



Hacettepe University Graduate School Of Social Sciences

Department of Economics

**A COMPARISON OF MARX AND WEBER'S ANALYSES ON THE
ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM**

Kardelen KILINÇOĞLU

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2023

A COMPARISON OF MARX AND WEBER'S ANALYSES ON THE
ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM

Kardelen KILINÇOĞLU

Hacettepe University Graduate School Of Social Sciences
Department of Economics

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2023

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

The Jury Finds That Kardelen Kiliçođlu Has On The Date Of 19.04.2023 Successfully Passed The Defense Examination And Approves Her Master's Thesis Titled "A Comparison Of Marx And Weber's Analyses On The Origins And Development Of Capitalism".

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgür TEOMAN (Jury President)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muammer KAYMAK (Main Adviser)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Arif EREN

I agree that the signatures above belong to the faculty members listed.

Prof. Uđur ÖMÜRGÖNÜLŞEN

Graduate School Director

YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI

Enstitü tarafından onaylanan lisansüstü tezimin tamamını veya herhangi bir kısmını, basılı (kağıt) ve elektronik formatta arşivleme ve aşağıda verilen koşullarla kullanıma açma iznini Hacettepe Üniversitesine verdiğimi bildiririm. Bu izinle Üniversiteye verilen kullanım hakları dışındaki tüm fikri mülkiyet haklarım bende kalacak, tezimin tamamının ya da bir bölümünün gelecekteki çalışmalarda (makale, kitap, lisans ve patent vb.) kullanım hakları bana ait olacaktır.

Tezin kendi orijinal çalışmam olduğunu, başkalarının haklarını ihlal etmediğimi ve tezimin tek yetkili sahibi olduğumu beyan ve taahhüt ederim. Tezimde yer alan telif hakkı bulunan ve sahiplerinden yazılı izin alınarak kullanılması zorunlu metinleri yazılı izin alınarak kullandığımı ve istenildiğinde suretlerini Üniversiteye teslim etmeyi taahhüt ederim.

Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan **“Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge”** kapsamında tezim aşağıda belirtilen koşullar haricince YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi / H.Ü. Kütüphaneleri Açık Erişim Sisteminde erişime açılır.

- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulu kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren 2 yıl ertelenmiştir. ⁽¹⁾
- Enstitü / Fakülte yönetim kurulunun gerekçeli kararı ile tezimin erişime açılması mezuniyet tarihimden itibaren ay ertelenmiştir. ⁽²⁾
- Tezimle ilgili gizlilik kararı verilmiştir. ⁽³⁾

...../...../.....

[İmza]

Kardelen KILINÇOĞLU

“Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge”

- (1) Madde 6. 1. Lisansüstü teze ilgili patent başvurusu yapılması veya patent alma sürecinin devam etmesi durumunda, tez **danışmanının** önerisi ve **enstitü anabilim dalının** uygun görüşü üzerine **enstitü** veya **fakülte yönetim kurulu** iki yıl süre ile tezin erişime açılmasının ertelenmesine karar verebilir.
- (2) Madde 6. 2. Yeni teknik, materyal ve metodların kullanıldığı, henüz makaleye dönüşmemiş veya patent gibi yöntemlerle korunmamış ve internetten paylaşılması durumunda 3. şahıslara veya kurumlara haksız kazanç imkanı oluşturabilecek bilgi ve bulguları içeren tezler hakkında tez **danışmanının** önerisi ve **enstitü anabilim dalının** uygun görüşü üzerine **enstitü** veya **fakülte yönetim kurulunun** gerekçeli kararı ile altı ayı aşmamak üzere tezin erişime açılması engellenebilir.
- (3) Madde 7. 1. Ulusal çıkarları veya güvenliği ilgilendiren, emniyet, istihbarat, savunma ve güvenlik, sağlık vb. konulara ilişkin lisansüstü tezlerle ilgili gizlilik kararı, **tezin yapıldığı kurum** tarafından verilir *. Kurum ve kuruluşlarla yapılan işbirliği protokolü çerçevesinde hazırlanan lisansüstü tezlere ilişkin gizlilik kararı ise, **ilgili kurum ve kuruluşun önerisi** ile **enstitü** veya **fakültenin** uygun görüşü üzerine **üniversite yönetim kurulu** tarafından verilir. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler Yükseköğretim Kuruluna bildirilir.
Madde 7.2. Gizlilik kararı verilen tezler gizlilik süresince enstitü veya fakülte tarafından gizlilik kuralları çerçevesinde muhafaza edilir, gizlilik kararının kaldırılması halinde Tez Otomasyon Sistemine yüklenir.

