration and existence of a class of rich idle capitalists”. Moreover, where landownership is important for large part of the producers as in the smallholding economy, “the price of land will rise independently of the rate of interest and often in inverse proportion to it, because the demand for landed property will outweigh the supply”. Fragmentation of land into parcels also means that higher prices are paid for small parcels of land because the buyers are small and large. Marx states that these reasons lead into high prices for land even in the case of high interest rate (Marx, 1991b, 947). The situation is in contrast with “the high and usurious rate he himself has to pay to his mortgagee” (Marx, 1991b, 947-8). Marx states that rising prices of land can even lead into a point where production can not be maintained (Marx, 1991b, 948). Here, land is turned into a commodity as a result of the **development of the capitalist mode** of production. However, if the price of land creates such a situation, the capitalist mode of production is **not very developed** and the agriculture is not or not yet subjected to it, but “**subjected to a mode of production taken over from forms of society that have disappeared**”. Here the dependence of the producer on the price of products as a negative aspect of the capitalist production is combined with its “incomplete development” as another negative aspect of it. “The peasant becomes a merchant and industrialist without the conditions in which he is able to produce his product as a commodity” (Marx, 1991b, 948).

Marx observes that the “conflict between the price of land as an element of the cost price for the producer and as a non-element of the price of production for the product” demonstrates one of the forms of “the contradiction between the private ownership of land and a rational agriculture, the normal social use of the land”. However, despite the existence of this irrationality, Marx points to a dialectical relationship between ownership and non-ownership under capitalist mode: “**private ownership of land, and thus the expropriation from the land of the direct producers-**

private ownership for some, involving non-ownership of the land for others- is the basis of the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 1991b, 948). Landownership means the existence of people without land, and without a condition of production.

Private property and the price of land is a barrier both to the small-scale and large-scale agriculture because it reduces the productive investment of capital. Only the landowner benefits such a situation (Marx, 1991b, 948). In both cases, land is not treated in a conscious and rational manner. Rather, “the powers of the earth” is exploited and squandered. In the smallholding, this is caused by the fact that science and technology cannot be adequately implemented. In the large landed property, this is the result of the fact that the farmer and the landowner exploit resources “for the most rapid possible enrichment”. This is because both scales depend on the market price (Marx, 1991b, 949).

If small-scale landowner ship creates a class of barbarians standing half outside society, combining all the crudity of primitive social forms with all the torments and misery of civilised countries, large landed property undermines labour-power (Marx, 1991b, 949)

Marx observes that the preponderance of the small-scale landownership presupposes the existence of a large agricultural population and the domination of the isolated labour over social. Here, wealth and reproduction is limited and weak in material and intellectual aspects and the conditions for a rational agriculture are also constrained. On the other side, “large landed property reduces the agricultural population to an ever decreasing minimum and confronts it with an ever growing industrial population crammed together in large towns; in this way it produces conditions that provoke an irreparable rift in the interdependent process of social metabolism, a metabolism prescribed by the natural laws of life itself. The result of this is a squandering of the vitality of the soil, which is carried by trade far beyond the bounds of a single country” (Marx, 1991b, 949). Marx prefers “a conscious and rational treatment of the land as permanent communal property, as the inalienable

condition for the existence and reproduction of the chain of human generations”, neither unconditional large-scale agriculture nor unconditional small-scale landownership. “If **small-scale landownership creates a class of barbarians** standing half outside society, **combining all the crudity of primitive social forms** with all the torments and misery of civilised countries, large landed property undermines labour-power in the final sphere to which its indigenous energy flees, and where it is stored up as a reserve fund for renewing the vital power of the nation, on the land itself” (Marx, 1991b, 949-50). Large-scale industry ruins “the natural power of man”, and industrialised large-scale agriculture ruins “the natural power of the soil”. These two destructions are combined in the later stage of development because industrially realised agriculture devitalises the workers, while the industry and trade help the agriculture exhaust the soil (Marx, 1991b, 950). Now here is the ecologist Marx in the context of man’s unity with nature.

In *Capital’s Volume 3*, debate about the genesis of capitalist ground-rent comes after the analyses of the differential rent and absolute rent, and the rent of buildings, rent of mines and the price of land. But, I will briefly deal with these after the genesis of the capitalist ground-rent.

Marx states that the landed property is not the subject matter of the last part of the *Capital’s Volume 3*, but “a portion of the surplus-value that capital produces falls to the share of the landowner”. It is assumed that agriculture is dominated by the capitalist mode, i.e. rural production is realised by capitalists. The assumption about the domination of the capitalist mode of production also implies the domination of capital of “all spheres of production and bourgeois society”. This domination implies the other preconditions of the capitalist mode of production such as “the free competition of capitals, their transferability from one sphere of production to another, and equal level of average profit, etc” “in their full development”. Here the landed property is “a specific historical form, a form *transformed* by the intervention of capital and the capitalist mode of production”. The original form may be feudal

landed property or small peasant agriculture for which “the possession of the land and soil” seems to be a condition for the direct producer, “the condition for *his* mode of production to flourish” (Marx, 1991b, 751).

Landed property means a monopoly of some private persons over some part of the earth by excluding the others (Marx, 1991b, 752). The legal power of these persons enables them to use or misuse this monopoly. However, the use of this power depends on economic environment. Landowner is a mere commodity owner. The legal conception of the private landed property, says Marx, emerges in the ancient times when the organic order of society began to dissolve and in the modern times when the capitalist production begun to develop. Legal conception is related with the ownership of land as a commodity. It is exported to Asia by the Europeans (Marx, 1991b, 753).

The monopoly of the landed property is a precondition for the development of the capitalist mode of production and exists as its own foundation. However, the capitalist mode of production changes its form when it confronts with it, by subjecting agriculture to capital. For this reason, “feudal landed property, clan property or small peasant property with the mark community is transformed into the economic form corresponding to this mode of production, however diverse the legal forms of this may be” (Marx, 1991b, 754). The capitalist mode of production firstly transforms old agriculture to a scientific and conscious activity to within the limits of private property (Marx, 1991b, 754). Secondly, it deprives landed property of “relations of lordship and servitude, while on the other hand it completely separates the land as a condition of labour from landed property and the landlord, for whom moreover this land represent nothing but a certain monetary tax that his monopoly permits him to extract from the industrial capitalist, the farmer” (Marx, 1991b, 755). The capitalist farmer is, too, an industrial capitalist. Landed proprietor no longer has to live in his landed property. It loses all traditional political and social connotations. Marx states that the capitalist

mode of production rationalises agriculture and reduces the landed property into “an absurdity” (Marx, 1991b, 755).

The capitalist mode of production on agricultural sphere assumes that “the actual cultivators are wage-labourers, employed by a capitalist, the farmer, who pursues agriculture simply as a particular field of exploitation of capital, as an investment of his capital in a particular sphere of production. At certain specific dates, e.g. annually, this farmer-capitalist pays the landowner...a contractually fixed sum of money (just like the interest fixed for the borrower of money capital), for the permission to employ his capital in this particular field of production. This sum of money is known as ground-rent, irrespective of whether it is paid for agricultural land, building land, mines, fisheries, forests, etc” (Marx, 1991b, 755-6). Landed property is thus “economically realised, valorised” in the form of ground-rent. “We have together here, moreover, and confronting one another, **all three classes that make up the framework of modern society- wage-labourer, industrial capitalist, landowner**” (Marx, 1991b, 756). In the last chapter of Capital Volume 3, “Classes”, it will be said that “The **owners of mere labour-power, the owners of capital and the landowners**, whose respective sources of income are wages, profit and ground-rent-in other words **wage-labourers, capitalists and landowners- form the three great classes of modern society based on the capitalist mode of production**” (Marx, 1991b, 1025). Three classes or three great classes of modern society are the owners of mere labour-power, the owners of capital and the owners of land. Here we face a three-class model of modern society which is based on a developed capitalist mode of production. Marx observes the best realisation of this model in England where capitalist farming besides industrial capital has a long tradition. It is already Marx who sees capitalist farming as a form of industrial production of capital; “the farmer produces wheat, etc. just as the manufacturer produces yarn or machines” (Marx, 1991b, 752). Only the fields of investment of capital are different. In the case of ground-rent, Marx talks

about capitalist rural production, in fact. Similarly, the capital may be invested on building land or on forestry, or on mining.

Ground-rent is paid by the farmer to the landowner. Marx calls this “ground-rent proper”. “Interest on the capital incorporated into the earth and the improvements that are thereby made to the soil as an instrument of production may form a portion of the rent that is paid by the farmer to the landowner”. But this is not ground-rent proper. So the question is not rent (in general terms) but the rent paid to only the naked land itself (Marx, 1991b, 756). The capital investments in the agricultural production which are made to improve the land fall to the landowner when the contract between the farmer and the landowner expires. “When the new lease contract is concluded, the landowner adds interest on the capital incorporated into the earth to the ground-rent proper”. In this case, rent increases, so does the value of land. If the landowner sells his land, he will sell not only land, but the improved land. This addition costs nothing for him. Marx observes that this is “one of the secrets-quite apart from the movement of ground-rent as such- of the increasing enrichment of the landowners, the constant inflation of their rents and the growing money value of their estates as economic development progresses” (Marx, 1991b, 757). Marx states that the source of this rent increment of the landowners is “the result of a social development achieved without their participation” (Marx, 1991b, 757). On the other hand, such a situation points to a obstacle to a rational agricultural development since the capitalist farmer does not want to make additional investment which will have not any return for him during his contract period (Marx, 1991b, 757).

The difference between “the ground-rent proper and the interest on the fixed capital incorporated into the land” is clearly seen in the property in buildings (not only housing). Interest on the buildings goes to “the industrial capitalists, the building speculator or farmer” before the expiration date of the lease. This interest is not related with the ground-rent which is paid annually for the use-of land. The capital incorporated into land at the end goes to the landlord and

its interest increases his rent (Marx, 1991b, 759). (The lease-price of the housing is in fact the interest on the building paid to the landlord. Here it is the interest of the fixed capital incorporated into the land by the capitalist farmer or industrialist. Instead of leasing the building and hence paying the lease price, he build himself).

Ground-rent is presented as being identical with interest by some advocates of the landed property such as Carey, says Marx. Thereby, they abolish “the opposition between the landowners and capitalists”. But, ground-rent is “the specific economic expression of landed property” (Marx, 1991b, 759). However, “ground-rent can and does exist without the addition of any interest on the capital incorporated into the soil”, “landowner nor only receives interest on other people’s capital in this way, without it costing him anything, but gets the capital itself for nothing into the bargain”. As regards with the justification for landed property, Marx says that it is a form of property, but “at a certain level of development it appears superfluous and even harmful even from the standpoint of the capitalist mode of production” (Marx, 1991b, 760).

Another example of confusion which is seen between ground-rent and interest is the fact that the former “presents the appearance of a certain sum of money that the landowner draws each year from leasing out a piece of the earth”. Any sum of money “can be capitalised, i.e. can be considered as the interest on an imaginary capital”. For example, a capital of 4000 pounds may be seen that it has an annual ground-rent of 200 pound in the average interest rate of 5 percent. If ground-rent is capitalised by this interest rate, it forms “the purchase price of land or value of the land”. However, this is irrational, replies Marx, since “the earth is not the product of labour, and thus does not have a value” (Marx, 1991b, 760). The capitalisation of rent “presupposes the rent itself, whereas the rent cannot be conversely derived and explained from its own capitalisation” (Marx, 1991b, 761). If the ground-rent is constant magnitude, the lower interest means higher price of land. “This movement in the price of land is governed simply by the rate of interest

and is independent of the movement of ground-rent itself". And, Marx adds that **as long as the rate of interest is determined by the rate of profit, interest rate has a tendency to fall just as the falling rate of profit "as social development proceeds"**. A tendential fall in the interest rate is caused by the growing loanable money capital, putting aside the profit rate. Since the price of land rises in inverse ratio to the rate of interest, **the land price tends to raise "independently of the movement of ground-rent and the price of the products of the soil, of which rent is one part"** (Marx, 1991b, 761).

The confusion between the ground-rent and the interest is related with, Marx implies, the level of development where "landed property" is seen "as a particularly superior form of property" and "the purchase of land moreover as a particularly secure capital investment" (Marx, 1991b, 761). In addition, the fact that the price of land is manifested it as the capitalised ground-rent permit some apologists of landed property to argue that equivalents are exchanged between the purchaser and seller of the land. Here the existence of ground-rent is justified by its existence (Marx, 1991b, 762).

"In practice, everything that the farmer pays the landowner in the form of the lease-price for permission to cultivate the soil appears as ground-rent". The lease-price appears as ground-rent. But this appearance is related with the fact that the landowner has a monopoly over a piece of land which enables him to put a price on it and exact a tribute (Marx, 1991b, 762). The similarity between **this lease-price of the land** and "**ground-rent proper**" is that the former "determines the price of land", which is "nothing but the capitalised revenue from the lease of the land" (Marx, 1991b, 763).

Leaving aside the "interest on capital incorporated into the soil" which "may form a foreign component of the ground-rent", "the lease-price" may "include either partly, or in certain cases entirely (i.e. when ground-rent proper is completely absent and the land thus actually valueless), a deduction from

average profit, normal wages, or both together” (Marx, 1991b, 763). This deduction from profit or from wages “appears here in the form of ground-rent because instead of accruing to the industrial capitalist or the wage-labourer, which would be normal, it is paid to the landowner in the form of the lease-price”. But, neither deduction forms ground-rent, but “in practice”, they form “income for the landowner, an economic valorisation of his monopoly, just as much as genuine ground-rent does” and they have “the same effect in determining the price of land” (Marx, 1991b, 763). In the case of **the smallholder and petty landowner, Marx observed that rent is a part of profit or a part of wages in the leased farms of the smallholding economy, hence “only nominally rent, not rent as an independent category vis-à-vis wages and profit”** (Marx, 1991b, 946). Here again a portion of profit or of wage may be paid to the landowner in the form of lease-price. Hence, the lease-price appears as ground-rent. However, as an economic form, it is not ground-rent, which is **“independent category vis-à-vis wages and profit”, but a mere income for the landowner and this income affects the price of land.**

In Ireland, ground-rent, “the mode of landed property corresponding to the capitalist mode of production has **a formal existence even though the capitalist mode of production itself does not exist**”. In this country, Marx observes that “the tenant himself is not an industrial capitalist, and his manner of farming is not a capitalist one”. He is **“generally a small peasant”**. His lease-price “often absorbs **not only a portion of his profit**, i.e. his own surplus labour, which he has a right to as the owner of his instruments of labour, but **also a portion of the normal wage**, which he would receive for the same amount of labour under other conditions”. Here the landowner **“expropriates from him the small capital which he incorporates** into the soil for the most part by his own labour, just as a usurer would do in similar conditions” (Marx, 1991b, 763). Marx states that the dispute over the land tenure system in Ireland was related with the compensation of the tenant farmer in terms of the improvements he did for the land and capital he

incorporated into land in his time. But reform demand was met by the attacks of the land proprietors in the House of Commons (Marx, 1991b, 763-4).

Marx refers to some exception cases “even in countries of capitalist production”. For example, “in the English industrial districts”, some plots were leased to the factory workers for gardening or cultivation purposes. Rental extorted by the landowner, however, did not relate to “the product of the soil” (Marx, 1991b, 764). He states that what he is concerned here is “**agricultural rent in countries of developed capitalist production**” (meanwhile, for Marx if there is a hierarchy between the countries, it is counted as a hierarchy between the development levels in their capitalist mode of production). In England, there is a number of small capitalist farmers, who are “forced to be content with a smaller than average profit and to part with a portion of this to the landowner in the form of rent”. Otherwise, they cannot invest capital on the land for agriculture. Predominant influence of the landowner over legislation there “can be exploited to cheat the entire class of farmers”. For example, the 1815’ **Corn Laws** provided for them to keep the prices for agricultural products above the level which could be realised under “a system of free corn import” (Marx, 1991b, 764). “The farmers were cheated in this way from 1815 to the 1830s” when “a new law was passed with new normal prices”. This period witnessed “the expropriation and ruin of an entire generation of farmers and **their replacement by a new class of capitalists**” (Marx, 1991b, 765). However, new laws still kept the prices above the normal levels and “favoured the better-off farmers” (Marx, 1991b, 765, note 31).

The more important fact, Marx observes, is the wages of the agricultural labourers is reduced to a level which is below normal average and thereby is to make a portion of wage “a component of the lease-price and thus accrue to the landowner instead of the worker under the guise of ground-rent”. By doing so, “a part of the normal wage” is handed over to the landowner. Before the introduction of the Corn Laws, this reduction of wages and their

suppression below the minimum level was one of the causes behind the high rents and high land prices during the Anti-Jacobin War in England. Marx states that depreciation of money among the others is an instrument for this operation “while at the same time the incomes of the farmers rose enormously and the landowners fabulously enriched themselves” (Marx, 1991b, 765). However, both farmers and the landowners saw that the wage of the agricultural workers could not be reduced any further. Nonetheless, the situation was not altered in England and in Europe, ground-rent continued to involve a part of normal wage (Marx, 1991b, 766).

In the conditions where the wages temporarily raises “without a simultaneous reduction in ground-rent”, the tenant farmer argues that this ruins himself and “it is thereby admitted that in the name of ground-rent the farmers make a deduction from wages and hand this over to the landowner”. Wage raises occurred between 1849 and 1859 because of exceptional circumstances such as the decreasing supply of the Irish agricultural labourers, “the exceptional absorption of the agricultural population by manufacturing industry”, the conditions of war, and migration to the United States and Australia. Average corn prices fell and the farmers demanded a reduction in rents. Marx states that they did not succeed in this very much. The solution was to reduce the production costs through **mechanisation** (Marx, 1991b, 766). One of the results of this solution was **the unemployment for agricultural labourers and a creation of “an artificial over-population and a fresh fall in wages”** (Marx, 1991b, 766-7). These all occurred despite a general fall in the agricultural population according to a general population increase (Marx, 1991b, 767).

Land is not a product of labour and has no value in and of itself. “In considering the forms of appearance of ground-rent, i.e. the lease-price that is paid to the landowner under this heading for the use of the soil”, Marx says that it should be noted that

the price of things that have no value in and of themselves- either not being the product of labour, like land, or which at least cannot be reproduced by labour, such as antiques, works of art by certain masters, etc.- **may be determined by quite fortuitous combinations of circumstances** (Marx, 1991b, 772).

In the analysis of ground-rent, Marx points to three main errors. 1) Confusion between the various forms of rent corresponding to the different levels of social productivity of labour. In its all forms, “the appropriation of rent is the economic form in which landed property is realized and “ground-rent in turn presupposes landed property, the ownership of particular bits of the globe by certain individuals”. The owner may be “a person representing the community, as in Asia, Egypt, etc.”, the landed property may be a mere “accidental accompaniment of the property that certain persons have in the persons of the immediate producers, as in the systems of serfdom and slavery”. It may be also “pure private property that non-producers have in nature, a simple ownership title to land”. In addition, it may point to “a relationship to the land which, as with colonists and small peasant proprietors, appears as directly implied, given their isolated and not socially developed labour, in the appropriation and production of the products of particular bits of land by the direct producers”. Consequently, the common properties of the all forms of rent is that it is “the economic realisation of landed property” and “the legal fiction by virtue of which various individuals have exclusive possession of particular parts of the globe” (Marx, 1991b, 772). 2) Rent corresponding to the capitalist mode of production is “always an excess over and above profit, i.e. over and above a portion of commodity value that itself consists of surplus-value (surplus-labour)”. For this reason, the error is that “this particular and specific component of surplus-value can be explained simply by explaining the general conditions of existence for surplus-value and profit”. However, before the general conditions of production of this surplus-labour, there are two limits. One is the “Natural fertility”, and the other is the development of the productivity of social labour. A section of society must produce necessary foodstuffs for the entire society; “this great division of labour between agriculturalist and industrialists must be

possible, and similarly that between those agriculturalists who produce foodstuffs and those who produce raw materials” (Marx, 1991b, 773). Marx argues that if the division of social labour into necessary labour and surplus-labour is in due proportion, “products of various types will be sold at their values (at a further stage of development, at their prices of production), or at least at prices which are modifications of these values or production prices are determined by general laws” (Marx, 1991b, 773-4). This in fact demonstrates that the laws of value operate in relation to “the total products at a given time of particular spheres of social production autonomized by the division of labour” and that “not only is no more labour-time devoted to each individual commodity than necessary, but out of the total social labour-time only the proportionate quantity needed is devoted to the various types of commodity”. If there is an imbalance in the proportions of necessary and surplus-labour, “the commodity value, and therefore also the surplus-value contained in it, cannot be realised”. For example, unnecessary production of some goods means the fact that, “too much of society’s overall labour has been spent on this particular branch, and so a portion of the product is useless”. The products are thus sold “as if only the necessary proportion had been produced”. Marx sees here a “quantitative barrier to the quotas of social labour-time devoted to the various particular spheres of production”. It is also “simply a further developed expression of the law of value in general” (Marx, 1991b, 774).

3) The amount of ground-rent is not determined by its recipient but “rather by a development of social labour that is independent of him and in which he plays no part”. The amount of ground-rent, and the value of land, rises with the social development “as a result of the overall social labour”. Demand for market, agricultural products and land itself grows “since it is a condition of production”. Agricultural rent proper grows with the development of market for the products of land. The later grows with the non-agricultural population and with their growing needs together with rising demand for foodstuffs and raw materials. The capitalist mode of production by its nature reduces the

agricultural population as compared with non-agricultural one “because **in industry** (in the narrow sense) the growth of constant capital in relation to variable is linked with **an absolute growth in variable** capital (even if a relative decline in relation to constant); while **in agriculture** the **variable capital** required for the cultivation of a particular piece of land **declines absolutely** and can therefore grow only in so far as new land is cultivated, which however presupposes in turn a still greater growth in the non-agricultural population” (Marx, 1991b, 776). Marx says that these are not peculiar to agriculture, but also to the other branches of capitalist commodity production (Marx, 1991b, 775-6).

We have seen that ground-rent as a surplus profit is nevertheless a portion of surplus product and surplus-value, which “The landowner has only to seize” and which “increases without any effort on his part” (Marx, 1991b, 776). In addition “the mass of value, the mass of surplus-value, and the transformation of a portion of this surplus-value into ground-rent depends on the social production process, on the development of commodity production in general” (Marx, 1991b, 777).

5.4.4 Small (French) Peasants in 1850s

In *the 18 Brumaire*, Marx observed that: “The small peasants whose all members live in the same conditions but are not united within real relations with each other, form an immense mass” (Marx, 1990a, 137-8). “Their mode of production” divides and isolates them with the effect of their poverty and of the underdeveloped means of transportation system of France. The small holdings do not permit any social and economic development. A parcel of land, a peasant and its family is sided by another parcel of land, peasant and the family. Certain numbers of the families form the village and certain numbers of the villages form an administrative unit. This mass, majority of French nation, is composed of “the simple sum of the same quality of things”. “**Millions of peasant family form a class** to the extent that they live in the

economic conditions which separate them from each other, and which put into confrontation their modes of living, their interests and their cultures with those of the other classes of the society". We can state that if economic conditions create distinctive, characteristic features for a part of the society according to the other parts of society, we can talk about the existence of a class. However, corresponding internal organisation, living mode, interests and culture must accompany these economic conditions. This is objective existence of a class. But, to the extent that there is only the local relations stemming from their living spaces among the small peasants and as long as the similarities of their interests do not lead into "any cooperation, any national connection and any political organisation", "**they do not form a class**" (Marx, 1990ab, 138). The Cooperation, the national connection and the political organisation refers to a nation-wide organisation of the political activity of a class. However, isolated, unorganised, and local based life of the small peasants does not permit this massive majority to be able to make itself into a class. We have a class which is not a class. This is a dialectical contradiction since we have a force which is dispersed and not concentrated and hence composed of isolated weak parts. Collection and concentration of these particles into an organised and united force is limited by the reasons such as economic conditions of agriculture, distribution and the scale of the rural land property, the development of the transport and communication technology, and hence self-sufficient, local and isolated life of the peasants. Only a representative could surpass these objective limitations.

The peasants that cannot form a class because of the lack of political cooperation and organisation through the national links are not "in a condition by which they advocate their class interests in their name be it through the mediation of a parliament, or be it through an assembly" (Marx, 1990ab, 138-9). "They can not represent themselves by themselves, they must be represented". Their representative must protect themselves against the other classes and must seem to be a high authority and to be "an absolute executive power". The small peasants express "their political effect" in "their

dependence upon the executive power of society” (Marx, 1990ab, 139). Here Marx uses a sort of **political geometry** for the relation between the state power and the masses. If small holder peasantry occupies a large portion of the popular masses, this means that intermediary great powers do not exist between the state and the small holders. Otherwise, either the state or the small holders lose their power to the intermediary agents of power. If the state does not permit the existence of the great power between itself and the popular masses, the latter must be populous small holders. Hence, a centralised powerful state needs populous small holders. It is sure that this political geometry seems to be valid for the political power of the state in the societies which are to large degree agrarian.

After the coup, some of the French peasants made armed protests against their 10 December votes. However, the majority of the peasants were so much chained by “their illusions” that even those in “the reddest provinces” voted for Bonaparte. He according to them broke the chains put over the rural areas by the cities (Marx, 1990ab, 141).

In the period of Napoleon, the division of land meant nothing but “the completion of the free competition and newly developing big industry in the cities” towards the rural areas. Even the privileges given to “the peasant class” were “in the interest of new bourgeois society”. “This newly created class”, the small holding peasantry, implied the nation wide expansion of the bourgeois order. It meant a nation wide “protest” against “newly destroyed landed aristocracy”. It was a ground for attack against possible regeneration of “the feudals”. Small land property was put forward against “feudality”. It was “a natural barrier” for “the bourgeoisie” against all possible revival of “old feudal lords” (Marx, 1990ab, 142).

However, during the nineteenth century, “feudal lords” were replaced by “urban usurer”; “land based feudal obligations” by “mortgage”; and “aristocratic land property” by “the bourgeois capital” (Marx, 1990ab, 142).

Now the small land parcel of the peasant is a means for the capitalist to obtain “**profit, interest and rent**” from the land to leave a minimum daily amount to the peasant (Marx, 1990ab, 142-3). The development of the small land property led into “a servitude before capital” and “rendered the cave men the French nation”. “16 million peasants, (including women and children) lived in the caves”. The “bourgeois order” which at the beginning of the century had made the state “a watchman looking after the protection of the small parcel” now became “the vampire” of the same parcel in the interest of capital. The Code Napoleon became “the law of sequestration and compulsory selling”. To the official 4 million miserable were added the 5 million poor who lived in the cities migrated into the rural areas or the ones lived in the rural areas migrated into the cities. Now, says Marx, the interests of the peasants were no longer in accordance with “the interests of the bourgeoisie and capital” as in the time of Napoleon. Rather, the reverse was true. “For this reason, the peasants naturally find their allies and guides in the proletariat of the cities whose mission was to overthrow the bourgeois order” (Marx, 1990b, 143). Louis Bonaparte (Marx, 1990b, 143-4) now defended this order.

Besides mortgages, the state taxes were the other important burden over the peasants. Marx states that heavy taxation and powerful execution are two “simultaneous” phenomena and small land property serves a “populous” and “powerful bureaucracy”. It creates “**equal level of relations and individuals on the whole surface of the country**”. By doing so, it helps the central power “exert the same effect **over each point of this same mass**”. “It **puts away the intermediary, aristocratic strata, which are standing between the popular mass and the central power**”. As a result, it leads into the state’s intervention in every sphere. It also “**creates an extra unemployed population**” which is not employed neither in the cities nor in the country and searches for official posts and which result in these posts (Marx, 1990b, 144).

These crowded executive personnel in the period of Napoleon was “not only the immediate producer in the meaning of that this personnel, thanks to ... the taxes ... (*in the blanks here, words “abolished” and “the state” are used in the translation; but the reverse is implied by Marx, 144;E.G.*), realised, in the form of public works, for the newly formed peasantry, the things which the bourgeoisie was not yet able to realise with the help of its own private industry”. The state tax was the forceful measure needed to “maintain the exchange between the city and the countryside”. Otherwise, the small holder peasant did not continue their relation with the cities (Marx, 1990b, 144).

The taxes which the state had abolished were compensated by Napoleon’s penetration into Europe and his plundering therein. New markets opened by him and his plundering Europe repaid the cost of abolished taxes. The new state taxes were a support for the rural industry in Napoleon’s period, while they soon meant a burden over it. The second Bonaparte saw himself as being obliged to create an artificial cast” “near the real classes of society” as “the maintenance of his own regime”. For this reason, one of his last acts was to increase the salaries of the servants to their previous levels and to create easy sources of income (Marx, 1990b, 144-5).

Besides the crowded bureaucracy, the other *Napoleonic ideas* of the second Bonaparte were to ensure the domination of the monks and of the army. Marx states that “while the newly emerged small parcels of land were naturally religious given its harmony with society, and its dependence on natural forces and servitude to the authority which protects them”, the small land which was subordinated by the debts and had not a good relationship with the high authority and driven to its outer borders “becomes naturally irreligious”. The monk was, unlike being in the period of Napoleon, “seemed to be consecrated the dog of the earthly police” “watching the enemies of Bonaparte in the villages rather than watching the enemies of the small holder’s regime as in the past (Marx, 1990b, 145).