* Tez **danışmanının** önerisi ve **enstitü anabilim dalının** uygun görüşü üzerine **enstitü** veya **fakülte yönetim kurulu** tarafından karar verilir.

ETİK BEYAN

Bu çalışmadaki bütün bilgi ve belgeleri akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, görsel, işitsel ve yazılı tüm bilgi ve sonuçları bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, kullandığım verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapmadığımı, yararlandığım kaynaklara bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunduğumu, tezimin kaynak gösterilen durumlar dışında özgün olduğunu, **Doç. Dr. Muammer Kaymak** danışmanlığında tarafımdan üretildiğini ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Yönergesine göre yazıldığını beyan ederim.

Kardelen KILINÇOĞLU

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muammer KAYMAK, for his invaluable guidance and unwavering support throughout my research and writing the thesis. I am truly grateful for his patience, expertise, and mentorship, which have helped me to improve academically.

I would also like to thank to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgür Teoman and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Arif EREN for their substantial contributions and encouragements in broadening my perspective on my field of study.

Last but not the least, I am deeply grateful to my family and my grandmother Güner ÖZMEN for their unwavering love and encouragement. Their constant support and belief in my abilities have served as a constant source of motivation and strength. I am profoundly thankful for their sacrifices and the supportive environment they created for me to achieve my academic goals.

ABSTRACT

KILINÇOĞLU, Kardelen. *A Comparison of Marx and Weber's Analyses on the Origins and Development of Capitalism*, Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2023.

Comprehending the emergence and growth of capitalism by understanding the similarities and differences between Marx's and Weber's perspectives is crucial. Numerous discussions have focused on this topic. Their analytical framework and methodology should also be studied to compare their viewpoints on the origins and development of capitalism, mostly in Western Europe, since only through such an analysis can the perspectives of Marx and Weber be compared. This study compares Marx's and Weber's analysis of the development and origins of capitalism. Therefore, its main objectives were not to discuss whether Marx or Weber is correct in his analysis, compare the key material features of their two modalities of intellectual representation, or examine the history of capitalism. As the method of this study, their primary publications, letters, speeches, etc., were used in this study based on the concerns they are aiming to address as well as their responses to questions about the beginnings and development of capitalism. This was carried out by obtaining viewpoints on the subject of study from both Marx and Weber, as well as some of their supporters and detractors and subsequent discussions. The main argument reached by this thesis is that although the thoughts of Marx and Weber on the origins and development of capitalism are seen as rivals to each other by many, their analyzes are quite consistent with each other in terms of examining the various aspects of society, their examination methods, and their dialectical perception of society.

Keywords

Marx and Weber, Origins and Development of Capitalism, Primitive Accumulation, Bourgeois Revolution, Rationalisation, Protestant Ethic

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

YAYIMLAMA VE FİKRİ MÜLKİYET HAKLARI BEYANI

ETİK BEYAN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iv

ABSTRACTv

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....vi

TABLES.....viii

INTRODUCTION.....1

CHAPTER 1:

MARX ON THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM.....7

1.1. CAPITALISM AS A SPECIFIC SOCIAL FORMATION.....7

1.1.1. An Introduction to Marx's Understanding.....9

1.1.2. The Basic Structure of Marx's Writings; The Importance of Ideology and Superstructure.....16

1.2. ON THE ORIGINS OF CAPITALISM.....26

1.2.1. Role of Division of Labor.....28

1.2.2. Bourgeoisie's Role in the Development of Capitalism and the Question of the Bourgeois Revolution.....33

1.2.3. Primitive Accumulation.....39

1.2.4. Historical Epochs.....47

CHAPTER 2:

WEBER ON THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM.....55

2.1. CAPITALISM AS HUMAN NATURE.....55

2.1.1. An Introduction to Weber's Methodology.....56

2.1.2. Weber's Theory of History: Ancient Barriers and Rationalisation.....65

2.2. ON THE ORIGINS OF MODERN CAPITALISM.....	71
2.2.1. The Emergence of Modern Capitalism and the Protestant Ethic.....	72
2.2.2. Capitalist Society.....	90
CHAPTER 3:	
A COMPARISON OF MARX AND WEBER.....	100
3.1. WEBER ON MARX, MARXISTS, AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM... 	100
3.2. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF ANALYSIS IN THE WRITINGS OF MARX AND WEBER.....	104
3.3. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MARX AND WEBER REGARDING THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM.....	106
3.4. IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION.....	112
REFERENCES.....	115
APPENDIXES.....	121
APPENDIX1. ETHICS COMMISSION FORM.....	121
APPENDIX2. ORIGINALITY REPORT.....	122