In addition, to the emperorship, the small holder peasantry, and the bureaucratic machine of the state, the **most important Napoleonic idea**, however, was “the **supremacy of the army**”. The army for the small peasants was the “subject of honour” (Marx, 1990b, 145-6). The army had become the hero when it was advocating “the new form of the property” in the outer world, the newly acquired “nationhood” and “plundering the world”. “The uniform was their own state dressing, the war their poem, the small holding expanded and extended in though the fatherland, the patriotism the most sublime form of the feeling of property”. Now the enemy of the property was not the *Cossacks* but “the bailiffs” and “the tax collectors”. “The holdings did no loner lie in the fatherland but in the mortgage registrations”. The army was not “the rose of the peasant youth” but that of “the rural lumpenproletariat”. The large part of the army was composed of the paid soldiers. Its function was to perform the services of gendarme and the army, Marx envisages, when it goes to foreign countries, would be defeated (Marx, 1990b, 146).

5.4.5 The Peasants in the WPT Program

The peasants: The program observed that some positive results of the agricultural change were valid for the peasant masses. The peasants acquired a mobility and awoke more or less and they did not accept the life in a fatalistic way and begun to hope a better life. The marches of the peasants owning no land in Cukurova for land were clear signs of these awakening. The old closeness of the villages was broken more or les and the village turned into open to the external social and economic dynamics. Such a situation replaced “the conservative” and “even reactionary” mind with “a condition of spirit in the poor peasants” which would “support radical transformations” (see WPT program, www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/text). It should be noted that the new spirit developing in the poor peasants was presented as a supportive element for radical transformation. The program was realistic and closed to Maoist literature about the peasantry and popular

revolution which would emerge within several years after. Meanwhile, I can make a connection about the fact that rapid migration from rural to urban areas after the 1950s *in itself* was not one of the results of social and political uprising between 1960 about 1980 in Turkey. But, the waves of migration of the poor peasants into the cities were one of the foundational reasons behind socialist mobilization in this period.

The program stated that “the poor peasant mass has a special place in our social development”. They were the most populous class within the labouring classes and formed the majority of the population of the country. For this reason, “without the support and active participation of the peasant mass, reform cannot be done, the development of Turkey cannot be realized”. The program suggested that: “The provision of a close cooperation and solidarity between peasant mass and the working class and all labouring strata is a condition” (see WPT program in www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts). This was suggested as a condition, for what: it was for the development of Turkey and for the realization of radical retransformations, or to say, radical reforms. It was not suggested for any kind or any stage of revolutionary change.

CHAPTER 6

THE PROGRAM OF THE “MOVEMENT”

Above we have seen the revolutionary classes and revolutionary potentials in the NDR framework. The sharp division between Marxian theory and *the Aydınlik* will be seen below when we will lastly demonstrate that Marxian theory of class and revolution is completely based on the proletarian socialist class politics, while *the Aydınlik*'s strategy and related analyses are based on the popular democratic strategy and revolution. However, the ironical thing is the fact that this strategy and revolution, it is thought, would be realized under the leadership of the proletariat in organizational (Proletarian Party), political and ideological terms (scientific socialism). The confusion between class struggle and popular struggle is the most unfortunate aspect of *the Aydınlik*.

6.1 The Program of the *Communist Manifesto* 1848

First Measures for Rupture from Past in Advanced Countries: In the revolutionary rupture of “the working class” with the past, “the first step” is “to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of **democracy**”. After the seize of the power, the “proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible”. The *Manifesto* suggests “despotic inroads” on “the conditions of bourgeois production”, on “the rights of property”, and on “the old social order”. These measures are unavoidable in the beginning “as a means of entirely revolutionising the mode of production”, and “will of course

be different in different countries”. However, the Manifesto proposes some general ones for “the most advanced countries” (SW, 261).

- 11) Abolition of landed property and the use of all land rent for public purposes (261).
- 12) A heavy progressive or graduated income tax
- 13) Abolition of all rights of inheritance
- 14) Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels
- 15) Centralisation of credit under the State’s national monopoly
- 16) Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State
- 17) Extension of the means of production of the State, the cultivation of wastelands, and the improvement of the soil according to a common plan
- 18) Equal liability of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially in agriculture.
- 19) Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the town-country distinction, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
- 20) Free and public education for children. Abolition of child labour in the present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc.

When, in the course of development, **class distinctions have disappeared**, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of **associated individuals**, the **public power will lose its political character**. **Political power**, properly so called, is merely the **organised power of one class for oppressing** another (SW, 262).

In the *Preface to German edition of 1872 of the Manifesto*, Marx and Engels pointed to the changing conditions and the rising experience of the working class and working class movement since the Manifesto of 1848. They said that “In view of the gigantic strides of Modern Industry in the last twenty- five years, and of the accompanying improved and extended party organization of

the working class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details become antiquated". The experiences which changed some "details" which had been valid before 1848 February were firstly the revolution of February 1848 and then the most importantly of 18 March 1871. The state had to be seized and then immediately turned into the socialist state, the proletarian dictatorship which required a new state form and content (SW; 604, and in Turkish, 1993; 83).

6.2 The Criticism of the *Gotha Program* in 1875

Before 1875, there were two significant social democrat parties in Germany. The first was the Workers Association of All Germany (briefly **ADAV** in German), which had been founded by Ferdinand Lasalle in 1863. The other party was the Social Democrat Workers Party (briefly **SDAP** in German), founded in 1869 and led by August Babel and Wilhelm Liebknecht. Two German social democrat parties were united on the base of the so-called Gotha Programme in 1875. This party was the predecessor of the Social Democrat Party which, having a Marxist programme would appear in 1914 (see for concise information, John Breuilly's article *The Sources of Germany Social Democracy (1835-1875)*, 1991).

Here I will follow Marx's ideas rather than his criticisms about this programme. The main theme in his criticism was the fact that the programme of the new united party carried the characteristics of Lasallian ideas, the state socialism, which was attributed to Lasalle and the bourgeois remnants as well.

Marx said that "the means of labour in the present society" were "under the monopoly of the land owners *and* capitalists (the monopoly of land property is also the base of the monopoly of capital)". However, He said that Lasalle

attacked only towards “the capitalist class”. He added that in England, the factory owners did not own even the land upon which their factories were erected (MESY, 1979; 19).

About “a just distribution” of “the revenue of labour”, Marx asked what “the revenue of labour” meant. These uncertain statements were criticised by Marx. Did the revenue of labour mean the product of labour, or its value? In the second case, was it all value of the product or new value added by the labour? This meaningless statement belonged to Lasalle (MESY, 1979, 19). As for the “just distribution”, Marx said that the present bourgeoisies argued that the existing distribution was already just (MESY, 1979, 19-20).

Marx suggested that what had to be concerned at this point was “not one which *developed* from its foundations but communist society in the form of which it was *born* from capitalist society”. Hence, the society under consideration was the one which still carries the characteristics of “old society”. “For this reason, the producer as an individual (after necessary reductions have been made) receives the exact return of which he gives to society” (MESY, 1979, 21). What he gave to society was the amount of his labour. He receives a document which demonstrated what amount of labour he gave to society and in return, he received an equal amount from “the stocks of the consumption means of society. The amount of labour presented to society was received back in another form (MESY, 1979, 22). In fact, here the document which Marx envisaged was the money of socialist society price of which was equal to value due to the higher level of development of industrial production.

The “principle” here was “the exchange of the equal values” and therefore the same with “the principle regulating commodity exchange”. However, the form and content of the principle had been changed due the fact that nobody could obtain under new condition anything else from “individual means of consumption” and nobody could give to society anything else from “his

labour". The "dominant principle" for distribution is this: "a certain amount of labour in a certain form is exchanged with an equal amount of labour in another form". Marx said that "equal right" here was nothing but "bourgeois right" since "the right" was in *proportion* to the labour he presented. Equality here meant only "the phenomena that counting is made through an equal criterion, i.e. labour". Marx said that this "equal right" was "an unequal right for unequal labour". It did not recognise "class division" (MESY, 1979, 22). "Therefore, this in its essence, like every right, is a right which is based on inequality". Right was meaningful "only when the same criterion is used" (MESY, 1979, 22-3). For this reason, Marx suggested that "the right" had not to be "equal" everywhere (MESY, 1979, 23). What Marx meant was nothing but "positive discrimination" for the handicapped persons, sections and excluded elements of society by society itself. However, we are here still in the stage of a society which was "not one which *developed* from its foundations but communist society in the form of which it was *born* from capitalist society".

"However, these sorts of drawbacks", said Marx, "are inevitable things in the first stage of communist society". "In a higher stage of communist society, once the forced division of labour and together with it, the "contradiction between the mental and physical labour is abolished", "labour" was turned into "the first need for living" from "the instrument of living", once individuals developed in every respect, once the productive forces increased and "all sources of the collective wealth spring up with gurgling sound", and only after these were realised, the limited framework of the bourgeois law would be "surpassed completely". In this stage, society adopted the principle "From all according to his talent, to all according to his need" (MESY, 1979, 23).

As for the relationship between production and distribution of the consumption items, Marx repeated what he demonstrated throughout his criticisms of the bourgeois political economy. He said that "the distribution of the means of consumption is nothing but a result of the distribution of the

conditions of production itself. But this distribution is a peculiarity of the mode of production itself". For example, said Marx, "capitalist mode of production" was based on, on the one side, the distribution of the "material conditions of production" in the form of "capital property and land property" to "the persons who did not work" and on the other side, the fact that "the mass own only the personal condition of labour, the labour-power". Marx said that "If the elements of production are distributed in this way, the present distribution of the means of consumption emerges from this spontaneously". If "the material conditions of production" belonged to "the collective property of the workers themselves", new distribution of the means of consumption would be result of the former distribution. Marx added that "crude socialism" and "a portion of democracy" through the mediation of "crude socialism" took from "the bourgeois economists" the idea that the distribution was independent from "the mode of production" and that "socialism" was essentially related with the problem of "distribution" (MESY, 1979, 24).

However, the most irritating thing, for Marx, was not this "iron law", but a moving backward from the scientific conception of the wage which had been adopted by the party for ages. For example, the wage was not the *value* or the *price* of the labour as seen at the surface, but "a masked form of the *value* or the *price* of the labour power". This conception was adopted by the party after the death of Lasalle. The waged labourer could maintain his life only when its work for the capitalists for a while for nothing was permitted. All capitalist system was based on the prolongation of the working day or the development of the productivity, i.e. the intensification of the labour-power, increasing the un-priced labour, and hence the fact that "waged labour system" was "slave system" and that as the productivity of social labour developed, this slavery developed more and more (MESY, 1979, 28). Marx said that "when this view is adopted in the party more and more as day passes", although the fact that Lasalle was completely ignorant about the wages and confused the appearance with the essence had to be seen, the party went back to his "dogmas" (MESY, 1979, 28-9). Marx said that the

representatives of the party assassinated towards the concept which had been adopted by the mass of the party (MESY, 1979, 29). He added and demonstrated possibly one of his most important contributions that “Instead of the uncertain last sentence saying that ‘Elimination of all kind of social and political inequality’, it had to be stated that, once class divisions are abolished, all kind of social and political inequality which originates from these divisions disappears spontaneously” (MESY, 1979, 29). **The purpose of the socialist working class struggle was, for Marx, the abolishment of classes or class divisions, instead of, to say, the abolishment of social and political inequalities.**

The state of capitalist society: The Gotha Programme stated that “The German Workers Party” worked for “free state- and- socialist society” (and for the abolishment of “the iron law of the wages”, “the wages system”, “all kind of exploitation” and “all kind of social and political inequality” (MESY, 1979, 27). Marx observed that the party acquired a purpose of “realising ‘free state’” (MESY, 1979, 30). The programme accepted that the state was “independent reality which itself has own *intellectual, moral and free foundations*” rather than seeing “the present society...as the *foundation* of the present state”. Marx said that “the present society” was “capitalist society” which was seen “in all more or less developed civilised countries” which eliminated more or less “the elements of the middle age”. The “present state” however, was confined to “the borders of the countries”. It was sure that the common elements of the various forms of the state of these civilised countries were the fact that they were “founded upon the bourgeois society” which developed more or less in the capitalist sense (MESY, 1979, 31). Here it should be noted that Marx did not apply to the term “capitalist state”. He seems to have preferred to use the terms such as the state of “the bourgeois society”, “the capitalist society”.

Political demands: democratism: The political demands of the programme such as “universal suffrage” “direct legislation”, “popular law”, “popular

militia”, for Marx, were “old democratic refrain” and “the echoes” of the bourgeois party, for example. Marx said that as long as they were not imagined and exaggerated concepts, all of them had been already realised. However, the state which had realised them was the state in Sweden, the United States of America. This state was “the present state” although it was not existed in the German Empire. “All these beautiful small things” were in the framework of “so called popular sovereignty” and were only meaningful in “*a democratic republic*”. However, these things which could be meaningful only “in the democratic republican conditions” were demanded “from the state”, Marx described Germany of the time, which involved parliamentary forms was mixed with feudal elements, was under the influence of the bourgeoisie and was nothing but the “military despotic government” designed by bureaucracy and protected by police (MESY, 1979, 32). In addition, Marx suggested that “in this state” it had not to be stated in the programme that these demands would have made accepted “through legal means”. He said that “even crude democracy” which saw “in the democratic republic” the end of “the class struggle” was in a higher status than this kind of “democraticism” (MESY, 1979, 33).

Marx’s criticism of the Gotha Programme was also concerned with the state education, “normal working day”, “women’s labour”, factory inspection, etc. He said, in the case of the demands for compulsory state education, which the schools had to be kept distant from the influence of the government and the church. It was the state which had to be educated by the people. As much as Marx did reject democratic refrains, he rejected state socialism and the influence of the bourgeois state over the masses. He said that “this programme” carried the characteristics of “slave belief of the Lasallian sect in the state, or the worse, the belief for the miracle of democracy”; “or to say better, both of them are a compromise between these two kinds of belief for the miracles which are equally far away from socialism” (MESY, 1979, 35).

As for the correct attitude of the working class towards the other classes and the purpose of the working class movement, The *Gotha Programme* argued that “the all other classes in the face of the working class are *only a reactionary mass*” and the purpose of the working class had to be “the emancipation of labour”. This idea was modified from the regulation of the International, which talked about “the emancipation of the working class”. The first idea, modified from the manifesto, said Marx, was a *pure* Lasallian argument (MESY, 1979, 24). The original statement, said Marx, stated that “Of all classes confronting today with the bourgeoisie, only the proletariat is *really a revolutionary class*” (MESY, 1979, 24-5). Marx continued from the *Manifesto*: “The other classes are dissolved in the face of the modern industry and at the end expire; the proletariat, however, is its special and basic product” (MESY, 1979, 25). He said that “the bourgeoisie here” was seen as “a revolutionary class- as the metager of the big industry” in comparison to “the feudals and the middle classes” which tried to preserve “the outmoded mode of production”. For this reason, the bourgeoisie could not be put into the side of the feudals and the middle classes (MESY, 1979, 25). Marx seemed to have used the term “middle class” in the meaning of “the petty bourgeoisie as a residual of the feudal society rather than the middle class or the petty bourgeois classes of the bourgeois society. Here I can also suggest that Marx used the term middle classes in the meaning of the petty bourgeoisie in the countries where capitalist mode of production is dominant. Otherwise, the middle classes covered all bourgeois and petty bourgeois sections of society.

The bourgeoisie was revolutionary due to its position towards old society and its industrialism for Marx. He continued to say that “the proletariat” was “revolutionary in the face of the bourgeoisie” since “it tries to eliminate the production from capitalist characteristic which the bourgeoisie tries to make immortal”. Let me repeat: the bourgeoisie is revolutionary according to the old feudal society and classes, and the proletariat is revolutionary according to the bourgeoisie and the capitalist mode of production. The proletariat is

revolutionary in “the face of the bourgeoisie”. Marx recalled that the manifesto added that “‘lower middle class’ became revolutionary ‘since it is participating in the proletariat’ (MESY, 1979, 25). I can repeat that the lower middle classes who are participating in or will participate in the proletariat become revolutionary for Marx. Marx added to the historical revolutionary position of the industrial bourgeoisie, the revolutionary potential of the lower middle classes in the future.

The *Gotha Programme* created the greatest workers party in the world in its time. This party carried the Lasallian characteristics (among others, the state socialism, rejection of the revolutionary potential of the classes outside the proletariat, and now the national emphasis upon the labour movement) in its first programme. The programme said that the working class “works for its emancipation firstly in the national state framework” (MESY, 1979, 26). Marx said that Lasalle, unlike the manifesto and all other socialism before, “conceived the workers movement from the most limited national angle”. The working class, said Marx sure had to be “organised as class” in its own country in order to struggle. Each country was the sphere of this struggle. Marx said that “For this reason, the struggle of the working class carries the national characteristic in this sense rather than its content, but as the *Communist Manifesto* stated, the national in ‘the sense of its form’”. Lasallian programme reduced the internationalism to “the consciousness that “*the international friendship of the people*’ will be”. The programme did not concern the “international functions” of German working class, said Marx. However, he asked how the working class could struggle against his bourgeoisie who had already established friendships against itself with the bourgeoisies of the other countries and against “the international conspiracy policy of Bismarck” (MESY, 1979, 26). Marx stated that “the international movement of the working classes” did not need the existence of the International. The International was only the first attempt for offering a centre to the movement, facilitated the movement and yielded “long term results”.

However, it lost its “first historical form” after the fall of Paris Commune (MESY, 1979, 27).

The *Gotha Programme* stated that “in order to *prepare the way of the solutions to the social problems*”, the German Workers Party demanded that “the production cooperatives *under the democratic control of the labouring people*” had to be established with “the state aid”. An extension of these cooperatives would lead to “the *socialist organisation of total labour*” (MESY, 1979, 29). Marx saw Lasalle in these statements. He said that “*social problem*” replace the “existing class struggle”. “Socialist organisation of total labour” could be born from “the revolutionary transformation process of society” rather than “the state aid” and the cooperatives the state itself rather than “the labourers” “*established*”. Marx stated, to think “a new society can be established just like a railway construction through state debts” fitted Lasalle. At least, Marx said it was good that “democratic control” of “the labouring people” over “the state aid” had been suggested (MESY, 1979, 29).

Marx observed that this prospectus was put forward against French socialist in the time of Louis-Philippe and then adopted by some “reactionary workers”. However, the more important aspect of the statements was “the step taken backward towards the view of the movement of sect leaving from the view of class movement”. In addition, the workers’ demand for the national and social extension of the cooperatives did “not mean anything else from trying to make revolution in the present conditions of production”. In addition, the present cooperatives were meaningful only when “the governments or the bourgeoisies and only when they become independent establishments in the hands of the workers” did not protect them (MESY, 1979, 30).

Marx also did not use the term communist state even though he asked “which kind of transformation” “the state in a communist society” would be

confronted with. What kind of social functions would exist for the state in such a society? Marx asked a question about future, but replied, "This question can be answered only through scientific path" rather than connecting the words the state and the people to each other in many ways (MESY, 1979, 31). What Marx meant by "scientific" in this context is nothing but the historical experience of the class struggle and of the revolutionary classes. He said that "Between capitalist society and communist society, from one to another, there exists the period of revolutionary transformation. To this, too, a political transformation period corresponds, here; the state can be nothing but the *revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*" (MESY, 1979, 31-2). Marx added that the *Gotha Programme* did concern neither with "the present state" nor "the state of the future in communist society" (MESY, 1979, 32).

Petty Bourgeois Influences in the Workers Party: *In their "Circular letter to Bebel, Liebknecht, and other leaders of the German Social Democratic Party (with Engels, 1879)"* Marx and Engels recalled that for almost forty years we have stressed the class struggle as the immediate driving power of history, and in particular the class struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat as the great lever of the modern social revolution; it is, therefore, impossible for us to co-operate with people who wish to expunge this class struggle from the movement. When the International was formed we expressly formulated the battle-cry: the working classes themselves must conquer The emancipation of the working classes. We cannot therefore cooperate with people who openly state that the workers are too uneducated to emancipate themselves and must be freed from above by philanthropic big bourgeois and petty bourgeois" (SW; 622).

Marx and Engels thought that the petty bourgeoisie "people from what have hitherto been the ruling classes would also join the militant proletariat and supply it with educative elements". But they "must bring real educative elements into" "the proletarian movement". However, they saw some attempts "to bring superficially mastered socialist ideas into harmony with the

exceedingly varied theoretical standpoints which these gentlemen have brought with them from the universities or elsewhere...". These men "have only produced desperate confusion-fortunately almost exclusively among themselves". Marx and Engels said that if these kind of men from other classes participated in the proletarian movement, "the first condition must be that they should not bring any remnants of bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, etc., prejudices with them but should whole-heartedly adopt the proletarian outlook". However, "these gentlemen, as has been proved, are chock-full of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideas". They said that in a "petty bourgeois country as Germany", these ideas had their justification. "But only outside the Social-Democratic Workers' party". Marx and Engels invited them to leave the party of the workers and suggested that "If these gentlemen constitute themselves into a Social-Democratic petty-bourgeois party they have a perfect right to do so (SW; 621). Only in such a condition, "one could...negotiate with them, form a bloc according to circumstances, etc" (SW; 621-2). For Marx and Engels, pure class ideology was needed for the workers' party. The party could accept the elements from other classes as long as they did not carry the bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideas into the party. They said that, otherwise, "in a worker' party they are an adulterating element". But, if even the leadership of the party should fall more or less into the hands of such people, the Party would simply be castrated and there would be an end of proletarian incisiveness" (SW; 622). Adulteration and castration by the bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements were the dangers for the proletarian party and movement.

6.3 Mihri Belli: Addressing the General Meeting in October 1970

Mihri Belli as the leading figure of *the Aydınlık* circle gave a speech to the proletarian revolutionary congress held in 29-30 October 1970. Belli stated that the most important aspect of the year of 1970 was the fact that the working class stamped over the historical development of the country. This role of the working class was clearly seen by the June events in İstanbul and

Kocaeli. In the year of 1970, the proletarian revolutionaries could reach in more than 2000 villages. The struggle of the workers and the peasants reached in their most intensive period in this year. In all these struggles and events, the proletarian revolutionaries were existed. Belli stated that therefore the balance sheet of the actions were positive (Belli, 1971, 213).

Belli stated that what was meant by “organisation” was “the revolutionary political organisation of the Turkey’s workers and poor peasants”. However, the leading force of the movement until then was the youth, particularly the university youth. To the congress, many workers and the peasants from the provinces came. However, said Belli, these workers and peasants were not hosted in the homes and neighbourhoods of the workers. They were hosted in the student dormitories. The movement as such could not yet be counted as the movement of the workers and the poor peasants. The proletarian revolutionary organisation required that the burden of the movement should be on the shoulder of the proletarians and the peasants. The old habits which had been acquired in the past decade had to be abandoned (Belli, 1971, 213). Here Belli added to the published version of his speech that in the latter stage of the socialist organisation some circles tried to prevent the centralisation and discipline (Belli, 1971, note in 213).

Belli made clear what the organisation of the party meant. It meant a process. The party would be established through action. It would not be established with a petition. He said that “we are not the ones of 46”. “We are not 12 trade unionists who established the WPT either”. He said that their organisation would be welcomed neither by Justice Party, nor the WPT and nor “white **Aydınlık**”. The proletarian revolutionary political organisation could be established through the resistance of the mass of the workers and the poor peasants for the organisation itself from the bottom to the top. In addition, the organisation to be established, that is the organisation in legal framework, had to struggle to eliminate not only the superstructure but also its economic base (Belli, 1971, 214).

In “the imperialist world system”, there were two camps. The one was the camp of the exploiter and the other the exploited. There was no passage from one to another. A dependent and exploited country could not pass into the position of an exploiter, capitalist country by following capitalist mode of development. Belli said that there was no such country in history (Belli, 1971, 215). In the present age, there was nothing like “development through capitalist path” (Belli, 1971, 215-6). A real development could be possible only after disconnecting from the imperialist system and moving towards socialism. A mixed capitalist economy was also impossible. Belli added that just as there was no possible change from one economy to another a passage from one superstructure to another was also not possible. A dependent country could not turn into an exploiter capitalist country. A Philippines sort of democracy or fascist dicta could not turn into bourgeois democracy (Belli, 1971, 216). The alternative of Philippines democratism was fascism, open fascism (Belli, 1971, 215).

What Belli meant by “democracy” was not “the bourgeois democracy”. This sort of democracy could not be realised in a country like Turkey. “The democracy we refer is the order in which all classes and estates entered into politics and conserve politics as their own spheres and keep the compradors of the imperialism outside the politics (complete reverse of the situation of the present day) and each of them can influence the historical development of the country in proportion of their powers”. In such a condition, the dominant element would be necessarily “the worker”, “the poor peasant”. The dominated element would be necessarily “the national bourgeoisie”. This class was weak and dependent on “the comprador capital”. It would remember “its nationality” when expropriation process would begin tomorrow. The national bourgeoisie would demand that they should have been expropriated in the last stage”. Belli said that they would meet this demand before he gave the example of China and Mao of 1956 who had a speech that begins with “comrade capitalists” (Belli, 1971, 216).

The establishment of the organisation meant that this democracy had been already established. Here Belli warned that here it could not be concluded that establishment of democracy would be followed by the organisation. The establishment of the democracy meant that the organisation would be the leading force of the workers and the poor peasants and cover the large parts of them. Belli stated that what he meant was “a process”, “a process of creating, struggling”. “a result” could be obtained by “fighting position by position, making war” (Belli, 1971, 217). Meanwhile we can see that Mihri Belli has given us some clues of the civil-socialism of the period after 12 September 1980's fascist military intervention. What Belli meant by “organisation” was being organised and becoming hegemonic force of the people. In addition, the statement of “fighting the position by position” echoes Gramsci's concept of “position war”.

Belli stated that they had already “minimum organisation” and asked why they did not see this minimum organisation as “adequate” (Belli, 1971, 217). The answer was related with the changing class relations and power balances between the classes in the time. Socialist movement could no longer be content with the militancy of the youth. The working class had just appeared as an important agent in Turkish history. Belli conceived well the characteristic of the new period. The periods before and after June 1970 were not similar due to the rising workers movement.

Positions of the war were many and many positions had been won before. Bell firstly counted the liberation of the socialist literature in Turkey. In the beginning of 1960s, even the word “socialist” was forbidden. The Yön journal was obliged to make some tricks to use the term. The word “socialism” could be used now and the studies of the founders of scientific socialism had been translated into Turkish. Reading Marxist classics were no more under the monopoly of those who knew foreign languages. Belli said that they should read Marx and understand how Marx presented the problems in a complex

way. He suggested also that Engels and the masters of the imperialist age should be read.

Belli referred to someone who pointed to two journals, the **Kurtuluş** and the **Aydınlık** and the FRYA as the organs of communication of the proletarian revolutionaries' movement. Belli observed that those who gathered around those two journals were mainly the students who were close to the Ankara branch of the FRYA. Belli stated that a presentation of these two journals as the centres of the movement were wrong. The movement has surpassed "that stage". The question of organisation had to be considered in the context of the workers and the poor peasants. "The enterprise of creating the revolutionary organisation of the proletariat cannot be imprisoned to the youth movement". Belli continued to say that many members of the FRYA were aware of this situation and called for the reduction of the burden of struggle on the shoulder of the student youth. Belli addressed to the peasants and the workers who came to the meeting saying that the main burden belonged to them. "The foundational force was the worker, the poor peasantry, and this has to find its expression in the organisation". Belli said that the youth would surely help the workers and the peasants. However, the fate of the movement could not be given up to the youth. Many problems would happen and it was indeed so (Belli, 1971, 217).

Belli said that formerly the Babeuf's book was collected by the state although Babeuf was a man of the age of the bourgeois revolutions. The situation changed because of the struggle against the Philippines democracy (Belli, 1971, 218).

The second position won was defeat of the 6.Filo. It could no longer come to İstanbul although it came to İzmir. 6. File was amoral support for the comprador circles. If it could not easily come to Turkey, this meant that Philippines democracy and its treaties were partially injured (Belli, 1971, 218). The third position won by the proletarian revolutionaries was seem in

the fact that the revolutionary youth who tried to defend itself digested the commando camps which had been designed and financed to form the forceful base of fascism. The role of the commandos was to digest the communist. They were financed by America. However, the result was that the universities became the beds of the revolutionaries. This was another victory of the proletarian revolutionaries for a real democracy (Belli, 1971, 219).

Fourth position the proletarian revolutionaries of Mihri Belli won was the great workers' resistance in June 1970. The proletarian revolutionary youth walked side by side with the workers and became friends with them in the prisons. They revealed the characteristics of the men of the yellow trade unionism. In addition, Belli said that they went and make a connection with the peasants (Belli, 1971, 219).

Belli suggested that the organisation of the movement had to base on the ideological unity. For this unity to be realised, he suggested the organisation of the conferences, meetings, etc and then the preparation of "the political platform" in a written form. This draft programme had to be sent to all militants of the proletarian revolutionaries in the provinces, factories, and villages. Feedbacks which would come from the militants had to be collected in a centre and then turned into a "political platform draft". He added that this political platform draft had finally to be debated and accepted in a general proletarian revolutionary congress in which the workers and the peasants would prevail. Belli said that this last point was "a wish" while the former points were "duty" (Belli, 1971, 220).

Before organisation, "an initial organisation" was needed, said Belli. The first stage was the unity of principles. A committee which had theoretical talents had to prepare and write the draft program of the movement. In the note added by *the Aydınlık* to Belli's speech it was said that the speaker (Belli) suggested for the committee who would write the draft program four members of the **Aydınlık** editorial board, one who was the member of a

revolutionary trade union, the one who was the president of the organisation committee for The Meeting of The Proletarian revolutionaries. Belli also suggested that the FRYA should send five members to the committee from its Ankara, İstanbul and İzmir branches. Belli suggested that these members should be appointed by the organisation of the FRYA's organisation. In the end of the conference, the committee which wrote the final announcement of the conference declared that the duty of preparation of the draft programme of the proletarian revolutionaries gave the duty of preparation of the draft programme to an extended editorial board of the **Aydınlık** (Belli, 1971, 221). The composition of the committee would be as such: four from *the Aydınlık's* editorial board, one from the trade union, one from the organisation committee of the conference, five from the FRYA. It is clear that the party leadership of the proletarian revolutionaries would absolutely belong to Mihri Belli and the FRYA according to this composition. This draft would be voted and accepted by the general congress in which the workers and the peasants would prevail. How could this be possible? The movement had not yet connected with the workers and the peasants. It is already evident that the suggested "congress" to vote the draft did not take place because of 12 March and the martial law in April. The workers and the peasants whom Belli pointed could be the militant, socialist, and communist children of the workers and the peasants besides young poor peasants, the workers of the revolutionary trade unions, the youth of the squatters, the intellectual petty bourgeoisie.

As for the international communist movement and its reflections over Turkey, Belli spoke realistically and pragmatically to the audiences. One of the subjects he dealt with was "modern revisionism" which was attributed to the Soviet Union by the PRA following Chinese sources. Belli replied that the revisionism was based on "workers aristocracy". The Soviet Union had a "socialist order". This country was not capitalist. The reactionary, conservative and opportunist sections in the socialist countries were not the working class' aristocracy. These attitudes could come from "bureaucrat-

technocratic estate". Germany where the revisionism originated in between the end of the 19.centutr and the beginning of 20.century and the Soviet Union had no historical similarities. The term "modern revisionism" was not suitable for the latter (Belli, 1971, 222). However, Belli said that they had some criticisms about the Soviet Party leaders. For example, these leaders extended the membership of the party to many in contrast to Leninist's party conception (Belli, 1971, 222-3). The similar event was seen in the case of the Turkey's Worker Party which opened its door to the careerists. These people entered the party and strengthened the opportunist leadership. Belli said that a party which was in the power had not to open its door to the ones whose origin was not known. In this case, the Soviet party had to be criticised, if it was, however, necessary (Belli, 1971, 223).

Belli has said that they had right to criticise the Soviet policies when necessary. He continued to utilise his "right". The Soviets competed with American imperialism for consumption economy. This meant that the war was to be made in the conditions in which the enemy was in advantageous position. It was hoped that the world peoples would prefer the best system in this context. This was the policy of "peaceful coexistence of two social systems". Belli said that this policy was wrong. The socialist countries had also other duties different from the welfare of their peoples. These duties were the requirements of "the proletarian internationalism". In addition, the principle of "peaceful coexistence of the countries in different social orders" was a temporary principle of foreign policy of a socialist country according to Lenin. This principle had not to be changed into the main principle of the international revolutionary movement and had not to be used in order to ignore "class struggle". Lastly, in the case of Arab-Israeli conflict the Soviet Union suggested the border between the Israel and Arab countries be controlled by the Soviet and American troops. Belli said that the aim had not to be giving additional duties to America. American imperialism had to be pushed away from the Middle East (Belli, 1971, 223).

However, these criticisms did not mean that the Soviet Union prevented the possibility of an American oriented fascist government in Egypt because of its navy in the Mediterranean and because it enabled Egypt to recreate its war force. In addition, when America was pushed away from the region, a revolutionary power would need economic support of the Soviet Union. There was a need for friendly relationship with this country besides criticism just as Castro and Ho Si Min did. The slogans “Damn modern revisionism, damn social imperialism!” pointed to irresponsible behaviour for a revolutionary. The ones who used these slogans were “ne’er-do-well, traitorous”. Moreover, the Soviet Union had to be given a right for it to demonstrate its “revisionism” in the future when a revolution would take place in Turkey. Any blame could be levelled only if it would not help Turkey (Belli, 1971, 224).

Belli appreciated Ho Si Min for he did not use the language of Peking Review and advocated the unity of the communist movement in the world after the emergence of the divisions in the international communist movement after 1965. He also observed that there were many revolutionary movements in the world in that time. However, these movements had not “organic centres”. But there was a centre with whom these movements acted with solidarity. It was the centre of “Hanoi-Pyongyang-Havana”. Their language was the closest one to the language of the proletarian revolutionaries who struggled in the imperialist world. “Let us adopt this language, not the language of **Peking review**”. Belli said that they respected Mao, but China made “great state politics”. Ho Si Min, Kim İl Sun and Castro, in other words, Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba was a triangle forming the centre. When Castro recognised that The Cuban revolution could survive thanks to the Soviet help, he did not became “revisionist”. But to say that the Soviet Union helped Cuba in order to change its own bad image was “the effect of opportunist Campus ‘Maoist’ white *the Aydınlik* in our fronts”. Finally, Belli suggested that they should use “the language of the proletarian revolutionaries”. Otherwise, *the Aydınlik* would not exist (Belli, 1971, 225).

Towards the end of his speech, Belli pointed to the “national”, “patriotic” language of the movement. Formerly his speeches and writings had been published in *the Aydınlık*: In “The Reality of Nation” (Millet Gerçeği) (Belli, 1969) and “The revolutionary nationalism and the Proletarian Internationalism Complete Each Other” (Devrimci Milliyetçilik ile Proleter Enternasyonalizmi Birbirini Tamamlar) (Belli, 1970) Belli as a Marxist demonstrated how a bourgeois form could be filled with a Marxist content. National Democratic revolution was already a stage between the bourgeois revolution which had not been able to be completed due to the imperialist world system and the socialist revolution. It was a revolution which could be realised under the leadership of the proletariat in the name of the bourgeoisie for a democratic and independent country. It was a national revolution in the sense that it could eliminate the divisions which had been transferred from feudalism and hence create a national unity and coherence and it could eliminate the foreign domination over the country. The terms “national”, “anti-imperialist”, “anti-feudal” and “democratic” were all closely connected concepts which could be substituted by each other. In his speech, Belli summarised his two articles stated above and explained what I have said about “bourgeois form” with “Marxist content”.

Belli recalled that **Türk Solu** had used the term “nationalism” in the meaning of “patriotism” and “nation-ism” (Belli, 1971, 226-7). He said that they knew that the founders of socialist science did not use the term in these meanings. They wrote in the age when the bourgeoisie maintained its “national” characteristics and hence preferred to use the terms such as “nation-ism”, patriotism”. But there were also some men such as **Jaures** who used the term. Belli said that when he met with his words in some papers in the time of the Second World War, he immediately accepted the term. In a country like Turkey, in a world where the bourgeoisie lost its national characteristics, “nationalism” should not be left to the non-national classes. For this reason, Belli said that they used sometimes the term “patriotism”, sometimes “nation-ism”, sometimes even “nationalism”. What was said by Jaures was this: The

deep of the nationalism make you reach in internationalism; the less of the nationalism make you take away from internationalism. The deep of the internationalism takes you to nationalism; the less of it takes you away from it". Belli added, "we will not give up the word 'nationalism' to the sellers of the fatherland". The strange thing is that in that time according to the information which was given by Belli, while *the Aydınlık* rejected "nationalism" for it was "bourgeois ideology". Belli argued that they said so since they repeated many things from abroad and they saw "Nationalist China" of the clique of Chan Kay-shek. However, the label "nationalist" here had been used in the imperialist literature. The Chinese proletarian revolutionaries did not call it "Nationalist China" (Nationalist China or Formosa is called as Taiwan by China). They talked about it as "the traitorous of the nation", "false nationalist", etc. But they did not call it as "nationalist". Belli concluded that "real nationalist" was "whoever makes war for independency, whoever makes war for the nationalisation of the society that is, to rescue it from the feudal breaking down". He added that they would not give up the nationalism to the sellers of the fatherland (Belli, 1971, 227).

Meanwhile, let us add what Belli said about Türk Solu. He said that if this journal had not been published, many in the conference would have still under the influence of the opportunism. "Türk Solu hit the deathful strike to the Aybar-Aren opportunism in the ideological sphere". "It diffused slogan the National Democratic revolution to the proletarian revolutionary fronts". He also said that revolutionary collaboration also required that Marxist-Leninist and Kemalist come together in "a frontal journal". He said that they did this. Whoever opposed to this unity was outside "Marxist-Leninist attitude" (Belli, 1971, 226). It was argued that Marxist-Leninists used the term nationalism" in the meaning of "patriotism" "in our age when the bourgeoisie lost its national characteristic" (note in Belli, 1971, 226). He also quoted from Kim Il-sun, the leader of Korean Workers Party, who said that in his country, "**Nationalism** and **class consciousness** increased day by day and anti-American thought

were settling down among the wide popular masses of the South Korea” (note in Belli, 1971, 227).

Belli quoted from **Stalin** who had addressed to the party leaders in XIX. Party Congress held several months before his death. Stalin said that “In old days, the bourgeoisie was counted as the head of the nation, advocated the rights and the independency of the nation...Today the national principle has no tract. Today the bourgeoisie exchanges the rights and the independency of the nation with dollars...If you representatives of the communist and democratic parties want to become patriotic, the ruling force of the nation” it is your job to carry the flag of the nation over your head (note in Belli, 1971, 227-8). Belli said that since the publication of his article “The Reality of The Nation” in the **Aydinlik** (Bell, 1969) some opportunist circles exaggerated the subject. For example, many adopted the statement “peoples of Turkey” which had been firstly used in Ant journal. Belli sated that in Marxist terminology, the term “people” meant “community of certain classes” and it did not mean ethnicity. In a capitalist society in which feudal elements as classes were absent, “the people can be expressed as the equality of the nation minus the bourgeoisie”. In a society which carries feudal relations, the people could be used to imply the revolutionary forces as a front, but not as an ethnicity. For this reason the statement “the peoples of Turkey” was correct. The term “Soviet peoples” used in the Soviet literature covered the idea of the merging and unity of the peoples within the Soviet Union. Here the Russians were in the minor position. In China where there were more than 40 million people who did not come from Chinese origin, the proletarian revolutionaries including **Mao** talked about “Chinese nation”, Chinese people” (note in Belli, 1971, 228-9).

Belli surely mentioned the Kurdish question of Turkey. He said that four millions of Kurds lived in the country. “With this community of Kurds with the friendship of Turks passed the exam of history”. The Kurds protected the Eastern border of the Ottoman Empire. In the 19.century, the centralisation

policy of the state led into “the feudal resistances” of the Kurds rather than “national resistances”. The first rebellion took place in 1806 and after 5-6 important rebellions during the 19. century, in 1880 the last rebellion, that of Seyit Übeydullah occurred. Between 1880 and 1925 there did not take place any Kurdish rebellion. This period witnessed the dissolution of the empire. All national communities excluding Kurds rebelled toward the state. They made war in Dardanelle War and in the Liberation war with Turks. The proletarian revolutionaries, said Belli were not only the advocators of “the national claims” but also of “the land unity of the country”. In addition, the land unity of Turkey could be advocated in 1970 “only in one form by recognising equal rights to the Kurdish people, recognising its existence, recognising the use of mother language to this people...” Belli said that assimilation, commando attacks and the encouragement of chauvinist feelings were “real divisionist” (Belli, 1971, 228).

Meanwhile let me add that Belli said that **Aydınlık** was not published in order to correct some opportunist tendencies in **Türk Solu** as some claimed in the conference. Definition of the political line of Türk Solu could not be made since collective working could not be done due to technical reasons. For this reason, the editorial writer was obliged to decide in his own way. He said that they prepared the editorial writings with the exception of last two issues. When they continued their studies in **Türk Solu**, they helped the publication of “**Aydınlık** as ideological organ”. Belli and Vahap Erdoğan gave the name the *Aydınlık*. *The Aydınlık* did not level any criticism towards Türk Solu. In the editorial board of *the Aydınlık*, there were nine persons, six of whom would turn into “new opportunism” later on. They were the majority in the board. The team of the journal did not level any criticism towards Türk Solu which had carried the flag of the proletarian revolutionary movement between 1967 and 1969 (note in Belli, 1971, 226).

6.4 Class Party for National Front Struggle

Doğu Perinçek stated in his “Class Structure of the WPT Members” (Perinçek, 1969) that the developments within the party could not be understood without considering the class structure of the party (Perinçek, 1969, 205). For the analysis of the members in terms of classes and regions of the country, Perinçek suggested four regions: 1) Marmara-Aegean and Mediterranean Regions where agriculture was predominantly mechanised, agricultural production for industrial input was realised at most, agricultural workers were existed, the industrial proletariat was powerful, exchange relations were developed, banking system operated along with the usury, where “the yoke of the imperialism” was seen at most, urbanisation level was high, biggest cities of the country concentrated (Perinçek, 1969, 206-7). 2) Inner Anatolian Region where in agriculture small peasant economy prevailed, peasants with little land and middle peasantry were in majority, in some cities like Ankara and Eskişehir industry developed in certain degree and hence industrial workers existed. 3) Black Sea Region where industrial workers existed in industrial centres like Zonguldak and Karabük and fragmented small properties were prevalent in agriculture. 4) Eastern and South Eastern Anatolia where feudal relations survived to a large degree, industrialisation was rather backward, artisanship which were residual of feudalism had not been yet liquidated, production for market was not developed. In this region, an ethnic group was important in its population (Perinçek, 1969, 207).

Perinçek pointed to Article 53 of the WPT’s Regulation which called for that at least the half of the leading organs of the party had to be occupied by the workers who had to sell their labour or by the ones who were the members of the leading organs of the trade unions (Perinçek, 1969, 207-8). However, such an article increased artificially the proportion of the workers in the WPT’s leading positions. Perinçek said that “in a labour party”, the participation of the workers in the leading organs of the party was not

ensured through legal measures. This participation had to be related with the maturity of the working class and its wish to appropriate its own party (Perinçek, 1969, 208). According to the information given by the members of the party about their professions and works, 44, 47 percent of the WPT members were made of the proletarians and semi-proletarians. This category covered the workers (2495 persons, 19, 95 percent), servant workers (132 persons 1, 05 percent), qualified workers (294 persons 2, 31 percent), artisan workers (1191 persons 9, 38 percent), technicians (281 persons, 2, 22 percent) agricultural workers (1174 persons, 9, 24 percent), and mobile shopkeepers (seyyar satıcı) (79 persons, 0, 62 percent). The second category covered the petty bourgeoisie which composed of shopkeeper-artisan (1382 persons, 10, 88 percent), petty bourgeois bureaucrat and intellectuals (1367 persons, 10, 77 percent; this subcategory was divided into petty bureaucrats of 93 persons, intellectual bureaucrats of 599 persons, students of 603 persons, and trade unions of 72 persons), peasants with little land and middle peasant stratum (2576 persons, 20, 29 percent), “Free” employees (961 persons, 7, 57 percent), house wife (331 persons, 2, 61 percent). The third category was the bourgeoisie. It was composed of manufacturers (55 persons, 0, 44 percent), big service capitalist (84 persons, 0, 66 percent) intermediary-commissioners (214 persons, 1, 68 percent). The last category was unemployed ones (214 persons, 0, 62 percent) (from the table in Perinçek, 1969, 210-1).

The **proletarian and semi-proletarian** had no means of production and worked for bodily in the means of production owned by the others in return of wage. Perinçek said that not all of the workers in this category had permanent work. Particularly seasonal workers in agriculture had no the characteristics of “the modern proletariat” in terms of their seasonal and temporary employments. Mobile sellers or shopkeepers were included into this category since they had no means of production and works bodily although they worked freely (Perinçek, 1969, 211).

The sub-category of the **workers** (the ones who described themselves in the registration moment to the party) could not be differentiated in terms of industrial workers and trade union memberships. However, many of the worker members came from the first region with 72 percent of the total worker members in the party. This was normal since this region was the most industrialised and populated region of the country. The percentage of the workers in the Black sea region was roughly 3 percent of the worker members. Perinçek observed that this low rate demonstrated the fact that the workers working in the industrial regions of Ereğli, Zonguldak and Karabük did not enter into the WPT. On the other hand, although in Eastern and South Eastern Anatolia was weakly industrialised, they covered the 11, 43 percent of the WPT worker members. Perinçek said that these workers were employed in the rural mining areas.

Perinçek observed that some members registered themselves as “worker” although they worked for one for daily wage. For this reason industrial workers could not distinguished. In addition, among this “workers”, existence of the qualified and service workers was a great possibility. Perinçek implied that “the worker” category in fact had to cover the industrial workers. The division to be made between the qualified workers and workers according to the information by the members did not expose the reality (213). Perinçek wanted to say that the percentage of “the workers” was lower than seen. He said that the servant workers also had to be greater than seen since they were possibly registered as “worker” (Perinçek, 1969, 214).

In addition to 281 **technicians**, Perinçek said that three to four or four to five of some **artisans** had no means of production and worked for other men. He argued that one to four or one to five of 1191 artisans were petty bourgeoisies who worked through their means of production bodily on the base of an inquiry made by Sudi İlkokur about the artisans in Turkey (Perinçek, 1969, 214). The fact that one to four or one to five of the artisans had means of production might reflect in the WPT in a less degree. In

addition, the fact that the portion of the petty bourgeoisie was higher in the party and 106 of them was registered in the centres below 20 thousand in the fourth region was a sign for the fact that among these artisans there were some who owned a small workshop or stand. In addition, different members might have used name of the some professions for different meaning. Shoemaker was possibly an artisan in the Eastern regions, and possibly worker in the West (Perinçek, 1969, 214).

Perinçek said that the artisans, with technicians, were the sections of the working class which could find job easily and move freely in comparison to the other workers. The artisan workers had more chance to rise up and take higher positions.

Lastly, the large part of the artisan workers covers the drivers. 422 of them were drivers. Perinçek suggested that they were in fact service workers (Perinçek, 1969, 215).

The **agricultural workers** of the party were registered in the first region in a percentage of 83, 30. Perinçek predicted that they were agricultural wage workers. These regions covered wage-labourers in agriculture. Inner Anatolia and Black Sea regions where small peasant agriculture was prevalent covered only 3, 15 and 7, 24 percent of the agricultural workers in the party (Perinçek, 1969, 215). This figure was 6, 30 percent for the East and South East. This was because of the prevalence of the feudal relations in those regions (Perinçek, 1969, 216).

Mobile sellers (mobile shopkeepers) worked bodily and had not means of production. They were not regularly employed. For this reason, they had to be counted as “semi-proletarian”. They maintained themselves due to the immaturity of the distribution system. They did not have regular working life. They did not reject a permanent job (Perinçek, 1969, 216).

The petty bourgeoisie owned small property or capital. However, they themselves too worked. Perinçek said that intellectual bureaucrat strata who did not participate in production of capital directly and who originated generally from petty bourgeoisie had been traditionally included into the petty bourgeoisie (Perinçek, 1969, 216).

The artisan-shopkeepers were a stratum threatened by modern industry. Although its intermediary sections were extension of the big merchant in the towns and villages, they had contradictory interest with these merchants. Unlike small shopkeepers, these sorts of shopkeepers were in minority in the party since the latter opposed to these sections. The clever sections of these groups could support the parties which did not threaten the petty bourgeois property and moved towards “national democracy” because they were under the threat of proletarianisation and they were not confidential about future. The prevalent existence of this group in the Eastern regions in the party was caused by the relatively undeveloped conditions of this region (Perinçek, 1969, 216-7).

The **shopkeeper and artisan who are not intermediary** fulfil a service or makes production. These covered for example bakers, cooks, tailor, and photographer. The artisans who were dependent on backward technology were small artisans tinker, ironworker, and blacksmith who had been seen mainly in the feudal times. These were under the threat of industrialisation and the extension of the markets of the industrial products. The fact that this group was prevalent in the eastern regions was related with the fact that feudal structure had not been yet dissolved in that region (Perinçek, 1969, 217).

The **petty bourgeois bureaucrat and intellectuals** were a group which covered bureaucrats, intellectual bureaucrats, the students and the trade unionists. The students were the candidates for the bureaucratic posts and ideologically leaned to the bureaucrat intellectuals. The ones who described

themselves “trade unionist” in the moment of registration to the party should not be accepted as “workers” since they saw the trade unionism as a profession and job. These were professional trade unionists, said Perinçek. They did not work bodily. The trade unionists whose numbers were 72 probably had greater figure in the party. It was a great possibility for many trade unionists to have been seen as “worker” in the membership registrations (Perinçek, 1969, 217).

The fact that the petty bourgeois intellectuals and bureaucrats formed the 10, 77 percentage of the party members was striking and suggested that the ones who saw the bureaucracy as an enemy in the side of the dominant feudal comprador alliance and tried to develop “thesis for history” to prove this claim should have thought of this subject. In addition, the fact that the civil servants and the higher echelons in the public economic institutions could not become the members of the parties prevented that the civil servants be represented in the party. Their weigh and influence in the party was higher than their membership figures (Perinçek, 1969, 218).

Small bureaucrats were the small civil servants like counters, medical servants, and collectors. The **intellectual bureaucrat group** were formed of the lawyers (94 members), the artists (59 members), retired servants and officers (60 members), the engineers and the architects (51 members), the journalists (38 members), scholars (32 members), the medical doctors and dentists (31 members) (Perinçek, 1969, 218).

The students were concentrated in the university cities. Some of them were registered in their localities. The group was interested in socialist though at most in the party. It formed “the base force” of the anti-imperialist struggle in the cities (Perinçek, 1969, 219).

The **peasants with little land and middle peasantry** worked for another or employed another peasants, but were the peasants who worked themselves

too. The members of the party who were seen as “farmer”, Perinçek suggested as a proposition since the big landowners would not be the member of the party, should be included into this category. Some of them might be big landowner, but this fact would not affect the result. Their 20, 29 percentage of existence in the party was probably the result of the fact that the concentration of land property, usury led into misery among these peasants. This section of “the petty bourgeoisie” saw the small land property under threat accepted “national democracy program” (Perinçek, 1969, 219).

“Free” professionals were “small capital owners” who did not have “a certain and permanent job”. They were interested in small commerce and the ones of them who lived in the towns were interested with seasonal works. For example, they collected the products of the peasants and sold to the merchants in the big cities. The 80 percent of this group was concentrated in the first region (Perinçek, 1969, 219-20).

The housewives were a category who could be accepted as the wives of the petty bourgeois men who had enough earning to maintain house economy. The intellectual or working women members expressed their professions. 254 of the women members were registered in the first region, and 74 of them in the second. The only three women members in this category were from Black Sea region. Perinçek said that these were probably the wives of the intellectual and bureaucrats who were member of the party (Perinçek, 1969, 220).

The bourgeoisie point to a group of men who own the means of production, do not work himself but employ workers or are related with commerce and intermediary activities (Perinçek, 1969, 220-1). Perinçek said that it could be supposed that this group in the party, 2, 78 percent, did not include big industrialists or big merchants. The bourgeois members of the party were composed of 214 intermediary and commissioners such as merchants and owners of the oil stations, agent sellers, capital owners related with big

services and manufacturers such as hotel owners, transport company owners, cinema and restaurant owners. The merchants were a big group in the East and South Eastern Anatolia. Perinçek argued that the fact that two to third of the intermediaries lived in the towns was a sign for that these members were not big capital owners. The important portion of the bourgeoisies of the WPT lived in the towns. Perinçek suggested that this fact could be explained because of pressure of the bigger capital over them (Perinçek, 1969, 221).

The figure of the **unemployed** members of the party was not significant. They were 79. Perinçek said that they could be included into the proletarian and semi-proletarian category (Perinçek, 1969, 221). Only four of them were registered in the first region. The other unemployed members were evenly distributed to other three regions (Perinçek, 1969, 222).

The distribution of the party members into the regions was a criterion for the diffusion of the party into the country. 63 percent of the members were in the first region. The second region covered their 16 percent. The third region involved 9 percent of the members and the remaining 12 percent belonged to the East and South East. Perinçek said that excluding the first region, the party diffused more or less equally into the other regions. In the first region, proletarians and semi-proletarians became the members of the party more according to the other regions. Their ratio was 71, 64 percent of the same category in the party as a whole. The figure was 83, 30 for the agricultural workers. However, the petty bourgeoisie, excluding the intellectual-bureaucrat category, was represented less according to the other regions. The second region (central Anatolia) involved 30, 44 percent of the intellectual-bureaucrats in the party. It also covered 20, 30 percent of the small and middle peasants. 18, 87 percent of the petty bourgeoisie as a whole was represented in the party by this region. In the Black Sea region, the same peasant category was 20, 11 percent of the same peasant category

in the party as a whole. The 9, 72 percent of the petty bourgeoisies of the party was represented by this region (Perinçek, 1969, 222-3).

As we have mentioned above, Perinçek placed the small and middle peasantry into petty bourgeoisie. He said that the quantitative power of the small and middle peasants within the party increased through the central Anatolia and Black Sea regions. "In these regions the petty bourgeois characteristic of the party gets bolder". In the East and South East, the intellectual bureaucrat groups were less according to the other regions. Despite this fact, 26, 55 percent of the shopper-artisans (mainly the ones depending on old technology) in the party were registered in this region. 35 percent of the bourgeois members of the party (mainly intermediaries and commissioners) belonged to it, too (Perinçek, 1969, 223).

The distribution of the party members into the regions reflected the class map of Turkey to a large degree. The WPT had relatively more worker and intellectual members in the regions which had relatively a developed industry and capitalist relations of agriculture. In the regions of central Anatolia and Black Sea where small peasant economy was prevalent, the party attracted small and middle peasants. In the East and South East, Perinçek observed that the proportion of the shopkeepers, artisans, all petty bourgeoisie excluding intellectuals and bureaucrats increased. Perinçek observed that the WPT recruited its members in a similar way with the other parties. The big capitalist and land owners whose numbers were little in Turkey, said Perinçek, could not obtain the majority in any party. But they became sovereign in these parties.

The fact that Workers Party of Turkey has a class structure which is in the same direction of the class relations and economic structure of the regions, **demonstrate in one sense that the WPT is a party, in terms of class structure of its members, which does not reject the socio-economic structure of Turkey but a party which is subjected to this structure**" (Perinçek, 1969, 224).

As for the distribution of the party members to the cities, which were supposed to be the places above 20000 and the towns and villages, which were below 20000, Perinçek said that the members who were registered in the cities covered 54, 90 percent of the members (6970 members). The remaining 45, 10 percent (5725 members) was registered in the towns. The latter category involved 1174 agricultural workers, 2576 small and middle peasant. The peasant members of the WPT formed 29 percent of the party members. According to the distribution of the members into the cities, towns and villages, the WPT was seen relatively as the party of the citizens in the first and second regions (related category 60 and 63 percentages), the party of the peasants in the Black Sea (related category 55 percent) and the party of the inhabitants of the towns in the East and South East (related category 39 percent). Perinçek observed that the reason behind the fact that relatively higher ratio of the members registered in the towns in the last category was related with the little numbers of the places above 20000 in that region (Perinçek, 1969, 224-5).

Perinçek concluded that the membership structure of the WPT manifested directly the class structure of Turkey, the levels of consciousness and the participating in political life of the classes. The large part of the members had a petty bourgeois origin. It was probable that the influence of the petty bourgeoisie within the party was higher in the leading positions (Perinçek, 1969, 225).

Perinçek said that the weight of the petty bourgeoisie in the party could be explained because of its consciousness, experience, maturity and activity for political participation as a class and a necessity for itself to ally with other labouring classes. The petty bourgeoisie which was composed of labouring men to large degree searched in its own liberation through an alliance with urban and rural proletariat, in a country which was semi-dependent and semi-feudal. Its slogans were inspired from the ideology of the working class and it had a "populism peculiar to itself", and "a literature of 'labouring classes' ".

This class wanted to establish this alliance under its own leadership with these slogans, populism and literature. Perinçek said that this alliance would surely be established and “national liberation” would achieve its victory. “However, this alliance will not take place in a party. There must be and will be a pure party of the working class in terms of ideology and class structure of its members” (Perinçek, 1969, 225). What Perinçek demanded is a class party which is to be composed of the workers mainly, directed, organised and operated by the workers mainly, and a party having the ideology and theory of the scientific socialism. This is independent communist party of the proletariat. Let us follow Perinçek:

He argued that “the views inspired from socialism of the petty bourgeoisie”, were made dominant by the ones who rejected the alliance with the petty bourgeoisie in the struggle for democracy and independence in the party majority of which was the petty bourgeoisie. The conception of socialism was influenced by the ideological conceptions of the leaders and the class structure of the party. “According to these, socialism is ‘the power and the programme of the labouring classes’. Let us translate this conception, ‘socialism’ is argued to be the power and the program of the alliance of petty bourgeoisie (majority of them is labourer) and the proletariat. The facts that revolutionary step in front of us is necessarily national-democracy and that the progressiveness of the petty bourgeoisie is limited lead into this degeneration”. A revolutionary change of the WPT could be realised by a new revolutionary leadership and ideology. Such a revolutionary leading cadre could make the party have its real base (Perinçek, 1969, 226). As it is seen, the WPT was seen as a party which could be taken over from the opportunist leadership.

The WPT in the description made by Perinçek seems to be the social-democrat party which had been emerged during 1848 revolution in France. This party was a platform of the petty bourgeois radicals and the working

class. However, in that time, the proletariat became an independent class action and firstly attempted at seizing the power.

Although national democratic revolution strategy calls for an establishment of a national front of the so called national classes, and a national party which is to represent all labouring sections of the national community, Perinçek wants to see the WPT as a *class party* in order to realise national democratic revolution through the frontal struggle against the imperialism, comprador bourgeoisie and big land owners. There is no coherency between the social base of the demanded organisation and the strategy of the predicated revolution.

“Socialist workers parties which adopted the ideology of the working class” had to take care of the “powerful majority of the working class” in terms of their members and of “the sovereign” existence of “the conscious revolutionaries” that matured in the proletarian fronts in the party. The alliance of the working class with the petty bourgeoisie was searched for within the party itself because of the competition with other petty bourgeois parties and vote considerations. Perinçek said that this was “wrong”. A party had to be coherent in its ideology and class structure. In a “socialist party”, the working class had to be powerful in all regional units of the party. “Revolutionary parties” rejected the existing structure of society. A real socialist part had to be socialist party in every region. A revolutionary party became revolutionary party hen it was not subjected to the backward structures and when it collected the forced which rejected the existing structure. The organisation was not an aim in itself. It was an immediate need to breed revolutionary within the fronts of the proletariat (Perinçek, 1969: 225). The leadership of the working class had to be realised firstly inside the party. The WPT leadership tried to make the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and its rule sovereign in the party. The WPT leaders represented “the interests of an opportunist petty bourgeois minority” opposed the worker members to conceive their own “class ideology”. These leaders opposed the

attempts for establishing “struggle unity of nation-ist forces”. For this reason, “the revolutionaries” would fulfil the function of “breeding proletarian revolutionaries”, facilitating the working class with its own ideology, make it involve to “anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggle” through “consciousness of moving towards socialism”. This function would be realised through a struggle against the opportunists. “This is the reason of the disagreement between the opportunist and the socialists” (Perinçek, 1969:226).

Perinçek argued that “the views inspired from socialism of the petty bourgeoisie”, were made dominant by the ones who rejected the alliance with the petty bourgeoisie in the struggle for democracy and independence in the party majority of which was the petty bourgeoisie. The conception of socialism was influenced by the ideological conceptions of the leaders and the class structure of the party. “According to these, socialism is ‘the power and the programme of the labouring classes’. Let us translate this conception, ‘socialism’ is argued to be the power and the program of the alliance of petty bourgeoisie (majority of them is labourer) and the proletariat. The fact that revolutionary step in front of us is necessarily national-democracy, and that the progressiveness of the petty bourgeoisie is limited leads into this degeneration”. A revolutionary change of the WPT could be realised by a new revolutionary leadership and ideology. Such a revolutionary leading cadre could make the party have its real base (Perinçek, 1969: 226). As it is seen, the WPT was seen as a party which could be taken over from the opportunist leadership.

6.5 The Meeting of October and the Party Question

Kardam said that “the subjective (consciousness) element which forms the working class struggle is the conception of the spontaneous processes of the working class struggle by the progressive elements of the working class again and under the lights of this conception that socialists draw a program, and strategy and tactics which will realise this program to themselves.

Thereby, the working class changes its struggle into a conscious and systematic political struggle which aims at the ultimate liberation” (Kardam, 1970b, 124).

Kardam distinguish “struggle” and “class struggle”. The latter also includes “subjective” element of the working class struggle:

Here since the working class struggle in Turkey is made of these two elements, each action of the working class of Turkey is **not the class struggle of the proletariat**. The struggle of the working class becomes **class struggle** only when the most progressive elements of the working class aware of the fact that they are a single class whose interests and the targets are the same, only when they as a class for themselves form a front under the leadership of the working class with the other class and stratum who are like itself exploited and oppressed against the totality of the classes which exploit, depress and enslave themselves rather than a struggle aiming at each employees who exploit themselves one by one and then make a struggle towards the path going to the ultimate victory. Let me say, it is the subjective element of the struggle which turns the struggle of the working class of Turkey into **class struggle** (Kardam, 1970b, 124).

Totality of subjective and objective elements of the struggle of the working class had to be conceived as “a dialectical unity”. For example, even though a mere spontaneous movement of a small section of the working class against single employee for “daily interests” “like increasing the wages, reduction of the working hours, giving waged vacancy, betterment of the working conditions” is “a movement far away from class consciousness” ultimately creates a reaction of the institutions under the control of “the imperialism-comprador bourgeoisie-feudal big landowners trio”. This reaction creates consciousness for the workers and then spreads over to the other workers. The consciousness becomes stronger and acquires a “political” characteristic “within a totality” (Kardam, 1970b, 124). Kardam suggested that last workers’ struggle in the form of strikes, occupations, solidarity acts and strikes among the workers and eventually great worker resistance in June 1970 should be seen in this direction (Kardam, 1970b, 125).

Kardam said that 29-30 October meeting gathered the persons who shared the same programme and strategy. It was not a meeting of persons who had different programme and strategies like “Socialist Congress” of “new opportunism” and called themselves “socialist”. Their meeting was the meeting of “unity without principle” (Kardam, 1970b, 130-1). However, Kardam said that necessary agreement about the strategy and programme did not mean that tactics had to be same for all. Different views about the tactics were a source of dynamism for the movement (Kardam, 1970b, 131).

The proletarian revolutionaries held the Meeting of 29-30 October in the same date with the 4.Congress of Turkey’s Worker Party. The Congress of the WPT liquidated the proletarian revolutionaries who advocated national democratic revolution strategy against the socialist revolution strategy of the WPT. The 29-30 October’s meeting was a sign for the party organisation of the proletarian revolutionaries. Ahmet Kardam’s article “The Meeting of 29-30 October and the Party Question” (December 1970, 26) explained the meaning of this meeting, which implies a turning point for the socialist struggle immediately before 12 March 1971. It also demonstrates the differentiation of socialist struggle in the last year of 1970. This year was a new phase for the socialist struggle as a whole. Ahmet Kardam also gave the clues of the logic of the guerrilla warfare of the 1970s.

Kardam said that “27 May 1960 coup d’etat” created “a limited democratic environment”. The fifty years old socialist struggle developed in this environment after 1960. After this year, the struggle could be divided into two periods. Between 1961 and 1965, the WPT was established and then supported by all revolutionaries despite everything. It united socialists and the progressive elements of the petty bourgeoisie. However, the WPT opened its door to everybody and in time based upon “the town petty bourgeoisie”. As the class struggle rose in Turkey, the class struggle in the party also raised. An opposition developed to turn the party into a real socialist party against the petty bourgeois leading cadres. Kardam said that

the contradiction between the leaders of the party and the proletarian revolutionaries did not yet required that the latter ones searched in a base for their struggle. Socialist movement extended and reached in the labouring masses through the WPT. However, the contradiction between the petty bourgeois leadership of the party who tried to keep the party within the limits of Philippines democracy and the opposition which tried to turn the party into a socialist party also rose. After the elections of 1965, the leading cadres exposed their aims clearly. In the second congress of the party in 1966, the proletarian revolutionary opposition within and outside the party exposed themselves clearly too (Kardam, 1970b, 116). The second period began in 1965 and continued. In this period, socialist struggle raised as the class struggle raised. The opposition against opportunism in the WPT created other bases outside the party. However, it was not “organised”. This “unorganised” characteristic of the movement was not so powerful against the petty bourgeois waves and hence its unorganised structure rose more and more. Nevertheless, the second period ensured the recognition of the socialist movement as an independent political force in the country. The opposition, the proletarian revolutionary struggle was obliged to be based on the forces outside the party due to the journalism and liquidations in the party. The pillar points of the movement were the publications, the youth organisations and some local organisation which emerged to meet the need for mass organisation among the workers and the peasants in Anatolia (Kardam, 1970b, 117).

One of the pillar points of the proletarian revolutionary movement, according to Kardam, “of the socialist movement” after 1960, were the journals and newspapers such as: **Türk Solu**, **Aydınlık**, **İşçi-Köylü** and **Kurtuluş**. **Türk Solu** (Turkish Left) appeared in 1967 fall as an organ against the opportunism within the WPT. It tried to organise and unite ideologically the proletarian revolutionary opposition. However, since opportunism attempted to isolate the opposition by moving it outside the party, this journal was designed as “frontal journal”, “it fell into a condition where it could not satisfy

the need for ideological education of the militant cadres who came into existence during the process of opposition realised against the opposition in time". To meet this "unsatisfied need", **Aydınlık** appeared after approximately one year later from *Türk Solu*. The fact that class struggle increased from 1965 to 1969 and in parallel to this that socialist movement developed, the socialist movement needed an organ in order to establish "organics relations with the mass movements". In the summer of 1969, **İşçi-Köylü** (the Worker-Peasant) came into existence as "a frontal newspaper" of 15 days. The Worker-Peasant was different from *Türk Solu* in that the former could establish relations with masses and help the revolutionaries who was neutralised because of the WPT's passiveness connect with the masses and win new elements to the proletarian revolutionary fronts. Kardam recalled that a "right submissive deviation" (sağ teslimiyetçi sapma) emerged and developed more and more within the proletarian revolutionary movement. Kardam said that this deviation was liquidated in the beginning of 1970. But during the moment of liquidation, *Türk Solu* journal and *İşçi-Köylü* newspaper "remained in the hand of this new opportunism". To compensate the function of *İşçi-Köylü* and to continue the mass relations, **Kurtuluş** (Liberation) newspaper appeared. The proletarian revolutionary movement had **Aydınlık** and **Kurtuluş** in that time (Kardam, 1970b, 117).

The other pillar of the proletarian revolutionary movement was the youth organisations. Kardam said that the opposition levelled to the opportunism within the WPT manifested itself firstly in the university youth. In 1966, the WPT's leaders established the Federation of Thought Clubs which was to be dependent upon them. The federation was based on the clubs which had been established in the universities. According to Kardam, the fact that the WPT leadership wanted to use the youth in the federation in the direction of its "reformist" and "parliamentary" policy, led the revolutionary youth to begin to oppose against the federation and party leaderships. This university youth which begun to organise around the proletarian revolutionary movement that struggled in order to change the WPT into a socialist party became the

second pillar point of the socialist movement outside the WPT. In the second congress of the federation held in 1968, the federation was partially seized by the proletarian revolutionaries. In the third congress held in the beginning of 1969, the federation was nearly seized in a complete way by the proletarian revolutionary youth. In the October 1969 when the fourth congress held, the youth who was faithful to the opportunist leadership of the WPT was liquidated from the federation. In addition, the name of the federation of the Thought Clubs was changed into "Federation of Revolutionary Youth Associations" (FRYA) (Kardam, 1970b, 118).

Kardam said that the socialist movement emerged within the WPT as an opposition and spread over outside the WPT in time. The most important foundation of the socialist struggle in this period was the youth organisations. The proletarian revolutionary movement had already no other organisation. Kardam said that despite their drawbacks, the federation and the youth organisations enable "the socialist movement" to make itself be recognised by everybody as "an independent political force" (Kardam, 1970b, 118). Marx said that the proletariat firstly became an independent class power during the 1848 revolutions. In Turkey, as Kardam said, "the socialist movement" became an independent power. However, it can be said that even in Europe, before the emergence of an independent class movement of the proletariat in the party form, "socialism" had been already a system of thought and an ideology which were seen in the intellectual circles of the petty bourgeoisie. This was one of the reasons behind why Marx and Engels preferred to name the manifesto, as "Communist Manifesto" rather than "Socialist Manifesto". Communists wanted a total revolution of the working class while socialists seemed to be the social democrats of the twentieth century. They wanted to change the world without change the logic of capital (see Engels' 1888 Preface for English issue, page 92 and 1890 preface for German issue, page 97 to the *Communist Manifesto*, in Turkish 1993).

However, when the year 1970 came, the masses spontaneously upraised, the workers movement tend to acquire a political characteristic, and the peasants concentrated their movements in the form of land occupations for instance, the proletarian revolutionary movement saw that its pillar foundations (we have stated above) were weak. The opposition within the weak could not change the ineffective condition of the WPT. There was no central organisation. The organs could not get a characteristic to organise the movement. The organs therefore fell behind the mass movements. The youth organisations and particularly the FRYA was not in a position to carry the burden in its own way. For this reason, the movement began to have a new base in front of the rising mass mobilisation particularly after 1969. These were “local organisations” established in Anatolia in order to organise mass movements of the workers, peasants and the youth. The important ones were “the worker-peasant unions”, “local youth organisations” and “independent associations” which were established by the FRYA if the worker-peasant unions were absent. In addition, the proletarian revolutionary movement established “a revolutionary trade union” to organise the trade union activity of the workers. It was “The Trade Union of The Construction Workers” (Yapı İşçileri Sendikası, YİS). Kardam argued that this was the beginning of real democratic trade unionism” in Turkey (Kardam, 1970b, 118). In the place where these sorts of organisations could not have been established, the revolutionaries tried to organise themselves within the TUT (Kardam, 1970b, 119).

Kardam portrays the second period after 1965 and said that the socialist struggle had “two aspects which contradict with other”. The one was the fact the movement acquired an independent and powerful force which would have a different “programme and strategy” in relation to the WPT. The other one was the fact that as the movement tried to obtain new foundations, it could not create the cadres which could establish “the nucleus of the party, it became “a fragmented characteristic” more and more. None of the foundations of the movement could become a centre which would be able to

create “the nuclear cadre”, or no any centre which would be able to play this role could be created. For this reason, “deviations” emerged; the links between the foundations became loose; and the movement acquired the characteristic of “independent units” which tended to be subjected to “spontaneous-ism”. Such a situation was seen in all units of the movement from the organs to mass studies. The FRYA was the only organisation the movement had and carried the burden of the movement. For this reason, it was obliged to organise not only the youth movements but also wide popular movements. However, its real base was a student youth organisation, and its ideological maturity was inadequate, it could not fulfil this function properly in a complete and continued way. The movement could connect in a certain degree with the spontaneous movements of the workers and the peasants only after these movements had begun and could not continue its relation with them after they ceased to exist (Kardam, 1970b, 119). On the other hand, the worker and peasant unions could not go beyond economic struggle since the movement has no political centre. The publishing organs were ineffective in terms of organic relations, could make important ideological mistakes, and cried out erroneous slogans (Kardam, 1970b, 119). The revolutionary opposition which had been realised within the WPT elevated the movement into a higher stage. But it lost its significance (Kardam, 1970b, 119-20). The last attempts to change the WPT to a socialist party were very late attempts. Economic struggle of the masses developed because of the economic crisis without having an organisation. Revolutionary elements asked, “what we will do, how we will do?” The general answer was “let us be centralised”. However, each element demanded a centralisation around itself. The proletarian revolutionaries decided not to participate in the fourth congress of the WPT. The most important subject of their 29-30 October meeting was the question of party (Kardam, 1970b, 120).

Besides Mihri Belli’s speech in the meeting of 29-30 October 1970, I will also deal with Kardam’s evaluations about the party organisation in the context of

class and revolution within the general strategic context of the national democratic revolution.

One day before the 29-30 October meeting, the proletarian revolutionaries decided not to participate in the fourth general congress of the WPT which would be held in the same dates. This decision meant also a total resignation from the WPT. It was already the fact that immediately after the 29-30 October meeting the groups of the proletarian revolutionaries began to resign from the party. However, the revolutionaries who resigned made different meetings and decided that they should not establish a party immediately. The party was “a question of process”. Kardam said that after the meeting, it was clear that if the proletarian revolutionary movement was not able to create concrete improvement for party organisation, the existing fragmented and disconnected way of working would rise, and existing “individual mode of working” would stamp over the movement and the period in which they lived (Kardam, 1970b, 123).

Kardam stated that “Whatever the stage in which the movement stands is the duty of the proletarian revolutionaries is to work for making the working class struggle reach in its ultimate target, socialism. In other words, the proletarian revolutionaries are the persons who evaluate all questions only in terms of the interests of the working class, and consequently they are the persons who draw their strategy and tactics only in terms of the ultimate victory of the working class” (Kardam, 1970b, 123). I think that Kardam’s these statements are the rejection of the national democratic revolution strategy which requires that socialists should postpone or puts aside for a while socialist revolution. However, the same Kardam said that the national democratic revolution as a peasant revolution had to be realised before socialist revolution (see above and his article “*the National Democratic revolution as a Peasant revolution*” 1970 October, 24).

The working class struggle had two conditions: objective and subjective; “objective” condition was related with “spontaneous” development while “subjective” condition was related with “consciousness” (Kardam, 1970b, 123-4). Objective or spontaneous elements were the processes which were “independent from the conscious movements of the proletariat”. As a result of the capitalist development and the contradictions caused by this development, the movements such as strikes, meetings, occupations realised by the proletariat and the other class and stratum around it were “spontaneous movements that are independent from the consciousness and the will of the proletariat” (Kardam, 1970b, 124). Here we must ask whether spontaneity excludes so much the consciousness as an element in these movements. I think that Kardam had to divide a mere economic consciousness from socialist political class consciousness of the proletariat. In addition, Kardam’s statements seem to reject for example Mihri Belli’s balance sheet about the successes of the proletarian revolutionaries. Belli says that they went to the workers and the peasants in 1970 and points to the participation of the proletarian revolutionaries in the workers mobilisation of June 1970 (see above, Belli’s Speech in the meeting of 29-30 October, 219; January 1971, 27).

On the other hand, the subjective (consciousness) element which forms the working class struggle is the conception of the spontaneous processes of the working class struggle by the progressive elements of the working class again and under the lights of this conception that socialists draw a program, and strategy and tactics which will realise this program to themselves. Thereby, the working class changes its struggle into a conscious and systematic political struggle which aims at the ultimate liberation (Kardam, 1970b, 124).

I think that subsequent links between spontaneous class struggle, the progressive elements of the working class, a conception of struggling process, existence of socialists as external category and formation of a socialist revolutionary program have been constructed well. However, one point is striking: socialist consciousness is formulated outside. It is not injected from without as in Lenin. Socialists merely improve and systematise

the conceptions of the progressive elements of the working class. This is what I can say: *consciousness theorised outside* rather than consciousness from without. Nevertheless, when socialist consciousness is injected from outside, it can be asked that what the source of this socialist consciousness is. For example, When **Lenin** said that this consciousness cannot be exist as a product of the spontaneous economic struggle of the working class such as trade union activity and organisation, is socialist struggle a mere product of the intellectual petty bourgeoisie. I think that socialist consciousness, besides a product of concrete struggle of the class in a certain period, is an **historical and holistic** consciousness of the working class. Consequently, the socialist consciousness of the working class is not only a political class consciousness, but also a historical and holistic consciousness, in other words, **theoretical consciousness**, of the working class. These sides of the socialist consciousness of the working class can be preserved and developed only by socialist intellectuals and theorists since the workers cannot have a time and possibility to fulfil this function. I think that I have now established a connection between **Marx, Lenin** and **Lukacs** in terms of the working class, spontaneous development of the consciousness and action, socialist conception of the struggle, socialist intellectuals, and lastly the relation between theory and history. If the working class create a spontaneous, temporal, fragmented, sensational consciousness about its own problems and solutions, the class is in the sphere of concrete and daily, practical and momentous action and consciousness. This sort of consciousness is not theoretical and historical. It is not historical in the sense that it does not have long-term aims for future and does not have capability for looking at the history for its claims.

The development of the subjective element of the working class struggle in Turkey is explained by Kardam as follows: the establishment of Turkey Worker Party (the WPT), that “all proletarian revolutionaries transferred the heritage of fifty years old socialist struggle into this party”; the beginning of “opposition against opportunism” in order to change the party into “a socialist

party” in 1965; that the proletarian revolutionary movement obtained a strategy and program and that under the light of this, it connected with the wide labouring masses; that right deviation which emerged in the beginning of 1970 and manifested itself in the question of party organisation in particular was defined correctly and then liquidated; as a result, that “the proletarian revolutionary movement” was recognised “as an independent political force” by all (Kardam, 1970b, 124). If Kardam had to follow his schema for the development of the subjective element of the working class consciousness, he would mean that progressive element of the working class was the trade unionist founders of the WPT and in the lights of the conceptions of these trade unionists, the Mehmet Ali Aybar, Sadun Aren and Behice Boran, three opportunist leaders according to *the Aydınlık*, draw the socialist strategy and programme, that is, “socialist revolution thesis”. Kardam’s theoretical schema is not in accordance with his presentation of the development after 1960.

Kardam distinguish “struggle” and “class struggle”. The latter also includes “subjective” element of the working class struggle:

Kardam said that subjective and objective elements of the working class struggle had to be seen in a dialectical unity. However, this did not mean that spontaneity “automatically” would create a political content, a spontaneous strategy and programme, a front with other classes and sections of society, in other words, “an independent political force”. Such a belief would mean “**economism**”. “The struggle of the working class can never **spontaneously** become **a class struggle**”. Kardam said that “It is the duty of the proletarian revolutionaries to make the struggle of the working class into **class struggle** by organising the workers, making propaganda and agitation among themselves, making the spontaneously emerging movements to a struggle of all working class, working among the other classes and stratum of society, ensuring the alliance of the working class with other sections, providing the struggle of the working class with an independent political party which have

certain purposes” (Kardam, 1970b, 125). To fulfil this function, the proletarian revolutionaries had to organise themselves. This organisation however should neither be an organisation of the friends nor “wide mass organisation” which was established for economic struggle of the working class and the other classes and stratum around it (Kardam, 1970b, 125).

What sort of party organisation did Kardam suggest? His answer will demonstrate that the solution suggested by *some sections* of the movement to the question of party organisation of the proletarian revolutionary movement in that time was to be based on a synthesis of guerrilla nucleus of Latin American revolutionaries under the influence of Cuban revolution of **Castro** and **Guevara**, **Lenin’s** party which was composed of professional revolutionaries, in order to realise **Mao’s** national democratic revolution in Turkey, or peasant revolution. Proletarian revolutionaries formerly defined the revolutionary step before Turkey, and now defined how this revolutionary step would be taken. However, although the first step was the peasant revolution, two words, “the working class” and “proletarian revolutionaries” were frequently mentioned in Kardam’s sentences.

Kardam said that the organisation should be a “party” in which “proletarian revolutionaries organise themselves”, which covers “the totality of the proletarian movement”. It should have assimilated all foundations of “the working class struggle”. The party organisation became the most important question for the movement of the proletarian revolutionaries since it seemed to be clear that the movement could not rise to a next step without party, and that the WPT could not be turned into “a socialist party”, this was recognised in 1970, and that the WPT was destroyed (Kardam, 1970b, 125). The party the movement wanted to create had to include “the most progressive elements of the working class” and had to aim at not improving the conditions of the working class, but “organising the class struggle of the proletariat, and to lead this struggle in order the proletariat to construct a socialist society by seizing the power” (Kardam, 1970b, 125). Here is the **first clear expression**

of the perspective for seizing the state power. The party of “the working class would not be “**order’s party**” like the WPT which confined Turkey with the borders of Philippines democracy. It had to be “a **war party**” which would realise national democratic revolution and socialist revolution (Kardam, 1970b, 125-6). The war party would be made of “the most progressive elements of the working class” and ensure them to work in a disciplined and centralised way, have a central organs which would command all members. Such a party had to make close links among the masses. It was “the vanguard troop (öncü müfreze) of the working class”. This troop was the most important one among the other troops of the working class. Party as the leading troop of the class had already assimilated the progressive elements of the class and hence it would cover the totality of the struggle of the class. It was “the leader for the working class”. It had the “scientific foundations” of the struggle (Kardam, 1970b, 126).

The war party, the leading troop of the working class had to be ready for all sort of action in every condition. Cadres had to be composed of professionally revolutionaries. A cadre of leaders would come from these professional revolutionaries. This “professional nucleic cadre” strengthened the movement, collected the progressive elements as the struggle developed. It would “have wide and active membership” besides “nucleic cadres” (Kardam, 1970b, 126).

The leading troop of the working class would take some time. The party was not “a static, undeveloped, metaphysic phenomena”. It developed through struggle of the working class. It would elevate the struggle to next stage when necessary. The party which had to realise the national democratic revolution was different from the party which would realise socialist revolution. The party would develop continuously until “classless society” (Kardam, 1970b, 126).

Kardam pointed out that party organisation could not establish immediately. The movement was still based on the youth organisations. The movement was still young. Socialist ideology was seen firstly among the intellectuals and then among the young students. The burden of the movement was carried by the youth organisations which were the single organisations in the hand of the movement (Kardam, 1970b, 127). These all led to small group studies, individual studies, and fragmentation. These also led into the formation of “opportunist” tendencies. Individual form of working also paved the condition where “counter-revolutionaries” could easily benefit from. It was also a good condition for “agent-provocateurs”. Because of this amateur and individual form of workings, the struggles of the labouring classes and stratum became ineffective and remained local, and the proletarian revolutionary movement could not connect with them, could not lead them. The experiences also remained in the hands of some groups. This fragmentation and disconnections were also a reason behind why disagreements among the revolutionaries could not debate within the published organs clearly, and led into the fact that critical mechanisms could not be operated. Each person thought that his sphere and working was superior to the others. Experiences could disappear in the group workings. Kardam, however, observed that despite the necessity for centralisation of the movement, the centralisation became ever more difficult as time passed. This was caused by the fact that each element within the movement gave importance to their private questions and “could see the movements in a totality” (Kardam, 1970b, 128). Kardam said that “in an environment in which individual working has become so much prevalent, immediately establishment of a party will not lead into a result which is different from naming the existing fragmentation” (Kardam, 1970b, 128). This aspect of the party question was accepted generally in the meeting of 29-30 October, said Kardam (Kardam, 1970b, 128-9). The immediate task was to create “nucleic cadres” who enable the party organisation. This task had to be accomplished immediately since world capitalism was moving towards a general crisis, Turkey was living a serious political and economic crisis in relation with the

crisis in world capitalism, and the imperialisms and their compradors were ready to destroy the proletarian revolutionary movement (Kardam, 1970b, 129).

Socialist struggle went into a new period. The proletarian revolutionary movement had to leave from the second period which began in 1965 and start new one. Otherwise, the movement could not lead the working class struggle and get under the influence of opportunism (Kardam, 1970b, 129).

The meeting of 29-30 October (1970) demanded in its last announcement the preparation of “the draft for political platform”. This responsibility was given to the editorial board of the **Aydınlık**. The programme would be prepared according to Marxist theory and include both a minimum and maximum (ultimate) programme. The former was the national democratic revolution. The latter was the socialist revolution, the establishment of “the proletarian dictatorship” by putting an end to “the bourgeois dictatorship” (Kardam, 1970b, 130).

Kardam said that the most important task which the movement had to accomplish was to put an end to the second period of the socialist movement which had begun in 1960. He argued that a socialist movement had always to accomplish “a double task”. First was to connect the socialist struggle with the spontaneously rising working class struggle, to establish the alliance of the working class with other labouring classes and the peasantry in particular and strengthening this alliance; second was to create the cadres which would fulfil these functions in this process and elevate the struggle to a higher stage. However, the proletarian revolutionary movement had not a party organisation. For this reason it needed “a minimum organisation”. “This minimum organisation will establish a local organisation web upon which the party will sit down and will become the brain of the party, will create a nucleic cadre whose theoretical level is high and which acquires the revolutionary-ism as a profession” (Kardam, 1970b, 132).

6.6 “The Draft Programme of the Movement”

The Proletarian Revolutionary Group which emerged within the WPT was organised around *the Aydınlık*. The group prepared its programme just before the 12 March 1971's military intervention and proclaimed its draft in 29-30.issue of the journal. The draft was a stage before the party organisation. But, only Mihri Belli, Muzaffer Erdost and Vahap Erdoğan represented the movement which had been dissolved into different groups which advocated different forms of struggle against the background of the national democratic strategy.

As the background of the programme, the processes through which the Ottoman society was transformed into a dependent country and lived a dependent capitalist development were briefly demonstrated. Then national liberation war which was realised in the imperialist era of capitalism was appreciated for that it struggled against the imperialism, the comprador commercial bourgeoisie and feudal landowners. Kemalist state which originated from the liberation war established political independency of the country, attacked towards the domination of the compradors, abolished feudal superstructure, weakened the feudal pressure over the people and developed the conditions for a national consciousness of the masses. However, the error of the leading cadres of the revolution was that they tried to create a national bourgeoisie to develop the country. However, this was impossible since in a backward country could not develop through capitalist path under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie in the imperialist era. After the adoption of this policy, the regime rejected the organisation of the labouring masses and the working class and banned the first socialist party of the country in 1925. The Kemalist revolution remained uncompleted and misdirected revolution. It did not touch the economic base of the counter-revolutionary forces (Program, the *Aydınlık*, 1971d, 377-8). Counter-revolution made the civil-intellectual-military estate into a secondary force.

The imperialism, which was defeated through a war, came back through NATO (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 379).

Turkey today was an exploited and backward agricultural society (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 379). The state is the state of the capitalists, the big landowners, the usurer-wholesale traders. The private property relations are capitalist in the cities and prevalently feudal in agricultural areas. The comprador capitalist held the important investments areas in the industrial and commercial spheres which yielded higher profits. The national section of the bourgeoisie was weak. In Turkey, a dependent capitalist system included feudal relations. The dominant class was not the capitalist class, but the comprador capitalist classes of the imperialism and the parasitic pre-capitalist classes in the provinces. These allies of the compradors had been long disappeared in the developed countries. The dependent capitalist relations and semi-feudal relations were the main obstacles before the development. The comprador classes adopted the division of labour which was dictated by the imperialism to Turkey. In the country, there was no real industrialisation. There were ever increasing unemployment. The country lived the dilemma of inflation, devaluation, inflation. The poverty grew day after day. The country suffers from sharp social injustice. Its national income was rather low and distributed rather unequally. 69 percent of the agricultural population used the one quarter of the lands available for agriculture. This meant that there were 18 million poor peasants mass. The banking system was operated only in the interests of the comprador capitalists, big feudal landowners, and the usurer-wholesale traders. The democratic system was a sort of Philippines democracy, an anti-democratic order in which national forces were kept outside the parliament (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 380-1).

However, the proletariat rises and its consciousness developed; and the struggle between the working class and the exploiters became sharper than before. The June 1970's workers action and ever-developing worker resistance implied the revolutionary accumulation. The socialist

consciousness grew within the working class. The working class was the leading force towards socialism. On the other hand, the poor peasants were the most oppressed class in the society. The poor conditions of the poor peasant meant that the most radical transformation could not be a cure for their problems. Its problems could be solved only with a real industrialisation. In addition, such a real industrialisation could be realised only within socialism in our era. For this reason, this labouring class would be a foundational force of the revolution. Turkish revolution would be based on both the working class and poor peasantry. In addition, the middle peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie which were composed of the shop-keepers and artisans, and the civil-intellectual-military estate which originated from these backgrounds in general would participate in the side of the revolutionaries in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. The labourer characteristics of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie were more than its bourgeois characteristics. They formed an exploited mass. It had to be predicted that the poorest stratum of the middle peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie would support the revolution and take the side of the working class and poor peasantry. Its participation and support had to be predicted even in the socialist revolution. The revolution would be a product of the working class, the poor peasantry and the all revolutionary classes and estates under the leadership of the working class in a revolutionary collaboration. None of the progressive movements in our time could be really revolutionary unless it carried the predominant influence of the worker and the poor peasantry. All revolutions of our time had to move towards socialism which was the order of the urban and rural labourers. All revolutionary movement which could not reach in socialism was obliged to move towards counter-revolution in a miss-directed way (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 382).

This “socialist emphasis” of the programme of the proletarian revolutionaries of *the Aydınlık* continues as such:

Before the realisation of socialist revolution there is no real emancipation and happiness for the labourers. Socialist revolution abolishes the capitalist relations of production, and thereby abolishes the exploitation of man by man (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 382).

In order to prepare the conditions of socialist revolution and to realise this revolution, the proletariat and the poor peasantry must be able to seize the political power and must elevate to a situation in which they will overthrow all obstacles one by one before socialism. and this is possible only after the workers and the poor peasants reach in the level of a higher revolutionary consciousness than the consciousness of general exploitation of today, conceive the historical meaning and characteristics of social revolution, organise a proletarian revolutionary party, their own party, which will able to realise a revolutionary struggle in all kinds (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 383).

Now, the emphasis shifts from the socialist revolution to the national democratic revolution:

But, when we define the short termed targets of our proletarian revolutionary movement towards socialism, it must be directed from the reality that there has taken place a counter-revolution within last quarter century, that the earnings the Kemalist revolution provided to our people has been lost one by one, that Turkey has been put under the yoke of the imperialism once again, that our society still has pre-capitalist relations. In a dependent and semi-feudal society in the imperialist world system, only the creation of the conditions of socialist revolution is counted as possible. In order to be able to bring that country to the threshold of socialist revolution, firstly it is required that the imperialism must be driven back from the country and that the parasitic classes which are the comprador and ally of the imperialism must be neutralised. The first revolutionary step to take is to elevate the country to the condition of an independent and democratic country. The revolution which will succeed this is **National Democratic Revolution**. National Democratic Revolution is the revolution which prepares the conditions of the realisation of socialist revolution (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 383).

National democratic revolution is both national and democratic. It is democratic because it solves “the contraction between all national forces of society and the imperialism”. It establishes national independency in political, economic and in all other spheres. It nationalises all spheres which are under the control of the comprador classes. It is national because it will overthrow

the feudal big landownership which prevents the nationalisation, i.e. the transformation of the peasantry into “the individuals of the nation”, “the community of free and equal citizens”. It will replace “the feudal and cosmopolite culture” with “national revolutionary culture”. It will prevent feudal division in favour of the economic and land unity of the country (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 383). “**This revolution is democratic**” because it will destroy feudalism which produces reactionism (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 383). It will abolish the feudal relations and realise the democratic rights and liberties of the peasants. It will provide the equality, democratic rights and liberties of the individuals. It ignores the differences of language, religion and ethnicity. It will liquidate the racist tendencies which prevent “real patriotism”. It will replace the anti-democratic order with “real democratic order” (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 384).

After the presentation of these reasons behind the programme, it is stated that the proletarian revolutionary movement is the inheritor of the socialist action which follows scientific socialism after 1919. It is then stated that by consuming the last possibilities of the current constitution and by using all possibilities of revolutionary action, a struggle will be made in order to “realise the minimum programme in the path of creating a socialist Turkey” (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 384).

NDR was presented as “the revolution which prepares the conditions of the realisation of socialist revolution”. Now, its programme has been presented as “the minimum programme” *before* socialist revolution. However, it is not the minimum programme of socialist revolution. This programme is the preparatory stage of socialist revolution. It is based on and led by the proletariat. It is also based on the poor peasantry. It is supported also by the lower sections of the middle peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie and all other revolutionary classes and strata. National democratic revolution is a revolution for socialist revolution. Its success can be possible only when it immediately leads into socialist formation. The significant point in the

programme is that it no longer takes account the revolutionary possibilities which can come from the national bourgeoisie and it refers to only urban petty bourgeoisie rather than the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie. This programme seems to be influence by the events after June 1970's workers mobilisation and the period towards 12 March 1971' military intervention.

The "minimum programme" points to nine struggle areas: 1) "For Real Democracy"; 2) "For Complete Independency"; 3) "Basic Rights"; 4) "Plan of Economic Development-Popular Estatism"; 5) "To Increase the War Force of the Worker"; 6) "Land Reform"; 7) "Justice in Taxation"; 8) "For National revolutionary Culture"; 9) "Foreign Politics"; and finally a message to all for a popular front is addressed to all "honest oppositions" against "the current exploitation order". "The Proletarian revolutionary Movement" is presented as "the real political organisation of Turkey's working class and poor peasantry" and calls for the unity of "the radical parties, organisations, circles, group, wave or persons which are the real representatives of the middle peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and patriotic military-civil intellectuals in a mutually respectful and revolutionary spirit of collaboration within the sides of an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal national front" (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 393).

1) "**For True Democracy**": The establishment of a political order in which all revolutionary classes and stratum which contradict with the imperialism can have a place, the redesign of the constitution to realise the national democratic revolution and abolishment of the anti-democratic laws, the realisation of the national democratic revolution for the people to express its sovereignty through democratic elections, the change of the anti-democratic Political Parties Law and Election Law, the abolishment of the legal and other kind of fetters before free organisation of the people, the unity of the urban and rural labourers in their own professional and political organisations, compulsion for all organisations and parties to express their class and stratum base, and compulsion for the organisations to fit their political activity

to the class interests they claim to represent, preventing the organisations and parties of non-national classes and estates who are the compradors of the imperialism, which have aims that conflict with independency and democracy, right for the electorate for recalling the representatives, right for the military personal and intellectuals for political activity and hence the establishment of a real popular sovereignty, are the targets of “the true democracy” (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 384-5).

2) “**For Full Independency**”; all political, military and cultural dependencies are based on economic dependency. To realise “**full independency**”, all treaties which had been made between Turkey and USA will be abolished. NATO and CENTO memberships of Turkey will be abolished. Foreign military bases will be closed. All foreign military units, personnel, specialists, and consultants are driven away from the country. The army must be commanded by only their personnel and must be based on national sources. It must be based on the force and the support of the people of the country. It must also participate in production. The army must be merged with the labourers and thereby its national and popular characteristics must be strengthened. The base upon which the comprador classes of the imperialism in the cities must be taken over through the nationalisation of foreign firms, foreign commerce, banking and insurances, montage industry, mines, petroleum, the industrial workshops which are vital for the people, lands which are de facto under the property of the foreigners, and particularly the coasts (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 385). Feudal big landowners which are the allies of the imperialism in the agricultural areas must be liquidated through a radical land reform. The nationalised banks must be operated in favour of the producers of the towns and villages (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 386).

3) “**Basic Rights**”; the basic rights written in the constitution “without considering the division of language, race, sexuality, political thought, philosophical belief, religion and sect” must be firmly provided. The state

must be liberated from the intermediation of the feudal big landowners between itself and the citizen. The police and gendarme must be reorganised in democratic terms. The article in the constitution which bans “torture” must be really implemented. The legal services must be free for all. The implementation of the penalties must be humanised. Religious affairs must be reorganised according to the principle of secularity. The Administration of the Religious Affairs must not be allowed to remain the representative of single religious sect. The secularity principle of the constitution which points to the freedom of making or not making religious activity outside all force must be implemented completely (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 386).

4) **“Economic Development Plan -Popular Estatism”**; in order to reject the division of labour imposed by the imperialism, the abolishment of the existing five year’ economic development plan which does not correspond generally to the needs of the urban and rural labourers, and the preparation of a new plan which will gives the priority to the heavy industry and to the production of the means of production and which will thereby guarantee the long termed welfare of the labouring people and which aims to distribute the products according to the production of all, and which abolishes the deprived regions by eliminating the regional differences between the East and the West of the country. The representatives of the workers and peasants must actively participate in the preparation of the plan. All public and private firms must implement plan decisions. Public firms and workshops must not be “the institutions of the state capitalism” under the control of the reactionary and private entrepreneurialism of the reactionary governments. These firms must be administrated according to “popular estatism” in favour of the labouring people. The estatism must be understood in the meaning that the spheres which have not yet been penetrated by the states can be open to the private persons and that a mixed economy must be implemented by ever extending the sphere of public sector. The spheres which satisfy the needs of people such as industry, construction and commerce must be nationalised. Each person must have a possibility of working. A general working mobilisation

must be realised. The labour power must not be exported. Only necessary goods for industry and people can be imported. For this importation, the most suitable countries must be preferred. The exported goods must be produced goods in advance in the country. The foreign commercial deficits must be eliminated through a foreign commerce policy. Nationalised firms and the montage industry must be turned into real national industry in order to save currency through a rational plan. Nationalised banking system must finance the popular estatism and other firms which have not yet been nationalised. Natural resources must be used as much as in the country. Inner and outer tourism must be organised, administrated and controlled by the state. Coastal areas must be nationalised (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 387). Areas of the national parks must be extended (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 387-8). Activities of the local or foreign private tourism firms must be limited and controlled. Tourism must yield maximum income to the country. An international conference must be organised in order to solve the debt problem of Turkey. In the conference it must be argued that the debts have been used in the interests of several compradors and have been used in order to increase the imperialist exploitation and that the imperialist countries have seized more than they gave. A backward country cannot develop thanks to foreign debt, but thanks to the mobilisation of the national potentials and sources. Foreign credit can be accepted only in necessity and in good conditions. Nominee status for European Economic Union must be rejected and a protective tariff control must be adopted. Small shopkeepers and artisans must be protected and encouraged to be organised into production and selling cooperatives. Talented apprentices and masters must be provided educational possibilities. National democratic revolution must be completed in the economic sphere and thereby complete independency of Turkey must be ensured (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 388).

5) **“To Increase the War Force of the Worker”**; the article written in the constitution which points to the right for working can be realised only thanks to a popular estatism and to a direction leading towards socialism. The

working class must be protected in short terms and its war force must be developed. There must be a wage level which must be suitable for a human honour as stated in the constitution. For this, a suitable minimum wage level must be implemented. Nobody must be put into work which is not suitable to his sexuality, age and force, as stated again in the constitution. Each worker must have a right for relaxation as stated in the constitution (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 388). Eight hours' working day, five days' working week, 48 hours' waged holiday and festival holidays, 30 days' waged yearly holiday, shooter working days and weeks for the heavier works, minimum one half hundred percent more wage for necessary overworks must be provided for the workers (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 388-9). Equal works must be paid equally. Women workers must be protected through permissions for pregnancy, etc. Social security must be provided for all labourers. Retirement can be scheduled for the heavy works. The "workers committee" must be established in order to control the health and working conditions and the production. A forceful struggle must be directed towards "yellow trade unions" which is dictated by the dominant classes in the anti-democratic conditions to the working class. The patrons must not collect trade union payments. The workers must be the members of the courts of work. Collective agreement and right for strike must be freed from all obstacles. Right for solidarity strike must be permitted for all workers. Right for health which is written in the constitution must be implemented through the rehabilitation of the existing hospitals and health institutions and establishment of new facilities when necessary. Health services must be payless for all. There must be a planned social housing policy. In short term, the law of squatters must be changed in favour of the labouring people. Luxury housing must be banned. Housing rents must be in a level to the wages. Rent control must be implemented in order to prevent the excess profits of the real property owners. The associations must be established to provide solidarity among the housing tenants (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 389).

6) **“Land Reform”**; The aim of the land reform is to put an end to the exploitation and pressure of the feudal big landowners and the big landownership in the rural areas, to elevate the peasantry to the community of free and equal citizens, to rise the productivity of agriculture, to meet the needs of the industrialisation, to prepare the conditions for socialist formation and to present a human and civil standards to the peasantry. For a land and agricultural reform, a ministry responsible for the reform must be established, and “peasant land reform committees” must actively participate in the reform process. The constitution mentioned about the provision of land to the landless peasants or peasants who had not sufficient land. *The Aydınlık* stated that land must be taken from big land owners and distributed to these peasant labourers without payment and according to the constitution again, easy methods must be presented for the peasants whom land is to be distributed must also provided agricultural means of production. The lands which are to be redistributed and left for the big landowners out of the expropriated lands will be defined by the peasant committees which are supported by the specialists according to the geographical characteristics, and the transport possibilities of lands and after the consideration of the productivity of lands and the needs of the peasant farmers. The pastures and forests will be generally excluded from the redistribution and kept under the collective property of the villages or the public property (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 389). Cadastral studies must be completed as soon as possible. In the areas where cadastral mapping has not yet been finished, traditional borders of land will be considered during the process. Some measures will be taken in order to prevent the formation of old property structure in favour of the big land owners. Land reform will be implemented without weakening the state budget and without strengthening the feudal big land owners in order to put an end to the pre-capitalist relations and to establish real democracy. The reform will be implemented in order to increase the productivity of small agricultural producer and to prevent the exploitation caused by the big land property and usurer-wholesale trader. In some areas, the state will provide stations for agricultural machines and

fertilisers. Cooperatives will be encouraged. Big agricultural capitalist farms will be excluded principally from the redistribution of land. These and other suitable farms will be used as the examples of “agricultural production cooperatives” with the voluntary participation of “the most conscious peasant labourers”, “the pioneers of the collectivisation”. The superiorities of the collectivisation will be narrated to the peasants, “patiently”, by demonstrating the examples of “collective farms”. They are said that collectivisation will put an end to small properties which necessarily create capitalist relations and to the dispersed condition of the agricultural labourers and will lead into a higher level of production and welfare to the peasants and will close the gap between the cities and the villages. A voluntary unity of the peasants in the collective farms must be provided. They must not be forced into the collectivisation. More state personnel must be employed for the purchasing of the agricultural products. Intermediary elements will be liquidated. Forested regions will be nationalised. Along the lines of land reform and industrialisation, forest villages will be transferred from the forested regions according to a long term plan. Contemporary forest farming will be developed. In the forested regions where there are not sufficient land available for agriculture, forests which will meet the needs of the peasants will be given to them in the form of collective property of the village. In these areas, rational forest farming will be introduced. Erosion will be prevented through a wide campaign for afforestation. Parallel with the land reform, stock-raising will be eliminated from primitive methods and feudal relations. Pastures will be protected from destruction. The conditions will be created for “extensive stock-raising”. Cooperatives will be encouraged (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 390).

7) “**Just Taxation**”; Indirect taxes which are unjust will be reduced to minimum and abolished in time. A tax which increases proportionally with income and in which rich pays more and poor pays less will cover all incomes and will become the main income of the state and become single tax base of the state in time. Minimum wage are excluded from taxation and defined

according to the sufficiency of the labourer and his family. Against inflation which neglects just taxation, sharp measures will be taken. As a measure against it, a tax for wealth which originates from fraud and speculation will be introduced for once in a necessity (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 391).

8) **“For National Revolutionary Culture”**; a forceful struggle will take place against “reactionary, fascist and cosmopolite ideology and culture”. All religious reactionary points will be destroyed. All local and foreign private educational institutions will be nationalised. Eight years’ compulsory public education will be introduced. Education will be organised according to the planned development of the country. A merge between the intellectuals and the labourers will be provided. Learning through working will be implemented as a principle (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 391). The citizens whose mother language are not Turkish and who are in the age of schooling will be provided education for mother language and culture under the direction of the Ministry of National Education. Minority schools governed by the religious communities will be under the direction of the Ministry of National Education according to the principle of secularism. The scientists whom Turkey educated will not be permitted to go abroad to work for the interests of the imperialism. Media organs will be ensured that it will serve for the patriotism and the solidarity spirit with the world people who struggle against the imperialism for socialism. A revolutionary theatre will be supported and cinema will be escaped from present poisoning situation in favour of a national and revolutionary characteristic. The village institutes will be reopened according to present needs. Religious schools will be reorganised in order to breed religious cadres who will meet the needs of the people under the revolutionary conditions. All citizens will actively participate in sporting and body education. Professional sporting will be abolished. Media will not be permitted to be used as a propaganda tool of the compradors and the feudal big land owners. It must not be used to support the old beliefs of the masses and to lead the masses into unconsciousness. Real press freedom will be provided. Distribution of the press advertisement and

addressing will be nationalised completely. Big capitalist will not be permitted to control the media through distributing addressing and advertisement. Imperialist, cosmopolite and semi-feudal culture will be defeated and national revolutionary culture will be elevated to a dominant position (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 392).

9) “**Foreign Policy**”; imperialist attacks will be opposed in everywhere. Peoples who struggle for socialism, national independency and democracy will be supported. Turkey will establish close relationships with the revolutionary movements in order to get back the imperialism and to establish national liberation of the peoples in the Balkans and the Middle East (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 392). Cyprus problem can be solved through an establishment of independent, democratic and federal Cyprus Republic which is cleared from imperialist bases. This is in the interest of Greek, Turkey and of the Greeks and Turks in the Cyprus (Program, *the Aydınlık*, 1971d, 393).

Let me repeat the main items of the program: 1) “For Real Democracy, 2) “For Complete Independency”; 3) “Basic Rights, 4) “Economic Development Plan -Popular Estatism, 5) “To Increase the War Force of the Worker, 6) “Land Reform, 7) “Just Taxation, 8) “For National revolutionary Culture, 9) “Foreign Policy: Let me sum their content: A completed Kemalist revolution, which would open democracy to the working masses in cities and villages through democratic rights, just taxation and land parcels. A developed public economy is accompanied with popular democracy. Neither the communist party of the 1848 nor the German social democrat party of 1875 is applicable for Turkish case. The paradox is the fact that a Marxist class party and ideology is suggested for a national and democratic revolution. I can say that this suggestion is alien to Marxian theoretical framework and revolutionary purposes.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Throughout the thesis, I have tried to demonstrate that there is a gap between the conception of class in Marx and the reception of this conception by the Turkish left, which is represented by *the Aydınlik*. For the former, class is an analytical tool, a revolutionary force for social change, a medium through which individual becomes socialized, a strata in the social structure, an estate in the primitive stage of its development, common social and economic identity of the great sections of the population. In Marx, politics is class politics, which appears in every cell of social life (in the elections, in the factories, in the neighbourhoods, in the reports of the factor inspectors, in the parliament, etc). However, class politics appears perfectly only when a class becomes aware of the logic of capital-relation and class domination under the capitalist mode of production. This is the ultimate aim of Marx's *Capital*. Economic and political awareness of the class relations is the sine qua non for any attempt to transform the bourgeois society radically. Otherwise, although there can be a socialist politics, there cannot be any possibility of a radical social revolution. For Marx, communist politics is based on the independent class politics of the proletariat, its party and its supporters. Communists can ally with and support the other progressive elements of society. However, Marx points to the temporary characteristics of the class alliances and the political platforms between them. Class alliances are temporary firstly because of the class politics of the struggling classes and because of the changes in the reciprocal position of the classes in accordance with the changing dynamics of economic life. Economic analyses of classes demonstrate that class relations cannot be changed only through political struggle. Classes are political, economic and social divisions among the masses. However, in Marx, the political struggle, i.e., class politics of the

proletariat, must aim at seizing the political power in order to establish proletariat's class domination and abolish private property in accordance with the socialized production system of the capitalist mode of production. Economic and social analysis of classes in Marx surpasses and rules out adventurism in socialist politics, moral justification of socialist aims, anarchism in the radical transformation of the capitalist society, utopian socialism in the determination of the socialist project and future, and the petty-bourgeois socialism in the criticism of the bourgeois society. Adventurism points to the armed political struggle of a vanguard force in the name of the masses instead of organized and patient proletarian politics. Moral justification reduces socialism into an individual free choice. Utopianism is in fact a result of the absence or weakness of the revolutionary forces. The petty-bourgeois socialism envisages a capitalist production system without capitalist exploitation. Anarchism does not recognize the necessity of the class domination in the transitory phase towards socialism, i.e. the first phase of the communist society in Marxian term. Economic and social analyses in Marx succeeded in eliminating the other rival lines of socialism and established the foundations of a radical social transformation of the bourgeois society. For Marx, the aim of the socialist struggle is the radical transformation as such, not social reform or political democracy, and even not equality, but the elimination of the class relations of the bourgeois society through an establishment of the proletarian dictatorship *over the old ruling classes*. However, besides this aim which can be realized ultimately, near target of the socialist struggle is to struggle for power, to prepare the proletariat theoretically and to create its independent class organization.

For Marx, the bourgeois revolution, which was modelled best with the French Revolution, developed through stages. Marx had predicted the 1848 revolution in this bourgeois context before the revolution began. However, the 1848 revolutions put the proletariat forward as an independent political force first time in history. For this reason, the conception of revolution through stages and correspondingly the idea of the permanent revolution acquired

new meanings. With and through the 1848 revolutions, Marx witnessed that the progress of the revolution made all sorts of reformism and “the modest demands of the middle classes” move into the circles of red party. There was much socialism for different sections of the party of anarchy. Nonetheless, despite their differences, said Marx, all sections shared the idea that “socialism is the means of the emancipation of the proletariat” and that “the emancipation of the proletariat is the aim of socialism”.

The Turkish left was interested extremely in the emancipation of the masses, and the people. Liberation was the liberation of the country, liberation of the people. An emancipation of a class was not yet a political project despite the existence of the seizure of the state power for the class as a project. The political aim is to establish independent and democratic Turkey. This aim would be realised through a national-democratic revolutionary struggle of “the national classes” (the national bourgeoisie, the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie, the proletariat and the poor peasantry). National democratic revolution strategy was in fact a version of the permanent revolutionary thesis that socialists and Marx used before 1848 revolutions in Europe. This thesis pointed to the conditions where the democratic struggle and “the revolutionary socialism” had been still united and where the proletariat had not yet become an independent political force. In the thesis we have demonstrated that the cleaver sections of the working class of Turkey was well aware of its political and organisational power and wanted to develop and maintain its independence. In addition, in the 1960s, socialism became an important field of interest in society in general and in the trade union circles in particular. However, the strategy which Turkish left adopted ignored the fact that the national or popular classes they suggested could not be conceived as a revolutionary class front, but only as a popular, united front against a common enemy which might rule out all intra-frontal contradictions.

Marx said that, in the context of 1848 revolution in France the petty bourgeoisie became an advocator of “*the doctrinier socialism*” or of a mixture

of “the existing socialist systems”. This *doctrinier socialism* replaced individual intellectual activity with collective production, and above all, it was an “utopia” which took away from the scene “the revolutionary struggle of classes”. But, the *proletariat* left this socialism to the petty bourgeoisie, and it “gradually gathers around the *revolutionary socialism*, that is, around *communism* which the bourgeoisie labelled as *Blanqui*”. (Here Marx summarised his theory of revolutionary transition in relation to the general theory of historical materialism: Class divisions were based on the relations of production. Social relations corresponded to the relations of production. The ideas had origins in the social relations). In order to arrive at “the revolutionary socialism”, “communism” required the *permanent revolution* through the *class dictatorship* of the proletariat until the formation of communism, or until the elimination of the bourgeois relations of production and bourgeois modes of thinking. The interesting point was that Marx placed the permanent revolution into the interval between the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship and the emergence of communist relations. According to the division which was made by Marx in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, the permanent revolution was located within the context of socialist transition towards communism. It pointed to the progressive development of socialist society from initial stage to mature one that was the beginning of communism. Another meaning of the term *permanent revolution* was to put forward the *bourgeois democratic revolution* towards the socialist revolution. Therefore, we have two stages for the permanent revolution in terms of socialist politics. The one relates to the *period before socialist revolution* in which the socialists try to develop and complete the democratic revolutionary change in favour of socialist revolution in future, the other refers to the period through which the proletarian dictatorship fulfils its task of transition towards communism. Here, Marx referred to the permanent revolution in the era of the proletarian dictatorship, i.e. socialist transition of society:

This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to

the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations (for translation, see www.Marxists.org/archive/Marx, in Turkish, Marx, 1996, 130).

As we have seen, Marx deals with the *permanent revolution* and the problem of *socialist transition* in his *18 Brumaire*, *The Paris Commune* of 1871 and the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* in 1875. Marx concerned with the permanent revolution in the context of an agrarian capitalist society (France and then Germany) which was still completing its bourgeois revolution, and whose social conditions were still prior to the socialist revolution. However, although the transition after socialist revolution into communism was completely the problem of the proletarian dictatorship, even in the context of France of 1850s, Marx implied a permanent revolution with and through a proletarian dictatorship. However, the question of how the weak proletariat of France could establish its own class dictatorship seemed to have been answered by Marx against the background that the proletariat begun to develop its own *ideological and political independence* by going a way from the petty bourgeois democracy and petty bourgeois socialism. *Material weakness of the proletariat, which was a result of the weakness of the industrial capital, was compensated by its ideological and political strength*. In addition, *the proletariat had already won the leadership in the revolutionary movement* (in February 1848, the leadership of the revolutionary coalition was under the bourgeoisie) and had become the leading section of “the anarchy party”, while “the order’s party” was led by “the financial aristocracy” (Marx, 1996, 130). Moreover, the fact that *the proletariat abandoned its alliance with the petty bourgeois democrats, it had also abandoned the programmatic difference between the bourgeois democratic and the social demands. The completion of bourgeois democratic revolution was no longer a stage before socialist revolution which the proletariat had to pass from since it was clearly seen that the bourgeoisie could not move forward, putting aside moving backward. The completion of the democratic*

revolution (let us call it “revolutionary democracy” in the meaning of that the leading proletariat with its allies completes the democratic revolution) could be possible *only under the rule of the proletariat*. However, the *rule of the proletariat meant a socialist revolution*. For this reason, the permanent revolution was defined as a process moving towards communism, rather than only towards socialism through the completion of the democratic revolution. The *meaning of democratic revolution* also changed after the defeat of Junes of 1848 and 1849. The bourgeois meaning of democracy gave its place to the socialist meaning for the proletariat and its allies (proletarian democracy for revolutionary masses in both bourgeois and socialist eras, and proletarian dictatorship, *including* proletarian democracy, against counter-revolutionary forces in socialism). The former June meant the defeat of the proletariat while the latter June meant the defeat of the idea of the petty bourgeois democracy. We can conclude that Marx from now on, does not differentiate socialist revolution from the completion of the democratic revolution. The permanent revolution meant socialist revolution under the proletarian dictatorship.

The permanent revolution was conceptualized firstly in terms of the completion of the bourgeois revolutionary process under the leadership of the most progressive section of the bourgeois class. It was formulated in the context of the bourgeois revolution and erected upon the facts that the proletariat was not yet an independent political force, and that all sections of the bourgeoisie did not yet lose revolutionary energy, that all sections of the bourgeoisie were not yet involved into the state power. However, when the proletariat becomes an independent force, as stated above, the agenda of the revolution was socialist revolution even if the proletariat was not yet capable of realizing this revolution because of its material weakness. Here Marx pointed to the political and ideological independency and strength of the proletariat as a compensation factor. In such a condition, the question whether the bourgeois revolution has been completed or not does not matter. The permanent revolution begins to point to the *permanent development of*

socialist revolutionary struggle before socialist revolution and permanent development of socialist transformation under socialism. In the case of the socialist revolution, democracy was meaningful only in the context of socialist democracy (proletarian democracy) which the proletariat offered to the other classes of society excepting the old ruling classes. In terms of both the changing relationship between socialism and democracy and the meaning of the permanent revolution, the 1848 revolutions were the turning point for Marx.

For Marx, the class alliance is a secondary question in comparison to the question of the independent proletarian politics in the context stated above. In the backward conditions of struggle, Marx suggested that the proletariat should support the most progressive elements of society. Any collaborative action, and an establishment of a political platform between the classes, however, did not eliminate the class differences and should not decrease the independent power of the proletariat. Independent class action and program is very important aspect of the socialist politics for Marx.

In the thesis where I have dealt with the Turkish Marxism, we have seen that the search for class alliance in the name of the proletariat was extremely more important than the problems of the organisation of classes and their independent class politics. Not the bourgeoisie, but the alliance with the bourgeoisie, not peasantry, but alliance with the peasants, were the main political and ideological interests for the socialists.

Class conception in Marx follows classical philosophical schema for the presentation of *the development of existence*. Existence evolves from primitive, potential stage to the developed, active, concrete stage. It is initially presented as *being without consciousness* (soul, mind). When it develops and reaches in a concrete stage, it is presented as *being without material*, or something that does not need material base to exist. Hegel developed this schema in his dialectical epistemology. Development of existence follows

some stages (alienations). The Marxian dialectic analysis of classes also follows certain stages in order to present class phenomena or class concept. Class in its primitive stage is existed as a mass whose elements are not aware of its wholeness. Here, more than the size, the geographical relation and closeness determine consciousness.

A neglect of the fact that existence of class develops from primitive stage to active, concrete stage (dialectical development of class) leads into strict divisions between economic, political and ideological existence of the classes, or strict division between the base of society and ideological-political-legal superstructure as if classes live different lives in different spheres. Another manifestation of this neglect is also seen in the strict division between *class in itself* and *class for itself*. For Marx, the question is not class consciousness, or political class consciousness. However, he is interested in communist, revolutionary class consciousness. We can say that the Turkish Marxism was well aware of this last contribution made by Marx.

As for the development of class existence, Marx and Engels in the German Ideology (in the case of the bourgeois groupings in the early commercial cities of the middle age) give the related example. Let us recall Marx and Engels in the case of the relationship between individual, class and society and in the case of the class formation. They said that “bourgeois class” was formed gradually of “the local bourgeoisies” of various cities in the Middle Ages. A “mode of work” changed the living conditions of each isolated bourgeois and turned them into “common” and “living conditions which are independent from each lonely individual”. The bourgeoisies created these conditions and these conditions created bourgeoisies. In time, “common conditions turn into the conditions of class” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 105). The same conditions and interests created the same habits. The bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels suggested, developed gradually as the conditions which created it developed. It was divided within itself into various sections according to an inner division of labour. It began to collect all old property

owner classes to itself to the extent that all property was transformed into commercial and industrial capital. Meanwhile, the bourgeoisie transformed the former propertyless classes which had been existed before the bourgeoisie and some sections of the property owner classes until then to “a new class, the proletariat”. They said that “each individuals form a class as long as they have to realise a common struggle against another class; in another cases, they are enemy for each other in the competition” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 106).

As regards with the bourgeoisie, in this stage of the development of the class phenomena (concept), class can be conceived as a social grouping which is formed of certain number of men since economic and political power of the bourgeois individuals are still limited in terms of national scale of capital formation and domination. A higher developed stage of class phenomena is seen in a higher stage of capital formation.

Class is a *social mediation*, a medium through which individual becomes *socialized*. In the *German Ideology*, Marx and Engels seemed to have seen the class as a *grouping of men* who had certain interests and problems as regards with other class interests and forces *only* in the conditions where the class under consideration was newly forming and not yet alienated to itself. As for its developed condition, they saw “class” as the *social mediation* through which the *individual* became *socialised*. They said that “class itself becomes independent from individuals; the individuals finds ready their own living conditions, they acquire from their class their conditions in life, besides this, their own personal development and all track this draws; they are dependent on their class”. Marx and Engels continued to say that “this appearance” was related with “the dependency of each individual on the division of labour” and it could be abolished only when “private property and the work itself is abolished”. They said that “this dependency of the individuals on their class” led into dependencies upon various imaginations (Marx and Engels, 1987, 106). “This dependency of the individuals on certain

classes cannot be abolished as long as a class who has no longer to make a private class interest be accepted as sovereign to the dominant class emerge” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 107). Marx and Engels seemed to have said that this dependency upon class could be abolished thanks to the existence of the *proletariat*.

The determination of class as a social medium through which individual becomes socialised implies that the formation of classes decreases the old strong role of community and family in the socialisation of individual. The reverse is also true. On the other side, it can be said that the formation of classes and individualisation goes hand by hand according to the formulations made by Marx (and Engels).

In the *18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* Marx is seen to have followed the classical schema stated above as regards with the peasants when he said subsequently that the peasants *formed a class and did not form a class*. Marx explained the objective existence of a class and its subjective awareness about its own existence in political and ideological terms; he witnessed that: the small peasants whose all members lived in the same conditions but were not united within real relations with each other, formed an immense mass (Marx, 1990b, 137-8). “Their mode of production” divided and isolated them with the effect of their poverty and of the underdeveloped means of transportation system of France. The small holdings did not permit any social and economic development. A parcel of land, a peasant and its family was sided by another parcel of land, peasant and the family. Certain numbers of the families formed the village and certain numbers of the villages formed an administrative unit. This mass, majority of French nation, was composed of “the simple sum of the same quality of things”. “Millions of peasant family form a class to the extent that they live in the economic conditions which separate them from each other, and which put into confrontation their modes of living, their interests and their cultures with those of the other classes of the society”. We can state that if economic conditions

create distinctive, characteristic features for a part of the society according to the other parts of society; we can talk about the existence of a class. However, corresponding internal organisation, living mode, interests and culture must accompany these economic conditions. This is objective existence of a class. As stated at the beginning, it is a stratum in the social structure, or a common social and economic identity of the great sections of the population. However, Marx continued to say that to the extent that there is only the local relations stemming from their living spaces among the small peasants and as long as the similarities of their interests do not lead into “any cooperation, any national connection and any political organisation”, “they do not form a class” (Marx, 1990b, 138). The cooperation, the national connection and the political organisation refers to a nation-wide organisation of the political activity of a class. However, isolated, unorganised, and local based life of the small peasants does not permit this massive majority to be able to make itself into a class. We have a class which is not a class. This is a dialectical contradiction since we have a force which is dispersed, diffused, and hence composed of isolated weak parts. Collection and concentration of these particles into an organised and united force is limited by the reasons such as economic conditions of agriculture, distribution and the scale of the rural landed property, the development of the transport and communication technology, and hence self-sufficient, local and isolated life of the peasants. Only a representative could surpass these objective limitations. In dialectical terms, the peasant acquired class identity (social mediation stated above) through the mediation of the representative, or the state personnel or state politics as in the cases of the Bonapartes.

The peasants, which cannot form a class because of the lack of political cooperation and organisation through the national links, are not “in a condition by which they advocate their class interests in their name be it through the mediation of a parliament, or be it through an assembly” (Marx, 1990ab, 138-9). “They can not represent themselves by themselves, they must be represented”. Their representative had to protect themselves against

the other classes and must seem to be a high authority and to be “an absolute executive power”. The small peasants express “their political effect” in “their dependence upon the executive power of society” (Marx, 1990b, 139). Here Marx used a sort of *political geometry* for the relation between the state power and the masses. If small holder peasantry occupied a large portion of the popular masses, this meant that intermediary great powers did not exist between the state and the small holders. Otherwise, either the state or the small holders lost their power to the intermediary agents of power. If the state did not permit the existence of the great powers between it and the popular masses, the latter had to be populous small holders. Hence, a *centralised powerful state needed populous small holders*. It is sure that this political geometry seems to be valid for the political power of the state in the societies which are to large degree agrarian. At this point, it is a striking fact that the Turkish Marxism dealt with the peasant question without dealing with the state and the bureaucracy in Turkey of the 1960s when the country was predominantly agrarian. This indifference *to the state and state bureaucracy*, despite exaggerated interests levelled towards the peasantry was another weakness of the Turkish Marxism.

Textbooks of the historical materialism in the twentieth century point to the classes throughout the history in terms of the modes of production. Slave and master, serf and lord, the proletarian and the bourgeois are the dominant and dominated classes. However, in *the German Ideology*, Marx (and Engels) seems to have suggested that *even the classes are the product of the bourgeois society*. This means that pre-capitalist era has only primitive forms of classes such as *estates* (the nobility, the clergy and the middle class) in the feudal society. It is said that “The division between the individual personality and, as opposed to this, the individual as a member of a class, the contingency of the conditions of existence for the individual, can emerge only with the class which itself is a product of the bourgeoisie” (Marx and Engels, 1987, 108). This statement was evaluated in the thesis as such: 1) the division between the individual and the individual as a member of a class

pointed to a contingency for the life of the individual; 2) the division is developed through the development of the bourgeoisie as a class; 3) “the classes” (in modern sense) are the products of the bourgeoisie. In other words, the bourgeois order created a world in which serfs or the lords needed not necessarily to continue their life as serf or lord; the formation of the class phenomena required a level of economic development which meant the development of the division of labour that would lead into an independency of the social relations from personal lives; “the class” is a new social division between the individual and the community (or society).

The idea is also supported by the *German Ideology* when Marx and Engels compared the *estates* and classes: "Today only in the countries where estates in their development have not yet reached completely in the stage of class and which reached in far more developed evolution where they still play a role, although they were liquidated, in other words, in the countries where there is a mixed condition, hence, in the countries where none of the sections of the population could not have reached in the condition to dominate the others, the independence of the state existed" (Marx and Engels, 1987, 125). It is said that an estate is the lower form of the class; the independence or the autonomy of the state is a result of the mixed condition in which estates and the classes coexisted and none of the classes is able to dominate the others; estates can play a role although they have been liquidated in a far more developed countries.

In Marx, an existence of an old form, an estate, (or a mode of production in economic terms) does not mean that they maintain their effect. They can acquire a new role and new functions under the domination of new class relations. However, they are, nevertheless, the forms which have been surpassed historically. In the Turkish Marxism, the influential existence of religious life, religious figures and language, and the existence of land ağas (landlords in the residual form) were not seen as the forms which have been surpassed historically, have acquired new contents in the current bourgeois

relations (as seen in the political relations between the feudal landlords and the bourgeois parties).

In the higher stage of its development, class acquires an ideological and political consciousness about its historical position, its class enemies, its tasks and legitimacy. This consciousness begins to develop mainly from proto-revolutionary struggle onwards when new revolutionary class struggled against the existing ruling classes. Here the class has a great economic, political and ideological power and dominates the other sections of society in these spheres. This high level of class formation, however, accompanies with the formation of new rival revolutionary classes. The most revolutionary class as such is the proletariat under capitalism.

The proletariat is the direct product of the development of capitalism. However, it must have been available in the market in advance before capitalists go to the market to buy labour power. The original source of the proletariat is the agricultural labourers, artisans and the other poor stratum of society. It is mainly the product of the expropriation of the property owner labourers. The proletariat emerges simultaneously as capital forms itself. In Turkey, the source of the proletariat is the migration to the cities and natural increase in the population. The reason behind this process, in Marxian term, underlies *the miserable mode of production* of the rural structure, i.e. small holder peasant economy. The Turkish Marxism saw this economy only in terms of the peasant-worker alliance. But, as seen in Marx's analysis of the relationship between the French small peasantry and the rules of the Bonapartes, this small holder economy was the base of the Kemalist bourgeois revolution, and the central bureaucratic state of Turkey. The Turkish left did not see this connection between the small peasantry and the centralist bourgeois state.

For Marx, the formation of property is accompanied with the formation of non-property. Exactly for this reason, landownership acquires a necessary and

novel position under the capitalist mode of production since it means non-property for the proletarian masses. However, as capitalist mode of production develops into a *higher stage*, income of the landowner, ground-rent, is reduced into the interests of the land price. According to Marx's developed schema in *Capital*, the modern capitalist society has three main great classes; the proletariat, the capitalists and the landowners. These three classes get their respective shares from total value produced by the labourers in the form of wage, profit and ground-rent. However, the last category is a form of surplus-profit which is appropriated by the capitalists who invest capital on land and then transferred by him to the landowner. The other intermediary forms of profit such as the profit of the merchant or interest paid for the money capital are also parts of the entrepreneurial profit of the capitalist. When these economic categories are crystallized, the classes who appropriate respectively related shares are also crystallized and conflict among them also clearly appears. Industrial landowner, banker industrialist, peasant worker, free small peasant, merchant manufacturer are intermediary and undeveloped categories. These categories manifest themselves much more than the classes of the modern bourgeois society described by Marx in *Capital* when capitalist mode of production has not yet developed perfectly and has not yet eliminated, above all, the property owner labourers such as free small holder peasantry, artisans in the guild system, feudal landownership, etc. However, in the case of France, although Marx pointed to the petty bourgeois characteristics of the French bourgeoisie in comparison to the English bourgeoisie and to the small peasantry which was a product of the French Revolution and the Napoleon's policy, he went on to apply the concepts of his class theory in the context of the bourgeois society and its class structure in a modified form. The condition of France did not prevent Marx to see the rising power of the bourgeois society and the independent class politics of the proletariat besides bourgeois class domination. Moreover, existence of mixed and undeveloped forms does not mean that Marxian theoretical framework which fits perfectly with the developed formations such as England is not applicable to the undeveloped

conditions. For example, as Marx exemplified in the case of the French peasants, rent could be paid to the landowner out of the profit of the farmer or wages of the labourers. However, the Turkish left did not take into account the possibility of these sorts of mixed categories. Analysis of peasantry exclusively centred on the analysis of the dependent or semi-dependent relations, leaving aside its exclusive interest over the distribution of agricultural parcels.

The Turkish Marxism, in the case of *the Aydınlık*, does not apply directly to the original conception of class in Marx. This is related mainly with the form of development of the bourgeois class and immaturity of the working class in ideological and organizational terms. The Turkish bourgeoisie was mainly a product of the state capitalism and had not yet alienated (developed) from its petty bourgeois (small capitalist) past. Private industrial capital became a new force only after the Second World War. However, the state capitalism gave an autonomous power to the state bureaucracy. This meant that the bourgeoisie was obliged to share its power with the bureaucracy. In addition, traditional role of the military strengthened this section of the state bureaucracy at the expense of the ideological and political power of the bourgeoisie. These all meant that the bourgeois domination was firstly realized mainly through the mediation of the bureaucratic power of the state. Direct result of this mediation was the disappearance of the bourgeoisie as the direct enemy of the working class and as a target of the socialist politics. In addition, the mediation as such led into a fact that the enemies or rival agents for the state bureaucracy as seemingly autonomous instrument of the ruling classes (the imperialism decreases the state control of the bureaucracy in determination of the economic policies, and military decisions and foreign affairs, for instance; and the feudal and semi-feudal forces decrease the political, legal and ideological power of the central state and its bureaucracy) were accepted by the socialists as the direct enemy of the working class. For this reason, the imperialism and the feudalism, decreasing the power of the national petty bourgeois bureaucracy, were seen as the main targets of the

socialist politics and the enemy of the working class and the other popular masses. For this reason, socialist politics and the energy of the working class were devoted mainly to anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle in order to establish national and democratic Turkey (NDR strategy). Bureaucratic state mediation of the bourgeois class domination was not conceived well and the bourgeoisie was not seen as the class enemy of the proletariat. The existence of the imperialist influence and the feudal remnants were not analyzed in terms of the bourgeois domination, but in terms of the bourgeois compradors and their counter-revolutionary policies implemented after the Second World War.

Regarding the proletariat, it can be said that this class appeared as an independent political and economic force in the 1960s and manifested its existence dramatically in the June events of 1970. However, the advocates of the NDR strategy saw the development of the working class only in terms of the national and democratic context and did not attribute any socialist content to this development. The rising power and militancy of the proletariat could not be utilized by the socialists who advocated the NDR strategy, which was adopted by the majority of the socialist left in Turkey.

The peasantry was the most interesting and the most confusing question for *the Aydınlık's* contributors. Only at the end, the poor peasantry and semi-dependent peasantry was suggested as the strongest allies of the proletariat. However, before this conclusion, the national bourgeoisie, Kemalist bureaucracy, urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie, besides poor peasantry, were put forward as the allies of the proletariat. It was argued that these classes formed the national classes (or popular classes) whose interests conflicted with those of the imperialism, the comprador bourgeoisie and the feudal landlords. However, these targets were not formulated and theorized according to the original Marxian conception of class. The imperialism could be seen as the international political attacks of the monopoly capitals; the bourgeoisie could be seen in its class content besides its cultural and

national identities; feudalism could be seen as a potential landed property and in terms of the expropriation of the labourers through capitalist development; the peasantry could be seen in terms of the Kurdish politics (the popular and democratic dimension of the Turkish socialist movement mainly comes from the populous existence of the peasant masses which mostly concentrated in the Eastern Kurdish provinces), unequal development of capitalism (urbanized West and rural East), and as regards with urbanization which pointed to the most systematic dissolution of the peasantry in the country (the fact that the living conditions of the peasants were worse than those of the new urban dwellers and that cities offered small parcels of land and non-industrial jobs to the newcomers were the handicaps for *socialist proletarian* politics); and nationality could be seen as the form of the class struggle rather than the content of the classes and class struggle (as stated by Marx in the case of the *Gotha Program*). Let us recall that the *Gotha Program* said that the working class “works for its emancipation firstly in the national state framework” (MESY, 1979, 26). Marx said that Lasalle, unlike the *Manifesto* and all other socialism before, “conceived the workers movement from the most limited national angle”. The working class, said Marx, had to be “organised as *class*” in its own country in order to struggle. Each country was the sphere of this struggle. He said that “For this reason, the struggle of the working class carries the national characteristic in this sense rather than its content, but as the *Communist Manifesto* stated, the national in ‘the sense of its form’”. Lasallian programme reduced the internationalism to “the consciousness that “*the international friendship of the people*’ will be”. The programme did not concern the “international functions” of German working class, said Marx. However, he asked how the working class could struggle against his “bourgeoisie who had already established friendships against itself with the bourgeoisies of the other countries” and against “the international conspiratorial policy of Bismarck” (MESY, 1979, 26).

The Turkish left did not see the imperialism as the relations of the “bourgeoisie who had already established friendships against itself with the bourgeoisies of the other countries” (MESY, 1979, 26) and did not conceive well the debate about the imperialism made by Lenin despite all words about Lenin. For the latter, the imperialism was a product of the monopolies that were the result of the concentration of capital in certain hands. The last phenomenon as the material base of the imperialism was well formulated by Marx. The analysis of the imperialism in Lenin concluded that international contradictions of the capitalism could not be resolved through peaceful solutions and the contradictions would create international conflict between states of the monopolies which would necessarily lead into a worldwide war. Lenin predicted that this war could be utilized in favour of *starting a socialist revolution in the weakest country of the imperialist system such as Russia*. The imperialism was “the eve of the socialist revolution” and to him, understanding “the economic essence of the imperialism” was required to explain “the modern war and modern politics” (*The Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin 1992, 8). Even more, Lenin saw the war as a possibility of a civil war and the destruction of the local state power in his the *April Thesis* (in Turkish, 1992). However, the Turkish left never related this conception and utilization of the imperialist phenomena in Lenin with the conception of the imperialism. The latter saw the imperialism through the eyes of the Kemalist liberation war and through the eyes of economic development and independency of the country. The former was the first anti-imperialist war in history. However, although this war was followed by a national democratic revolution under the leadership of the radical petty bourgeois democrats, i.e. Kemalist bureaucracy, it could not be completed. For this reason, there was a need for a second anti-imperialist struggle and a second national democratic revolution. However, the proletariat and proletarian revolutionaries who adopted the national democratic revolution strategy would lead this second struggle. This idea came from Mao’s revolution strategy and it was suggested under the name of the National Democratic Revolution. Mao put forward the Chinese revolution as the model of the backward countries of the East, while

he saw the Russian revolution as the model only for the more advanced capitalist countries. The October revolution as a model fit the imperialist countries, while his model fit the colonial and semi-colonial ones (Zagoria 1963; 16-7).

The advocates of this strategy have to accept that the conditions of Turkey in the 1960s and 1970s do not fit the Russian conditions. However, the Turkish Marxism which accepted this strategy seems to have considered the conditions of Turkey in 1960s as it with the proto-revolutionary China. Donald Zagoria said that “the Russia of 1917 was underdeveloped only by the standards of the advanced European countries. China of 1949 was underdeveloped by any standards” (Zagoria, 1963; 20). Leaving aside this anachronism, the Turkish Marxism (in the case of *the Aydınlık*) seems to have not understood even Mao’s emphasis as such: Mao rejected “a tactical alliance with the national bourgeoisie until his ‘revolution from below’ had achieved control over the whole ‘four-class alliance’ of national bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, and proletariat” (Zagoria, 1963; 41). However, the Turkish Marxism strictly followed the formula which suggested that the revolution would develop through stages and it saw the national bourgeoisie without determining its characteristics perfectly, as an ally from the beginning. “Once the class enemy of that particular revolutionary phase had been disposed of and Communist power consolidated, the least ‘revolutionary’ class of the coalition- or the most reactionary class- was assumed to have ‘gone over’ to the imperialists and was treated accordingly”. The Chinese communists emphasised the importance of armed struggles and “especially” “‘wars of national liberation’ by the oppressed peoples against the imperialists with tight party control over tactical alliances with the bourgeoisie” (Zagoria, 1963; 42).

In addition, the advocates of the NDR seem to have not cared of the fact that national democratic revolution strategy required a national democratic revolutionary condition. Such a condition perfectly appeared after the 1818 in

the Ottoman Turkey when Kemalist nationalists found out a favourable conjuncture for their political activity: after the military defeat in 1918, Sevres Treaty was signed by the Ottoman government, the Greek occupation begun, and the foreign soldiers invaded certain regions in the country, the political legitimacy of the existing government ended, and the national feelings were tortured. Moreover, these favourable conditions were also accompanied by the favourable international conditions where the victorious countries had to be interested in their own internal problems. Such a neglect of the national democratic revolutionary *conditions* for a national democratic struggle, besides its neglect of the rising independent power of the proletariat after 1960s, led the Turkish Marxism to continue popular struggle by using class terms. However, an existence of class language is not sufficient for the existence of class conception in Marxian terms. The strategic choice prevailed over the theoretical debates. The latter was used to justify the former.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, P., 1982, *Batıda Sol Düşünce*, Trans: B. Aksoy, Birikim Yayınları, İstanbul

Anderson, P., 1986, *Tarihsel Materyalizmin İzinde*, Trans. M. Bakırcı, H. Gürvit, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul

Anderson, P., 1988, *Gramsci - Hegemonya - Doğu/Batı Sorunu Ve Strateji* Trans.: Günersel, T., Alan Yayıncılık, İstanbul

Althusser, L., 1991, *İdeoloji Ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları*, Trans.: Alp, Y., and Özişik, M., İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul

Althusser, L., 1970, *For Marx*, London

Althusser, L., and Balibar, E., 1971, *Reading Capital*, London

Avcıoğlu, D., 1976, *Türkiye'nin Düzeni (Dün-Bugün-Yarın)*, Vol. I, Tekin Yayınları, İstanbul

Avineri, S., 1968, *the Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx*, London

Balibar, E., 1995, *the Philosophy of Marx*, New York

Best, S, and Kellner, D., 1991, *Postmodern Theory- Critical Interrogations*, the Macmillan, London

Belge, M., 1989, *Sosyalizm Türkiye Ve Gelecek*, Birikim Yayınları, İstanbul

Benson, L., 1978, *Proletarians and Parties-Five Essays In Social Class*, Tavistock Publications, London

- Berkday, H., 1991, *Bir Dönem Kapanırken*, Pencere Yayınları, İstanbul
- Bottomore, T., 1992, *Classes In Modern Societies*, Routledge, London
- Brown, B., 1989, *Marx, Freud Ve Günlük Hayatın Eleştirisi- Sürekli Kültür Devrimine Doğru*, and Trans.: Y. Alogan, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul
- Buğra, A., 1997, *Devlet ve İşadamları, (State and Business in Modern Turkey, a Comparative Study)*, Trans: F. Adaman, İletişim, İstanbul
- Buharin, N., and Preobrajenskiy, Y., 1992, *Komünizmin Abecesi*, Trans.: Y. Alogan, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul (introduced by E.H. Carr)
- Boran, B., (First edition in 1968 May), *Türkiye ve Sosyalizm Sorunları*, Tekin yayınevi, second edition, 1970, İstanbul
- Callinicos, A., 1988, *Making History- Agency, Structure and Change in Social Theory*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York
- Castoriadis, C., 1997, *Toplum İmgeleminde Kendini Nasıl Kurar, Vol. I: Marxism Ve Devrimci Kuram*, Trans.: H. Tufan, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul
- Centers, R., 1961, *the Psychology of Social Classes- A Study of Class Consciousness*, Russell and Russell, New York
- Çetung, M., 1990, *Teori Ve Politika*, Trans.: N. Solukçu, Sol Yayınları, Ankara
- Cohan, A.S., 1975, *Theories of Revolution: An Introduction*, John Wiley and Sons, New York
- Cohen, G., 1978, *Karl Marx's Theory of History: a Defence*, Oxford
- Corlett, W., 1998, *Class Action-Reading Labor, Theory, and Value*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London

Çulhaoğlu, M., 1988, *Tarih Türkiye Sosyalizm - Bir Mirasın Güncelliği*, Gelenek Yayınevi, İstanbul

Çulhaoğlu, M., 1997, *Bin Yıl Eşiğinde Marxizm ve Türkiye Solu*, Sarmal Yayınevi, İstanbul

Dahrendorf, R., 1959, *Class and Class Conflict In Industrial Society*, Stanford

Deutscher, I., 1990, *Bitmemiş Devrim - Rusya 1917-1967*, Trans.. O. Koçak, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul

Deutscher, I., 1990, *Stalin-Bir Devrimcinin Hayatı I, II*, Trans.: S. Hilav, Sosyal Yayınları, İstanbul

Engels, F., 1990, *Ailenin, Özel Mülkiyetin Ve Devletin Kökeni*, Trans.: K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Engels, F., 1992, *Almanya'da Devrim ve Karşı Devrim*, Trans.: K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Engels, F., 1995, *Anti-Dühring*, Trans.: K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Engels, F., 1997, *İngiltere'de Emekçi Sınıfın Durumu*, Trans: Y. Fincancı, Sol Yayınları, Ankara (introduced By E. Hobsbawn)

Engels, F., 1999, *Köylüler Savaşı*, Trans.: K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Frankel, B., 1991, *Sanayi Sonrası Ütopiyalar*, Trans.: K. Durand, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul

Fülbert, G., 1999, *Büyük Deneme - Komünist Hareketin ve Sosyalist Devletlerin Tarihi*, Trans.: M. Okyayuz, Doruk Yayınları, Ankara

Galman, C., etal, 1996, *Paris Komünü ve Marxizm*, Trans: K. Somer, Sarmal Yay, İstanbul

Giddens, A., 1973, *the Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*, London

Giddens, A., 2000, *Tarihsel Materyalizmin Çağdaş Eleştirisi*, Trans: Ü. Tatlıcan, Paradigma Yayınları, İstanbul

Gündoğan, E., 1999, *Inserting Space into Social Theory: The Case of David Harvey*, Unpublished Master Thesis Submitted to METU, Ankara

Gouldner, A., 1980, *Two Marxisms*, London

Gorz, A., 1986, *Elveda Proletarya*, Trans: H. Tufan, Afa

Gregor, A. J., 1965, *a Survey of Marxism*, New York

Gramsci, A., 1986, *Hapishane Defterleri - Tarih, Politika, Felsefe ve Kültür Sorunları Üzerine Seçme Texts*, Trans: K. Somer, Onur Yayınları, İstanbul

Gramsci, A., 1994, *Pre-Prison Writings*, Bellamy R., (Ed.) English Trans.: Cox V., Cambridge University Press

Hall S., and Gieben B., (Ed), 1992, *Formations of Modernity*, Polity Press In Association with the Open University, Cambridge

Harvey, D., 1989, *the Condition of Postmodernity-An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Basil Blackwell

Hobsbawm, E. J., 1989, *Devrim Çağı: 1789-1848*, Trans: J. Ergüder and A. Şenel, V Yayınları, Ankara

Hodgson, G., 1988, *Sosyalizm ve Parlamenter Demokrasi*, Trans.: A. Demirel, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul

Hoffman, J., 1986, *the Gramscian Challenge - Coercion and Consent in Marxist Political Theory*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford and New York

Hook, S., 1962, *From Hegel to Marx*, Ann Arbor

Howard, D., 1972, *the Development of the Marxian Dialectic*, Carbondale

Israel, J., 1971, *Alienation: From Marx to Modern Sociology*, Boston

Marcuse, H., 1941, *Reason and Revolution*, London

Marx, K., 1979, *Grundrisse- Ekonomi Poliđin Eleřtirisi İin n alıřma*, edited, summed and Trans: S. Niřanyan, Birikim Yayınları, İstanbul

Marx, K., 1990a, *Capital - A Critique of Political Economy*, 1. Vol., Penguin Classics

Marx, K., 1990b, *Louis Bonaparte'ın 18 Brumaire'i*, Trans: S. Belli, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1991a, *Fransa'da İ Savař*, Trans: K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1991b, *Capital - A Critique of Political Economy*, 3. Vol., Penguin Classics

Marx, K., 1992a, *Capital - A Critique of Political Economy*, 2. Vol., Penguin Classics

Marx, K., 1992b, *Felsefenin Sefaleti*, Trans: A. Kardam, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1993, *1844 Elyazmaları*, Tran. K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1993, *Ekonomi Poliđin Eleřtirisine Katkı*, Trans: S. Belli, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1996, *Fransa'da Sınıf Savařımları 1848-1850*, Trans: S. Belli, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1997a, *Yahudi Sorunu*, Trans: by a board headed by M. Erdost, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1997b, *Hegel'in Hukuk Felsefesinin Eleştirisi*, Trans: K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K., 1998, *Artı-Değer Teorileri, I.Vol.* Sol Yay, Trans: Y. Fincancı, Ankara

Marx, K., 1999, *Artı-Değer Teorileri, II.Vol.* Sol Yay, Trans: Y. Fincancı, Ankara

Marx, K. and Engels, F., 1979, *Seçme Yapıtlar 3*, Trans.: M. Kabagil, *et all*, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K. and Engels, F., 1987, *Alman İdeolojisi [Feuerbach]*, Trans. S. Belli, Sol Yay., Ankara

Marx, K. and Engels, F., 1993, *Komünist Manifesto Ve Komünizmin İlkeleri*, Trans: M. Erdost, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Marx, K. and Engels, F., 1994, *Kutsal Aile- Ya da Eleştirel Eleştirinin Eleştirisi*, Trans: K. Somer, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Meszaros, I., 1970, *Marx's Theory of Alienation*, London

Mclellan, D., 1970, *Marx before Marxism*, London and New York

Mclellan, D., 2000, *Karl Marx-Selected Writings*, Oxford University Press

Miliband, R., 1989, *Kapitalist Devlet*, Trans.: O. Akınhay, Belge Yayınları,

Miliband, R., Poulantzas, N., and Laclau, E., 1990, *Kapitalist Devlet Sorunu*, Trans., and Ed.:M. Belge and A. Aksoy, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul

Mills, W., 1962, *the Marxists*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex

Moore, B. Jr., 1989, *Diktatörlüğün ve Demokrasinin Kökenleri- Çağdaş Dünyayının Yaratılmasında Soylunun ve Köylünün Rolü*, Trans.: Ş. Tekeli and A. Şenel, V Yayınları, Ankara

Mouffe, C., (Ed) 1992, *Dimensions Of Radical Democracy-Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*, Verso, London and New York

Piero, G., *Paris Komünü (1871)*, in V.İ. Lenin, 1992, *Komün Dersleri*, trans. K. Somer, Sol Yayınları., Ankara

Pipes, R., (Ed), 1968, *Revolutionary Russia*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Pirenne, H., 1990, *Ortaçağ İnsanları ve Kültürü*, Trans: M.A. Kılıçbay, İmge Yayınları, Ankara

Plehanov, G.V., *Marxismın Temel Sorunları*, Trans: E. Buri et al. Sosyal Yayınları, İstanbul

Politzer, G., 1975, *Felsefenin Temel İlkeleri*, Trans.: M. Ardos, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Porrit, J., 1989, *Yeşil Politika*, Trans.: A. Türker, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul

Poulantzas, N., 1992, *Siyasal İktidar Ve Toplumsal Sınıflar*, (First Book), Trans.: Ş. Süer and L. F. Topaçoğlu, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul

Redhead, B., 2001, *Siyasal Düşüncenin Temelleri*, Editor of Trans.: H. Özdemir, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul

Siriani, C., 1990, *İşçi Denetimi ve Sosyalist Demokrasi-Sovyet Deneyimi*, Trans.: K. Başoğlu, Belge Yayınları, İstanbul

Suchting, W. A., 1986, *Marx and Philosophy-Three Studies*, New York University Press, USA

Therborn, G., 1989, *Sermaye Egemenliđi Ve Demokrasinin Dođuşu*, Trans.. Ş. Tekeli, V Yayınları, Ankara

Türkiye Gerçekleri ve Terörizm (Beyaz Kitap), Ankara 1973 (prepared by the order of the prime ministry)

Laclau, E., 1990, *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*, Verso, London-New York

Laclau, E and Mouffe, C., 1992, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy- Towards A Radical Democratic Politics*, Verso, London-New York

Lane, D., 1971, *the End of Inequality*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex

Lefebvre, H., 1976, *the Survival of Capitalism- The Reproduction of the Relations of Production*, English Trans: F. Bryant, Macmillan Limited, USA

Lefebvre, H., 1986, *Marksizm*, Trans.: V. Günyol, Alan Yayıncılık, İstanbul

Lenin, V., I., 1989, *Devlet ve İhtilal- Marksist Devlet Öğretisi ve Proletaryanın Devrimdeki Görevleri*, Trans: K. Somer, Bilim Ve Sosyalizm Yayınları, Ankara

Lenin, V., I., 1992, *Emperyalizm-Kapitalizmin En Yüksek Aşaması*, Trans: C. Süreyya, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Lenin, V., I., 1992, *Burjuva Demokrasisi ve Proletarya Diktatörlüğü*, Trans: M. Erdost, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Lenin, V., I., 1992, *Nisan Tezleri ve Ekim Devrimi*, Trans: M. Erdost, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Lenin, V., İ., 1998, *Ne Yapmalı* Trans.: Erdost, M., Sol Yayınları Ankara

Lenin, V., İ., 1993, *Materyalizm ve Ampiryo Kritisizm*, Trans.: S. Belli, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Lenin, V., İ., 1996, *İşçi Sınıfı ve Köylülük*, Trans: M. Erdost, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Lively J., and Reeve A., (Ed. and intro.) *Modern Political Theory from Hobbes to Marx-Key Debates*; Routledge, London and New York

Lukacs, G., 1970, *History and Class Consciousness*, London

Lobkowitz, N., 1967, *Theory and Practice: History of a Concept from Aristotle to Marx*, University Of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame-London

Ollman, B., 1971, *Alienation: Marx's Critique of Man in Capitalist Society*, Cambridge

Ollman, B., 1993, *Dialectical Investigations*, New York

O'sullivan, N., (Ed), 1989, *the Structure of Modern Ideology-Critical Perspectives on Social and Political Theory*, Edward Elgar, England

Ruben, D., H., 1989, *Marxism Ve Materialism- Marxist Bilgi Kuramı Üzerine Bir Çalışma*, Trans., K. Emiroğlu, V Yayınları, Ankara

Rubel, M, and Manale, M., 1976, *Marx without Myth*, Oxford

Sabine, G.H., 1961, *a History of Political Theory*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Toronto and London.

Stalin, J., 1967, *Diyalektik Ve Tarihi Materyalizm*, Trans.: Z. Seyhan, Bilim Ve Sosyalizm Yayınları, Ankara

Stalin, J., 1994, *Marxism ve Ulusal Sorun ve Sömürge Sorunu*, Trans.: M. Erdost, Sol Yayınları, Ankara

Teber, S., 1990, *Politik Psikoloji Notları*, Ara Yayıncılık, İstanbul

Thomson, D., 1997, *Siyasi Düşünce Tarihi*, Editor of Trans. A. A.Ural, Şule Yayınları, İstanbul

Thompson, E. P., 1994, *Teorinin Sefaleti*, Trans: A. F. Yıldırım, Alan Yayıncılık, İstanbul

Keane J., (Ed.), *Sivil Toplum ve Devlet- Avrupa' da Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul

Korsch, K., 1971, *Marxism and Philosophy*, London

Korsch, K., 1936, *Karl Marx*, New York (in Turkish, *Karl Korsch-Marxist Kuram ve Sınıf Hareketi*, Trans: M. Okyayuz, 2000, Doruk Yay)

Küçük, Y., 1985, *Planlama Kalkınma ve Türkiye*, Tekin Yayınları, Ankara

Küçük, Y., 1987, *Sovyetler Birliği'nde Sosyalizmin Kuruluşu 1925-1940*, Haziran Yayınları, İstanbul

Küçük, Y., 1991, *Sovyetler Birliği'nde Sosyalizmin Çözülüşü*, Tekin Yayınları, Ankara

Küçük, Y., 1998, *Sol Marxism*, Akış Yayınları, İstanbul

Wood, E. M., 1996, *Democracy against Capitalism- Renewing Historical Materialism*, Cambridge University Press

Donald S. Zagoria, 1963, "Models, Some Comparisons Between the Russian and Chinese" (Part one), in *Communist Strategies in Asia, A Comparative Analysis of Governments and Parties*, Edited by A. Doak Barnett, Frederick A. Praeger, Publisher, New York-London,

Zeitlin, I., 1967, *Marxism: A Re-Examination*, Princeton, New Jersey

ENCYCLOPAEDIAS

Altay, S., 1991, *Devrimler Ansiklopedisi* (The Encyclopaedia of Revolutions), Milliyet Yayınları, İstanbul

Sosyalizm ve Toplumsal Mücadeleler Ansiklopedisi (The Encyclopaedia of Socialism and Social Struggles), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul

Sosyalist Kültür Ansiklopedisi (The Encyclopaedia of Socialist Culture) 1979, May Yayınları, İstanbul

WEB REFERENCES

For Marxian texts in English, www.Marxists.org/archive/marx

For the WPT's Program in Turkish, www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts

For the WPT, İbrahim Atalay, www.lycos.co.uk/turkiye_solu/texts

For Mahir Çayan's works, www.kurtuluscephesi.com/eris/mahir.html

AYDINLIK AND ITS CONTRIBUTORS CITED

The Aydınlik, 1968, "the Aydınlik Explains Its Thoughts: The World Turkey and Revolutionary Struggle" (*the Aydınlik Görüşlerini Açıklıyor: Dünya Türkiye ve Devrimci Mücadele*), November, 1. Issue

The Aydınlik, 1970, "Great Worker Resistance" (Büyük İşçi Direnişi), June, 21. Issue

The Aydınlik, 1971a, "We are Strong Enough to Defeat Fascism" (Faşizmi Yenecek Güçteyiz), January, 27. Issue

The Aydınlik, 1971b, "We Will Break the Isolation Game of the Counter-Revolution" (Karşı Devrimin Tecrit Oyununu Bozacağız), February, 28. Issue

The Aydınlık, 1971c, "The Draft Program of the Proletarian revolutionary Movement" (Proleter Devrimci Hareketin Program Taslağı), March, 29-30.Issues

The Aydınlık, 1971d, "Let Us Not Be Caught Unready in Next" (Bir Daha Hazırlıksız Yakalanmayalım), March, 29-30. Issues

Alpay, Ş., 1969, "On 'The Order of Turkey'" ('Türkiye'nin Düzeni' Üzerine), October, *the Aydınlık*, 12.Issue

Belli, M., 1969, "Reality of Nation" (Millet Gerçeği), *the Aydınlık*, May, 7.Issue

Belli, M., 1970, "The Revolutionary Nationalism and the Proletarian Internationalism Complete Each Other" (Devrimci Milliyetçilik ile Proleter Enternasyonalizmi Birbirini Tamamlar), *the Aydınlık*, September, 23.Issue

Belli, M., 1971, "Adressing in the General Meeting 29-30 October" (29-30 Ekim Kurultay Konuşması), *the Aydınlık*, January, 27. Issue

Erdost, M., 1969a, "An Outline for the Sources of Feudalism in Turkey and Its Present Condition" (Türkiye'de Feodalizmin Kaynakları ve Bugünkü Durumu Üzerine Bir Taslak), *the Aydınlık*, March, 5.Issue

Erdost, M., 1969b, "The Feudal Characteristic of the Stock-raising in the Eastern Anatolia (Doğu Anadolu'da Hayvancılığın Feodal Niteliği), *the Aydınlık*, June, 8.Issue

Erdost, M., 1969c, "On the Dominant Relation of Production in Turkish Agriculture" (Türkiye Tarımında Hakim Üretim İlişkisi Üzerine), *the Aydınlık*, November, 13.Issue

Erdost, M., 1970a, "The Place of the Petty Bourgeoisie in The Revolution" (Devrimde Küçük Burjuvazinin Yeri), *the Aydınlık*, February, 16.Issue

Erdost, M., 1970b, "A Criticism of New Opportunism" (Yeni Oportünizmin Eleştirisi), *the Aydınlık*, May, 19. Issue

Erdost, M. and Kaymak, A., 1971, "On the Present Problems of Our Revolution" (Devrimizin Bugünkü Sorunları Üzerine), *the Aydınlik* February, 28. Issue

Harman, M., 1970a, "Revolutionary Syndicalism and the Present Condition of the RTUCT" (Devrimci Sendikacılık ve DİSK'in Bugünkü Durumu), *the Aydınlik*, March, 17. Issue

Harman, M., 1970b, "TUCT the Satellite of the Imperialism (Emperyalizmin Uydusu TÜRK-İŞ), *the Aydınlik*, June, 20. Issue

Kardam, 1970a, "National Democratic Revolution and the Peasant Question" (Milli Demokratik Devrim ve Köylü Meselesi), *the Aydınlik*, October, 24. Issue

Kardam, 1970b, The Meeting of 29-30 October and the Party Question (29-30 Ekim Toplantısı ve Parti Sorunu), *the Aydınlik*, December, 26. Issue

Perinçek, D., 1968, "Class Structure of the WPT Members (TİP Üyelerinin Sınıf Yapısı), *the Aydınlik*, January, 3. Issue

AYDINLIK: ISSUES AND THE CONTRIBUTORS

ISSUE 1

NOVEMBER 1968: Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

The Aydınlik Explains Its Thoughts: The World Turkey and revolutionary Struggle (*Aydınlik* Görüşlerini Açıklıyor: Dünya Türkiye ve Devrimci Mücadele)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik*'ta Dünya ve Türkiye)

Vahap Erdoğan: Socialism and Counter-Revolution in Czechoslovakia (Çekoslavakya'da Sosyalizm ve Karşı-Devrim)

V.İ.Lenin: Writings About Youth: The recruitment of 183 Students, Organise the Youth! The Student Movement and the Present Condition, the Youth International (Gençlik Üzerine Yazılar: 183 Öğrencinin Askere Alınışı, Gençliği Örgütleyin! Öğrenci Hareketi ve Bugünkü Politik Durum, Gençlik Erternasyonali)

Ho Şi Minh: The Workers Movement in Turkey (Türkiye'de İşçi Hareketi)

Ergun Gerçek: The Book Review in Socialist Journal (Sosyalist Dergide Kitap Eleştirisi)

ISSUE 2

DECEMBER 1968: Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: Social Classes in General (Genel Olarak Sosyal Sınıflar)
Mehmet Gün: Asiatic Mode of Production (Asya Üretim Tarzı)
Rosa Lüksemburg: Ottoman Empire and German Imperialism (Osmanlı Devleti ve Alman Emperyalizmi)
Şahin Alpay: revolutionary Theoretical Education (Devrimci Teorik Eğitim)
Mustafa Suphi: The Roads of Turks (Türklüğün İstikametleri)

ISSUE 3

JANUARY 1969: Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: Social Parties in General (Genel Olarak Sosyal Partiler)
Doğu Perinçek: Class Structure of the WPT Members (TİP Üyelerinin Sınıf Yapısı)
Erdoğan Güçbilmez: National Liberation Struggle of Philistinian Arabs (Filistin Araplarının Milli Kurtuluş Savaşı)
Nazım Hikmet: The Working Class and labour Question in Turkey (Türkiye'de Amele Sınıfı ve Amele Meselesi)
The Announcement of the WPT revolutionary Group (TİP Devrimci Grup Bildirisi)

ISSUE 4

FEBRUARY 1969: Founders: V. Erdoğan, E.Güçbilmez, D. Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S. Erdoğan, G. Zileli, C.Çandar, M. Aktolga, Atıl Ant
Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: C.Çandar, Technical Editor: Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Mihri Belli: Some Ideas on the Asiatic Mode of Production (Asya Üretim Tarzı Üzerine Birkaç Söz)
Seyhan Erdoğan: İzmir Economic Congress-1923 (İzmir İktisat Kongresi-1923)
Deniz Kavukçuoğlu: Re-militarisation of the Economy in Western Germany (Batı Almanyada'daki Ekonominin Yeniden Askerileştirilmesi)
Mao Tse-tung: The Target of the Youth Movement, 4 May Movement (Gençlik Hareketinin Hedefi, 4 Mayıs Hareketi)

From Our History: The Memories and Documents related with the attitudes of the Turk and Greek Leftists in Our Liberation War (Tarihimizden: Kurtuluş Savaşımızda Türk ve Yunan Solcularının Tutumu ile İlgili Anılar ve Belgeler)
Documents: The Announcement of the revolutionary People from Akçadağ Village (Belgeler: Akçadağ Köyleri Devrimci Halkının “Duyurusu”)

ISSUE 5

MARCH 1969: Founders: V.Erdoğdu, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdoğdu, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, M.Aktolga, Atıl Ant
Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor. Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Muzaffer Erdost: An Outline for the Sources of Feudalism in Turkey and Its Present Condition (Türkiye’de Feodalizmin Kaynakları ve Bugünkü Durumu Üzerine Bir Taslak)
Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: Classes and Politics in Turkey (Türkiye’de Sınıflar ve Politika)
Türkkaya Ataöv: The Real Characteristic of Greek Civil War and The Real Aim of the Truman Doctrine (Yunan İç Savaşının Gerçek Yanı ve Truman Doktrininin Asıl Amacı)
Georgi Dimitrov: Is It United Front or a Collaboration among the Classes? (Birleşmiş Cephe mi, Sınıflar Arası İşbirliği mi?)
Georgi Dimitrov: Fascism and the Ways of Struggle against the Yellow Trade Unionism (Faşizm ve Sarı Sendikacılıkla Mücadele Yolları)
From our History: To Istanbul Labourers and Workers without Differentiation of Religion and Sects (Tarihimizden: Bila Tefrik-i Din ve Mezhep İstanbul Amele ve İşçilerine)

ISSUE 6

APRIL 1969: Founders: V.Erdoğdu, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdoğdu, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, M.Aktolga, Atıl Ant
Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor. Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Şahin Alpay: The Commercial Treaties of XIX. Century and Their Impacts over Ottoman Social Structure (XIX. Yüzyıl Ticaret Sözleşmeleri ve Osmanlı Toplum Yapısı Üzerine Etkileri)
Ali Orhan Yücealp: Contemporary Science and Materialism (Çağdaş Bilim ve Materyalizm)
Louis Althusser: Philosophy as Weapon of Revolution (Devrim Silahı Olarak Felsefe)
From Our History: To the Worker and Farmer and Moderately Living People Masses of Turkey (Tarihimizden: Türkiye İşçi ve Çiftçi ve Orta Halli Halk Kitlelerine)

Documents: Oppressing Regime is in the villages (Belgeler: Düşünceye Baskı Rejimi Köylerde)

ISSUE 7

MAY 1969: Founders: V.Erdoğan, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdoğan, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, M.Aktolga, Atıl Ant
Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor. Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Doğu Perinçek: The Youth and The National Democratic Unity of Power against the Reactionary Parliamentarism (Gerici Parlemetarizme Karşı Gençlik ve Milli Demokratik Güçbirliği)
Mihir Belli: Reality of Nation (Millet Gerçeği)
Carlos Rodriguez: Cuban Revolution and the Working Class (Küba Devrimi ve İşçi Sınıfı)
Rasih N.İleri: Doctor Şefik Hüsnü Degimer (Doktor Şefik Hüsnü Değimer)
Şefik Hüsnü: The Elections and the Poor and the Moderately Leiving Classes (İntihabat ve Yoksul ve Orta Halli Sınıflar)
Josef Stalin: The Condition in Caucasia (Kafkasya'da Durum)
Documents: Record Document for Searching (Belgeler: Arama Zabıt Varakası)

ISSUE 8

JUNE 1969: Founders: V.Erdoğan, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdoğan, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, M.Aktolga, Atıl Ant
Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor. Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: The Employer's Socialism-The Proletarain Socialism (İşveren Sosyalizmi-İşçi Sosyalizmi)
Muzaffer Erdost: The Feudal Characteristic of the Stock-raising in the Eastern Anatolia (Doğu Anadolu'da Hayvancılığın Feodal Niteliği)
Deniz Kavukçuoğlu: revolutionary Movement in Latin America (Latin Amerika'da Devrimci Hareket)
Gün Zileli: An Example of Petty Bourgeois Effect in the Socialist Movement: The Book of Behice Boran (Sosyalist Harekette Küçük Burjuva Etkenlere Bir Örnek: Behice Boran'ın Kitabı)
From Our History: Addressing to All Workers and Poor (Tarihimizden. Umum İşçilere ve Fakirlere Hitap)

ISSUE 9

JULY 1969: Founders: V.Erdoğan, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdoğan, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, M.Aktolga, Atıl Ant

Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

Live The Worker-Peasant Newspaper! (Yaşasın İşçi-Köylü Gazetesi)
The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Mihri Belli: My Defence (Savunmam)
Cengiz Çandar: The June of 1969 and the revolutionary Youth Movement (1969 Haziranı ve Devrimci Gençlik Hareketi)
Osman Ulaşay: On "The Alienation of the Order" ("Düzenin Yabancılaşması" Üzerine)

ISSUE 10

AUGUST 1969: Founders: V.Erdogan, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdogan, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, M.Aktolga, Atıl Ant
Owner: Münir Aktolga; Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: Organisation of Turkey's People (Türkiye Halkının Teşkilatlandırılması)
Fuat Fegan: Cyprus Question (Kıbrıs Meselesi)
Suat Derviş: My Husband Resat Fuat (Kocam Reşat Fuat)
Rasih Nuri İleri: Resat Fuat Baraner (Reşat Fuat Baraner)
Fakir Baykurt: What the Teachers have to do Today (Öğretmen Bugün Ne Yapmalı?)
Debate (Tartışma)
From Our History: Kazım Karabekir's Addressing to All Troops (Tarihimizden: Kazım Karabekir'den Umum Kitaata)

ISSUE 11

SEPTEMBER 1969: Founders: V.Erdogan, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdogan, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, Atıl Ant
Owner: G.Zileli, C.Çandar, Atıl Ant, Ömer Özerturgut, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

Mihri Belli: WE will Support the WPT as an Organisation (TİP'i Örgüt Olarak Destekleyeceğiz)
NATO is the enemy of our People (NATO Halkımızın Düşmanıdır) (*the Aydınlik-TÜRK SOLU*)
Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: What is Strategy and Tactic in classical terms? (Klasik Anlamıyla Strateji ve Taktik Nedir?)
Kenan Öcal: Is Marcuse a Prophet of Revolution? (Marcuse Bir Devrim Peygamberi midir?)
Documents: Marcuse: Is He a Honest Rightist within the Revolution or an Agent ? (Belgeler: Marcuse: Devrim İçinde Samimi Bir Sağcı mı Yoksa Ajan mı?)

Aziz Nesin: Thoughts on Theatrical Questions (Tiyatro Sorunları Üstüne Düşünceler)

From Our History: The Letter of the Turkey People Participation Party to the Government of the Great National Assembly) Tarihimizden: Türkiye Halk İştirakiyun Fırkasının BMM Hükümetine Beyannamesi

ISSUE 12

OCTOBER 1969: Founders: V.Erdoğan, E.Güçbilmez, D.Perinçek, Ş.Alpay, S.Erdoğan, G.Zileli, C.Çandar, Atıl Ant, Ömer Özerturgut

Owner: G.Zileli, C.Çandar, Atıl Ant, Ömer Özerturgut, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor. Yavuz Tarakçıoğlu

Doğu Perinçek: Ho Shi Min Has Died. Live the revolutionary Solidarity of the World Peoples (Ho Şi Minh Öldü. Yaşasın Dünya Halklarının Devrimci Dayanışması)

The Aydınlik Editorial Board: Let Us Render Proletarain revolutionary Fronts Steel (*Aydınlik* Yazı Kurulu: Proleter Devrimci Safları Çelikleştirelim)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*the Aydınlik*'ta Dünya ve Türkiye)

Sina Çıladı: Imperialism, Relations of Production and the Betrayel of Oportunism in Zonguldak Base (Zonguldak Havzasında Emperyalizm, Üretim İlişkileri ve Oportunizmin İhaneti)

Şahin Alpay: On "The Order of Turkey" ("Türkiye'nin Düzeni" Üzerine)

Mao TSETUNG: An Adressing to the Editorial Board of the Diary of Sansi-Suiyuan, Struggle against Liberalism (Şansi-Suiyuan Günlüğü Yazı Kuruluna Bir Konuşma, Liberalizmle Mücadele)

From Our History: Economic Affairs (Tarihimizden: İktisat İşleri)

Deniz Kavukçuoğlu: revolutionary Movement in India (Hindistan'da Devrimci Hareket)

ISSUE 13

NOVEMBER 1969: Owner: Gün Zileli, Cengiz Çandar, Atıl Ant, Ömer Özerturgut, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

The Aydınlik: As Our Struggle is Getting Two Years Old (Mücadelemiz 2.Yılına Gिरerken)

Türk Solu-*the Aydınlik*: To Deserve of Congragulating the Festival of Republic (Cumhuriyet Bayramımızı Kutlamaya Layık Olmak İçin)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*the Aydınlik*'ta Dünya ve Türkiye)

Cengiz Çandar: The Opportunists are in the Service of the Imperialism (Oportunistler Emperyalizmin Hizmetinde)

Muzaffer Erdost: On the Dominant Relation of Production in Turkish Agriculture (Türkiye Tarımında Hakim Üretim İlişkisi Üzerine)

Mihri Belli: On the revolutionary Solidarity (Devrimci Dayanışma Üzerine)

V.İ.Lenin: The Proletarait and the National Liberation Struggle (Proleterya ve Milli Kurtuluş Mücadelesi)

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk: "The Sovereignty is seized by Force and Violence"
("Egemenlik Kuvvetle ve Zorla Alınır")

ISSUE 14

DECEMBER 1969: Owner: G.Zileli, C.Çandar, Atıl Ant, Ömer Özerturgut,
Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)
Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: Military and Social Strategy-Tactic in General (Genellikle
Askercil ve Sosyal Strateji-Taktik)
Deniz Kavukçuoğlu: The German Question (Almanya Meselesi)
Halil Berktaş: Scientific Socialist Conception of Revolution (Bilimsel Sosyalist
Devrim Anlayışı)
Lenin: Lenin's Foresight about the revolutionary Storms in The East (Lenin'in
Doğudaki Devrimci Fırtınalar Üzerine Öngörüsü)

ISSUE 15

JANUARY 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

The Aydınlik: An Explanation (Bir Açıklama)
Mihri Belli: The Unity about the Principles is Essential (İlkelerde Birlik Şarttır)
The Aydınlik: The Line of our Proletarian revolutionary Movement is Clear
(Proleter Devrimci Hareketimizin Çizgisi Açıktır)
Mahir Çayan: Right Deviation revolutionary Practice and Theory (Sağ Sapma
Devrimci Pratik ve Teori)
Seyhan Erdoğan: the WPT's Cankaya Congress and The decreasing Vitality
of the Opportunism (TİP Çankaya Kongresi ve Oportünizmin Can Çekişmesi)
The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 16

FEBRUARY 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical
Editor: Barbaros Denizeri

The Aydınlik: On Hegemony in Organisation and Revolution (Örgüt ve
Devrimde Hegemonya Üzerine)
Muzaffer Erdost: The Place of the Petty Bourgeoisie in the Revolution
(Devrimde Küçük Burjuvazinin Yeri)
Sezgin Tüzün: An Essay on the Land Occupation in Elmalı (Elmalı'da Toprak
İşgali Üzerine Bir Deneme)
Atilla Sarp: The Place of the Youth in the Proletarian Fight (Gençliğin Proleter
Kavgadaki Yeri)
Lenin: The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement (Hareketimizin Acil Görevleri)
Charles Fourier: The Freedom of Thought and the Concepts of the Public
Servants in the Soviet Union (Sovyetler Birliğinde Düşünce Özgürlüğü ve
Memur Kavramları)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlık* (*Aydınlık'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 17

MARCH 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Barbaros Denizeri

The Aydınlık: Not The Government Crisis, But The crisis of the Regime (Hükümet Buhranı Değil, Rejim Buhranı)

Şevki Akşit: The Liquidation Hollow Dugged in the revolutionary Fronts (Devrimci Saflarda Kazılan Tasfiye Çukurları)

Mustafa Harman: revolutionary Syndicalism and the Present Condition of the RTUCT (Devrimci Sendikacılık ve the RTUCT'in Bugünkü Durumu)

Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: The Impacts of Religion over the Turkish Society (Dinin Türk Toplumuna Etkileri)

Mihri Belli: National revolutionary Culture (Ulusal Devrimci Kültür)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlık* (*Aydınlık'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 18

APRIL 1970: SPECIAL FILE FOR LENIN'S 100. ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH (100.DOĞUM YILDÖNÜMÜ LENİN ÖZEL SAYISI)

Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Barbaros Denizeri

Hikmet Kıvılcımlı: Lenin and Turkey, Lenin and Mustafa Kemal (Lenin ve Türkiye, Lenin ve Mustafa Kemal)

Nazım Hikmet: Poems, Lenin in Turkish (Şiirler, Türkçe'de Lenin)

Lenin: On the Role and The Tasks of the Trade unions in the Conditions of New Economic Policy (Yeni Ekonomi Politika Koşulları İçinde Sendikaların Rol ve Görevlerine Dair)

Stalin: On Lenin's Death, Lenin as the Organisator and the Leader of The Russian Revolution (Lenin'in Ölümü Üzerine, Rus Devriminin Örgütlenicisi ve Önderi Olarak Lenin)

Peking Review: Lenin's 90. Anniversary of Birth (Lenin'in 90.Yıldönümü)

Collective Announcement of the Peasants of Nallıhan (Nallıhan Köylüleri Ortak Bildirisi)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlık* (*Aydınlık'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 19

MAY 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Barbaros Denizeri

The Aydınlık: The Real Representatives of the Spirit of 23 April 1920 (23 Nisan 1920 Ruhunun Gerçek Temsilcileri)

Muzaffer Erdost: A Criticism of New Opportunism (Yeni Oportünizmin Eleştirisi)

A.Kerim: Fedai Movement in the Middle East and the Palestine's Democratic People Liberation Front (Orta Doğuda Fedayi hareketi ve Filistin Demokratik Halk Kurtuluş Cephesi)
The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 20

JUNE 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Mahir Çayan, Technical Editor: Mete Ertekin

The Aydınlik: We have come to the Junction (Yol Kavşağına Vardık)
Mahir Çayan: On the Characteristic of New Opportunism (Yeni Oportünizmin Niteliği Üzerine)
Mustafa Harman: THE TUCT the Satellite of the Imperialism (Emperyalizmin Uydusu Türk-İş)
The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 21

JULY 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Mete Ertekin

The Aydınlik: Great Worker Resistance (Büyük İşçi Direnişi)
Tanju Üner: New Opportunisma and Its Conception of Organisation (Yeni Oportünizm ve Örgüt Anlayışı)
F.Adalı: The Elections in Cyprus (Kıbrıs'ta Seçimler)
F.Engels: The Peasant Question in France and Germany (Fransa ve Almanya'da Köylü Meselesi)
The Aydınlik: The Attitude of *the Aydınlik*, the Message of the Youth)
Aydınlik'in Tutumu, Gençliğin Çağrısı
The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 22

AUGUST 1970 (22.issue had been censured by the police and is not available even for now)

ISSUE 23

SEPTEMBER 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Mahir Çayan, Technical Editor: Ahmet Sönmez

The Aydınlik: The Revolutionaries Die, The Revolutions Go On (Devrimciler Ölür Devrimler Sürer)
Mihri Belli: The revolutionary Nationalisma and the Proletarian Internationalism Complete Each Other (Devrimci Milliyetçilik ile Proleter Enternasyonalizmi Birbirini Tamamlar)

Hüseyin Cevahir: The masses, Cuban Revolution and New Opportunism (Kitleler, Küba Devrimi ve Yeni Oportünizm)
Gareth S.Jones: The Characteristic of the USA's Imperialism (ABD Emperyalizminin Niteliği)
The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 24

OCTOBER 1970: Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

The Aydınlik: Our Struggle for Legality, Where did we come in Our Struggle within the WPT? (Legalite Uğruna Mücadelemiz, the WPT İçindeki Mücadelede Nereye Geldik?)

Ahmet Kardam: National Democratic Revolution and the Peasant Question (Milli Demokratik Devrim ve Köylü Meselesi)

Okay Gönensin: The Imperialism in South-Eastern Asia and People War (Güney-Doğu Asya'da Emperyalizm ve Halk Savaşı)

Muzaffer Erdost: On The revolutionary Cultural Front (Devrimci Kültür Cephesi Üzerine)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 25

NOVEMBER 1970: the WPT SPECIAL FILE (TİP ÖZEL SAYISI)

Owner: Münir Aktolga, Editor: Sezgin Tüzün

The Aydınlik: Wher Did the WPT Come ? (TİP Nereye Geldi?)

Mihri Belli: Warranty, Claim-Demand for Liquidation (İhtarname, İddianame-Sevk İstemi)

Şekibe Çelenk, Halit Çelenk: Defence (Savunma)

Süleyman Ege: Defence (Savunma)

Vahap Erdoğan: Defence (Savunma)

Rasih Nuri İleri: Defence (Savunma)

Protesto sent by 13 Members of the Ankara Branch to the WPT's Central Executive Comitte (Ankara Örgütünden 13 Üyenin the WPT MYK'na Gönderdiği Protesto)

ISSUE 26

DECEMBER 1970: Owner, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

Ahmet Kardam: The Meeting of 29-30 October and the Party Question (29-30 Ekim Toplantısı ve Parti Sorunu)

Seyhan Erdoğan: The Significance of Kurtulus Newspaper in the Road Leading towards (PartyPartiye Giden Yolda Kurtuluş Gazetesinin Önemi)

V.İ.Lenin: Frederik Engels

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik'ta Dünya ve Türkiye*)

ISSUE 27

JANUARY 1971: Owner, Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

The Aydınlik: Let Us Realise the Tasks for Organisation (Örgüt İçin Görev Başına)

Mihri Belli: Addressing in the General Meeting 29-30 October (29-30 Ekim Kurultay Konuşması)

Frederich Engels: Capital of Marx (Marx'ın Kapital'i) Documents (Belgeler)

The Announcement of FRYA (Dev-Genç'in Bildirisi)

The Announcement of Forum of the University Teachers of METU (ODTÜ Öğretim Üyelerinin Forum Bildirisi)

The Aydınlik: We are Strong Enough to Defeat Fascism (Faşizmi Yenecek Güçteyiz)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik*'ta Dünya ve Türkiye)

ISSUE 28

FEBRUARY 1971: Editor: Vahap Erdoğan

The Aydınlik: We Will Break the Isolation Game of the Counter-Revolution (Karşı Devrimin Tecrit Oyununu Bozacağız)

Muzaffer Erdost-Ali Kaymak: On the Present Problems of Our Revolution (Devrimizin Bugünkü Sorunları Üzerine)

V.İ.Lenin: The Draft Program of Our Party (Partimizin Program Taslağı)

V.İ.Lenin: Draft Regulation of RSDWP (R.S.D.İ.P Tüzük Tasarısı)

The Aydınlik: On the Party (Parti Üzerine)

The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*Aydınlik*'ta Dünya ve Türkiye)

ISSUE 29-30

MARCH-APRIL 1971: (The Draft Program of the Proletarian revolutionary Movement) (Proleter Devrimci Hareketin Program Taslağı)

Editor: Vahap Erdoğan, Technical Editor: Orhan Onur

The Aydınlik: Let Us Not Be Caught Unready in Next (Bir Daha Hazırlıksız Yakalanmayalım)

The Draft Program of the Proletarian revolutionary Movement (Proleter Devrimci Hareketin Program Taslağı)

Ş.Hüsnü Deymer: The Program of Turkey Socialist Labourer and Peasant Party (Türkiye Sosyalist Emekçi ve Köylü Partisi Programı)

Filiz Kardam: The Celali Rebellions (Celali İsyanları)

V.İ.Lenin: In the Memory of Commune (Komün'ün Anısına)

V.İ.Lenin: Addressing about 1905 Revolution (1905 Devrimi Üzerine Konuşma) The World and Turkey in *the Aydınlik* (*the Aydınlik*'ta Dünya ve Türkiye)

APPENDIX A

TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Tez Marks'ın teorisini bütünsel olarak ele alır ve Türkiye sosyalist hareketinde bu teorinin ne kadar değerlendirildiğini, bu hareket ile Marks'ın teorisi arasında varolan ayırım ve farklılıkları inceler. Farklılıkların ortaya çıkması durumunda ise, nasıl kapatılmaya çalışıldıklarını araştırır. Bu sorunun ele alınışı, sosyalist hareketin önemli bir kesimini temsil ettiği düşünülen *Aydınlık* çevresi ve bu çevreyi bir arada tutan *Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergisi*'nin incelenmesiyle yapılmaktadır. Bu çevre, Türkiye'de sosyalist devrim şartlarının uygun olmadığı ve bu şartların milli demokratik devrim aşamasıyla hazırlanması gerektiğini savunmakta ve Marks'a ve daha fazla olmak üzere, Lenin-Stalin ve Mao'nun düşünce ve pratiği ışığında Türkiye koşullarının çözümlenmesini yaparak, önerdiği devrim stratejisini temellendirmeye çalışmaktadır. Hareket kendi çizgisini, sosyalist, Marksist, proleter devrimci olarak tanımlamakla birlikte, Marks'ı milli demokrat devrimin tamamlanmasından sonraki sosyalist mücadele sürecinin esas teorisi olarak kabul eder görünmekte, ama, mili demokratik devrimin de Marksist olmanın zorunluluğu olarak öne sürmektedir. Milli demokratik devrim, işçi sınıfının önderliğinde köylü kitlesinin devindirici temel gücü ile gerçekleştirilecek bir halk devrimi, bir demokratik devrim, bir milli devrim ve bir köylü devrimi olacaktır. Bu devrim, emperyalist sömürü ve bağlantıları kaldıracak, emperyalizmin yurt içi uzantısı olan işbirlikçi sermaye ile feodal toprak sahiplerinin ittifakına dayanan hakim sınıf ittifakının yerine işçi sınıfı önderliğinde, halk ya da diğer deyişle milli sınıfların iktidarını kuracaktır. Bu iktidar perspektifinde, hakim sınıflar ittifakı dışında her sınıf, kesim ve zümreye kapılar açık tutulmakta, burjuvazinin milli kesimleri ile küçük burjuvazinin demokrat ve alt kesimleri müttefik olarak görülmektedir.

Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi çevresi büyük ölçüde, 1961 yılında kurulan ve 1965 yılında seçim başarısı kazanan Türkiye İşçi Partisi içinde örgütlenen proleter devrimci grubun liderleri tarafından 1968 yılında Mihri Belli önderliğinde örgütlenmiştir. Proleter devrimci grup Türkiye İşçi Partisinin oportünist bir klik tarafından yönetildiğini iddia ediyor ve partinin ele geçirilmesine çalışıyordu. Fakat bu amaca ulaşılması zorlaştığı oranda, parti muhalefeti parti dışına çıkmış ve özellikle devrimci demokrat gençlerin kitlesel katılımlarıyla 1969 tarihinden itibaren, sonraki on yıla damgasını vuracak Marksist-Leninist ve Maoist sosyalist hareketlerin ilk mayalanmasını oluşturmuştur. Bu nedenle, *Aydınlık* çevresi ve bu çevrenin 1968-1971 yılları arasında teorik olarak örgütlendiği *Aydınlık Sosyalist Dergi*, sosyalist hareketin önemli bir uğrak, eğitim ve sıçrama dönemi olmaktadır.

Bu çevrenin Marks'ın teorisi ile ilişkisi şu iki yönden olmaktadır. İlki, milli demokratik devrim tezinin temellendirilmesi için, Türkiye'de özellikle köylülüğün feodal ve yarı-feodal bağımlılık ilişkisi içinde olduğu, bu nedenle de köylülüğün bu bağımlılıktan kurtulması için vereceği mücadelenin işçi mücadelesine eklenilebileceği, ve devrimin temel demokratik ve kitlesel yönünü oluşturacağı iddiasının gösterilmeye çalışılmasıyla ilgilidir. Feodal ilişkilerin sürekliliğinin gösterilmesi Marks'ın temel sermaye ve emek kategorilerinin kırsal alanlarda geçerlilik kazanmadığının gösterilmesiyle sağlanmaya çalışılmaktadır. Örneğin, kırsal üretimde *işçi* ortaya çıksa bile, bu kategori ücretli-emek kategorisine tekabül etmemektedir. Sadece bağımlı köylü emeğidir. Büyük toprak sahipleri pazar için üretim yapsa bile, bu üretim için ne sermaye yatırılmakta, ne de ücretli emek satın almak için sermaye yatırılmaktadır. İlişki bir sermaye-emek ilişkisi değil, feodal bir bağımlılık ilişkisidir. Bu ilişkinin çözülmesi de ancak, anti-feodal, demokratik bir devrimi gerektirmektedir. Sosyalist devrimi değil. Üretim araçları mülkiyeti de zaten kapitalistleşmenin değil feodal ilişkilerin geçmişinden ve sürekliliğinden gelmektedir. Tezde gösterilmeye çalışıldığı gibi, bu çaba büyük ölçüde, Muzaffer Erdost tarafından yapılmaktadır.

Marksın teorisi ile ilişkinin ikinci yönü ise, ancak ve ancak dolaylı bir şekilde yapılmaktadır. Hakim sınıf yerli ve milli kapitalist sınıf olmamakla birlikte, hakim sınıf emperyalist sermaye ile birlikte onun işbirlikçi yerli kapitalistleridir. Bunların diğer müttefiki feodal toprak sahipleri bir yana, bu sınıfların gayrimilli, ve kozmopolit nitelikleri, anti-kapitalist mücadelenin önüne anti-emperyalist mücadeleyi koymakta, hatta, milli kapitalizmin de bağımlı ve zayıf olması nedeniyle, anti-emperyalizm, anti-kapitalist mücadeleyi ertelemeyi gerektirmekteydi. Fakat, milli demokratik devrimin başarılı olmak için hızla sosyalist devrime geçişi de zorunluydu. Bunun teminatı ise, sadece ve sadece milli demokratik devrimin işçi sınıfı önderliğinde yapılmasıydı. Devrimin milli demokratik aşamadan önce sosyalist yönde yapılmaya çalışılması, milli unsurların önemli bir bölümü milli demokratik devrimde uzaklaştırarak,. sosyalist bir anti-kapitalist mücadele, demokrat ve milli unsurların önemli bir bölümünün karşı tarafa geçmesine neden olacaktır. Mili burjuvazi ürkütülmemeli, ya da en azından mücadelede tarafsız kalmaya zorlanmalıdır.

Bu ikinci yönün Marks'la ilişkisinin, "sürekli devrim teorisinin" 1960'ların Türkiye koşullarında bir yeniden üretimi ile kurulduğu görülmektedir. Bu teorinin tarihsel olarak diğer yeniden üretimleri şöyledir: Lenin'in 1905 Rus Devrimiyle ilişkili olarak, demokratik devrimde proletaryanın görevleri ile ilgili teorisi; Stalin'in Komintern döneminde geri ülke komünist partileri için ve aynı zamanda anti-faşist mücadele için Avrupalı partilere önerdiği halk cephesi politikası ile, son olarak Mao'nun doğunun geri tarımsal toplumları için geçerli gördüğü köylü ve halkçı demokratik devrim teorisi. Bu teoriler 1960 yıllarının başından itibaren eski Türkiye Komünist Partili Mihri Belli tarafından Milli demokratik Devrim stratejisi adı altında geliştirilmiştir. Burada, Marks'la ilişkinin dolaylı bir ilişki olduğunu görmek mümkündür. Marks'ın bu stratejiye en yakın durduğu dönem 1848 Avrupa devrimleri dönemi ve öncesinde, işçi sınıfının kendini bağımsız bir politik güç olarak henüz ortaya koymadığı, aynı zamanda burjuvazinin kendi devrimini henüz devam ettirebildiği bir dönemde, yani 1848 Fransız Şubat-Haziran proleter devrimi öncesinde savunduğu

bilinmektedir. Bu devrimin başarısız olması, ve işçi sınıfının kendi devrimi yapabilmekten daha uzunca bir süre uzak olması gerçeği bile, Marks'ın işçi sınıfının bağımsız ve sosyalist bir güç olarak ilk defa tarih sahnesine çıkması olgusunu tüm politikanın merkezine koymasını engellememiş, devrim teorisini tümüyle bağımsız proletaryanın kendi sınıf merkezli politikasını esas alarak inşa etmesini önlememiştir. Tez boyunca gösterilmeye çalışıldığı gibi, her ne kadar *Aydınlık* çevresi Lenin, Stalin ve Mao aracılığıyla da olsa, Marks'ın 1848 öncesi stratejisini 1960'ların Türkiye'sine uygun bulmaktadır. Milli demokratik devrim stratejisi tanımı gereği halkın kitlesele demokratik mücadelesi üzerine oturmakta, sınıf kavramını halk kavramı içinde adeta eritmektedir. Ayrıca, bu stratejiye uygun mücadele biçimi tartışmaları, bir tarafta kitle çizgisi (Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık), bir tarafta ise öncülerin savaşı (THKP-C) çizgilerine yol açmış, sınıf merkezli strateji, mücadele ve örgütlenme biçimlerinin kaçınılmaz geriye itilmesine yol açmıştır. Bu yönde gelişmeye *Aydınlık* çevresinin mili ve demokratik devrim teori ve stratejisinin önemli bir paya sahip olduğu tezde gösterilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Marks'ın teorisi ile ilişkili olarak, yukarıda belirtilen birinci ve ikinci ilişki yönlerinin Marks'ın teorik mirasıyla uyumu için tezde şu düşünceler geliştirilmektedir: Türkiye'de hakim üretim tarzının kapitalizm olması olgusu, kırsal alanların tüm arkaik ve yarı-feodal ilişkileri barındırmasına rağmen, çözülme sürecine girmesi, tarımda hızlanan makinalaşma, piyasa ilişkilerinin gelişmesi ve kentleşmenin köylülüğü çözücü etkilerini göstermeye çalışması; kentlerde işçi hareketinin militanlaşması ve kitleleşmesi, örgütlenmesi ve ulusal toplumda ilgi ve destek bulması, ilk defa işçiler adına bir partinin etki kazanması, sosyalizmin bir hedef ve söylem olarak işçi, öğrenci ve aydınların tartışma gündemine oturması; uluslararası alanda sosyalizmin saygın, güçlü ve etkin bir konumda bulunması olguları daha fazla işçi sınıfının kurtuluşunu ve sosyalizmin kuruluşunu hedef alan anlamda Marks yönelimi gerektirmekle birlikte, olgularla ve Marks'ın teorik mirasıyla uyumu tartışmalı devrimci demokrat bir anti-empyrist mücadele yönünde gelişmeler olmuştur. Marks'da ve teorik sentezini yaptığı sosyalist mücadele birikiminde, sosyalist

mücadelenin esas hedef ve çabası, işçi sınıfının kurtuluşu olarak belirlenmiş, diğer hedefler bu esas hedefe bağımlı ve ilişkili kılınmıştır.

Aydınlık çevresi, Türkiye’de hakim üretim tarzının kapitalizm olduğu gerçeğini ancak, bu kapitalizmi, emperyalizme bağımlı, feodal ilişkilerle yan yana, işbirlikçi, gayri-milli bir kapitalizm olarak tarif etmekle kabul etmektedir. Ne milli kapitalizm, ne de mili kapitalist sınıf hakimdir. Dolayısıyla, sosyalist mücadelenin hedefi, milli kapitalizm ve milli kapitalistler değildir. Emperyalizm ve onun işbirlikçileridir. Tezde gösterilmeye çalışılan esas sorunlardan biri, kapitalizmin ve kapitalist sınıfın bu milli, kültürel, mekansal kimliklendirilmesidir. Marks’ın teorik mirasında, burjuvazinin milliliğine, kültürelliğine ve coğrafi kimliğine değil, sermayenin üretimine, dolaşımına ve gerçekleştirilmesine ağırlık verilmekte, Alman sermayesi, ya da İngiliz sermayesi, Almanya’da ya da İngiltere’de işleyen sermaye olarak sunulmaktadır. Kapitalist sınıfların uluslararası ilişki ve ittifakları ise bir sermaye ve sınıf ilişkisi olarak görülmektedir. Marks, dönemin Fransız burjuvazisi için, İngiliz burjuvazisine göre, “küçük burjuva” sayılmalı demektedir. Alman işçi partisinin uluslararası ilişkilere yeterli ağırlık vermemesi nedeniyle, Alman burjuvazisinin işçi sınıfına karşı uluslararası ittifak kurduğuna, işçiler için de bu tür ilişkiler kurulması gerektiğine işaret etmektedir. Marks’da sınıflarla ilgili ittifaklar ve karşılaştırmalar, uluslararası alanda da yapılmaktadır.

Marks’da sadece sermayenin değil sınıfların da Hegelci diyalektik gelişme şemasına göre, zamanla evrensellik kazanacaklarına ilişkin açıklamaları, sınıfların da sermaye gibi, kültürel-yerel kimliklendirmelerden arınmaya başlayacaklarını, sermayenin ve bu gücü kişiselleştiren kapitalistlerin de çok daha fazla kendi sınıflarının evrenselliğine varacağını kabul etmek, sermayeye sermaye olarak bakmak, kapitaliste kapitalist olarak bakmanın sınıf analizi ve politikası için zorunlu olduğunu göstermektedir. Marks’ın sermaye analizinde, sermayenin bütünselliği içinde, çeşitli alt sınıf ve kategorilere ayrıldığı, farklı zincirleme süreçlerin bir bütünü olduğu, çelişkili ve

sürekli bütünsel ilişkiler yarattığı görülmektedir. Marks'da sömürü kapitalistler arasında değil, yaşam araçlarını tekeline alanlarla, sadece emeği ile geçinenler arası bir eşitsiz ilişki olarak sunulmaktadır. Kapitalistlerin kapitalistlerle ilişkiler, rekabet ve tekel ilişkileri ile, kar oranlarının eşitlenme yada eşitlenememe mekanizmaları çerçevesinde önem kazanmaktadır. Kar oranlarının eşitlenmesi ya da rekabet ilişkiler ve ilave artı değer edinimi kapitalistler arası ilişkilerin analizinde elzemdir Ancak, emperyalizm ve yerli-milli sermaye ilişkilerinin özellikle kapitalistler arası ilişkiler olduğu *Aydınlık* özelinde Türkiye sosyalistleri tarafından yeterince dikkate değer bulunmamıştır.

Türkiye şartlarının çözümlenmesinde, milli demokratik devrim tezinin temellendirilmesi kaygısının ağır basması, *Aydınlık* kuramcılarının çabalarını bağımlılık ilişkilerini göstermeye yöneltmiştir. Bu ilişkilerin nasıl geliştiğinin gösterilmesi ise, tarihsel ilginin ve üretim tarzları tartışmasının ön plana çıkmasına neden olmuştur. Feodal ilişkilerin varlığını göstermek için, bu ilişkilerin modern Türkiye öncesinde var olduğunu göstermek gerekmiş, bağımlılık ilişkilerinin nasıl yerleştiği sorunu ise, feodal toplumun emperyalizmin sızması ile çözüldüğü gösterilerek çözümlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Modern Türkiye'de bağımlı bir kapitalist gelişme ortaya çıkmış, bu bağımlılık da sosyalist mücadele yerine milli ve demokratik bir mücadeleyi zorunlu hale getirmiştir. Bu mücadele ilk değildir, çünkü, radikal Kemalist-bürokratik küçük burjuva ilk milli demokratik mücadeleyi vermiş, ama mücadelesini nihayete erdirememiştir. Karşıdevrim kapısı kapatılamamış, ve ikinci dünya savaşı sonunda emperyalistler-işbirlikçiler ve feodal toprak sahipleri karşı devrimle iktidara gelmişlerdir. Yine de, 27 Mayıs 1960 tarihinde, radikal küçük burjuvazi önderliğinde milli demokratik devrimi tekrarlamak ve tamamlamak fırsatı tekrar ortaya çıkmıştır. Ancak bu kez, mücadele ancak işçi sınıfı öncülüğünde başarı kazanabilir, diğer deyişle, sosyalistlerin teorisi ve işçi sınıfının sınıfsal önderliğinde başarı kazanabilirdi.

Marks için sosyalist devrim olanakları, işçi sınıfının ideolojik ve politik yetkinlik kazanması yanında, kapitalist sınıfın üretici güçleri geliştiremez duruma gelmesi ve hakim sınıf ilişkilerinin bölüşüm ilişkileriyle uyumsuz hale gelmesini de gerektirmekteydi. Fakat, 1960 yıllarından itibaren Türkiye’de, hem işçi sınıfının politik ve ideolojik yetkinlik kazanmaya başlamasının işaretleri ortaya çıkmıştı, hem de kapitalist sınıfın sanayileşme çabaları yanında ideolojik bilinç edinme işaretlerine de tanık olunmaktaydı. Burada, iktisadi olarak ilerici gücünü kaybetmeyen burjuvazinin yanında, işçi sınıfının yükselmesi , örgütlenmesi ve militanlaşması, Türkiye’ sosyalist hareketinin kendine has yönlerinden birini oluşturmaktadır. Türkiye’de burjuva devrimin tamamlandığını gösteren 27 Mayıs 1960 ve hemen sonrası, aynı zamanda, işçi sınıfının da yükselmeye başladığı dönmedir. Burada, burjuva devrimi, işçi devrimi, işçi devriminin bitmesi, burjuvazinin son ileri dönemlerini yaşaması, iki sınıf arasında mücadele ve eşitlik, ardından karşılıklı yetersizlik, devletin ve bürokrasinin görece özerklik kazanması, ya da diğer deyişle, silahlı müdahaleler, Marks’a atıfla, 1848 Şubat Devrimi, Haziran yenilgisi, ve II.Bonapart’ın yenilemeyen sınıfların arasından, ama burjuvazinin çıkarlarını temsil eden kendini her kesimin üzerine yerleştirmesi. Bu süreç kendini ilk kez 12 Mart 1971 askeri uyarısı ile göstermiş, 12 Eylül 1982 askeri müdahalesi ile de tümüyle hayata geçirmiştir. *Aydınlık* Sosyalist Dergi çevresinin özel olarak Kemalist sivil ve askeri bürokrasiye, genel olarak devlete bakışı Marks’ın metinlerinde görülen, açık sınıf diline sahip değildir. Kemalist düzen ve devlet konusunda, herhangi bir Marks çıkışlı eleştiri ya da çözümlenmeye rastlanılmamaktadır. Tek eleştiri, nesnel olarak, Kemalist devrimin sadece feodal devleti tasfiye etmekte başarılı olduğu, karşı devrim tohumlarını yok etmediğidir. Kemalist devrim radikal bir toprak reformu yapamamış, dış ticareti ulusallaştırmamıştır. Bu nedenle de, sosyalistlerin görevi, bu ve benzeri tamamlanmamış görevlerin yerine getirilmesi ve ardından sosyalizme doğru devrimin geliştirilmesidir. Fakat, Kemalist devrimin bir devlet kapitalizmi dönemi olduğu, ikinci dünya savaşı sonrası bu kapitalizmin yanında kırsal üretimde meta üretiminin de geliştiği ve makineleşmenin gerçekleştiği, savaş ve sonrası Türkiye’de yoksullaşmanın yanında sermaye birikiminin de olduğu

gerçeđi, *Aydınlık* yazarlarının çözümlerinde, sadece anti-Kemalist karşı devrimin gelişmesi olarak kabul edilmektedir. Karşı devrimin anti-Kemalist olarak ifade edilmesi, devrim ve karşı-devrim tanımlamalarında da ideolojik kimliklendirmelerin ön planda olduğunu göstermektedir. Marks, burjuvaziyi sadece cumhuriyetçi olarak aktarmamaktadır. Burjuvazinin farklı ve çelişen fraksiyonları olmasının yanısıra, ideolojik seçimleri de farklılaşabilmektedir. Marks, 1848 devrimi ve sonrası incelemelerinde, burjuvazini sayısız değişik tür ve şeklini zaman içinde değişimleriyle birlikte ele almaktadır.

Tez Mars ve *Aydınlık* arasında ne tür *bağlantılar* ve ayrımlar olduğunu, hem Marks'ın teorisinin ana gövdesini oluşturan metinleri (başta *Yahudi Sorunu Üzerine*, *Hegel'in Hukuk Felsefesinin Eleştirisi*, *1844 El Yazmaları*, *Alman İdeolojisi*, *Komünist Manifesto*, *Fransa'da Sınıf Mücadeleleri*, *Louis Bonapart'ın 18 Brumier'i*, *Kapital I-II-III-IV*, *Fransa'da İç Savaş* ve *Gotha Programı'nın Eleştirisi* olmak üzere) hem de, *Aydınlık Sosyalist Derginin* (1968-1971) tüm sayılarını inceleyerek göstermeye çalışmıştır.

VITA

Ercan Gündođan was born in Ankara in 1970. He graduated from Ankara High School and began to study urban and regional planning at METU and then completed his master thesis about David Harvey in the graduate program of urban politics and local governments in the same university. His fields of interest are socialist theory, general history, the theories of urban space, and the concepts of planning, intellectuals, music, and literature. Gündođan works in the Ministry of the Physical Development and Re-settlement as an urban planner.