TABLES

Table 1. Comparison of their analysis on the development and origins of capitalism.....113

INTRODUCTION

Comprehending the similarities and differences between Marx's and Weber's approaches, which have been the subject of a variety of debates over the years, is noteworthy in terms of understanding the origins and development of capitalism. To carry out this study examining Marx and Weber's views on the birth and development of capitalism, especially in Western Europe, we examine their methodology and the analytical approach on which they built their analysis because only such an analysis allows us to compare their approaches. Moreover, various historical and intellectual resources, which build each of their views around the origins and development of capitalism, constitute an important role for comparison. Numerous previous comparisons on this subject have shown how congruent and contradictory the general approaches of Marx and Weber were, and the origins and development of capitalism serve as only a small fraction of these comparisons. In most analyses, researchers argue Marx built his analysis as a Eurocentrist on an economically deterministic and teleological structure, whereas Weber's analysis of the development of capitalism included the influences of ideologies, religion, the political sphere, and so on (Wood, 1995, p. 146). Some approaches consider Weber's views a reversal of Marx's analysis, replacing the economy with religion, or that Weber's analysis is an interpretation of the world from an idealistic perspective as a power struggle (Swingewood, 1984, p. 151–152). However, both Marx's and Weber's approaches to the development of capitalism show a much more in-depth configuration.

In terms of the development of capitalism, during Marx and Weber's time, Germany and England existed in quite different social and political conditions (Giddens, 1995a). Additionally, both of them were influenced by the great political and social issues of their time. Moreover, an examination of the historical nature of the problematics requests shows the evaluation of the discussions of the Enlightenment and other precursors of Marx and Weber, since their analyses, in terms of the issues they address and the methods they employ, are as comprehensive as those of the Enlightenment. For instance, the social and historical views that developed based on evolutionism and progress within the Enlightenment are one of the most discussed topics in regard to both Marx and Weber and their critics. The subject of progress gives us an idea of what the development of capitalism means and whether the birth of capitalism should be

understood as progress. Progress did not always have a secular meaning, as in modern times, but rather it had moral or religious meanings in ancient civilizations, and when it was rescued from these fetters by the Enlightenment, it took on the meaning of achieving individual freedom, justice, and advancement in knowledge (Nisbet, 1979, p. 8). The Enlightenment developed a new way of thinking that would systematically examine human passions and social institutions within the framework of the common wisdom created by the scientific revolution in the 17th century (Çiğdem, 2021). This way of thinking leads to the conclusion that progress exists in all fields, including history, and that actors progress by creating an objective pattern. The foundation of the concept of society makes history a subject of evaluation in this way. The actors here find their expression in the theory of society first put forward by the Enlightenment. This conception of society is based on the new relations that the transition to a capitalist society had just shaped. In fact, 18th-century Enlightenment thinkers had a series of discussions with both their contemporaries and their predecessors over the meaning of historical progress and what/how it constitutes actual historical progress. Here it should be mentioned that the idea of progress was established by the French Enlightenment thinker Turgot (Çiğdem, 2021, p. 35). He and some of the French Enlightenment thinkers advocated that the history of people experienced different stages of progress, which can be tracked through appropriate instruments such as language, art, technology, and so on. Each of these stages carries an accumulation of the past stages, according to Condorcet, and this view is pioneering in the approach of positivist history (Çiğdem, 2021, p. 38). The Enlightenment's perspective on progress and evolutionism is essential for understanding both its political and economic implications in modern times and the subject under scrutiny. The origins of this form of the idea of progress, which is referred to as a process that involves the accumulation of knowledge, people being content beings through the spread of reason, and the advancement of technology later in the 20th-century radicalism, were laid by the Enlightenment (Nisbet, 1979, p. 32). Clearly, these visions that the Enlightenment improves, such as reason, accumulation, social evolution, and so on, can be tracked through the writings of Marx and Weber and their critics; they are opponents of some and advocates of others, and this fact is examined in subsequent chapters.

One of the debates revolves around the path of history and whether it must reach certain results as a necessity of progress or whether it develops in different societies in different circumstances that might take distinct shapes. If there is a unilinear path every country

has to follow, can the social sciences reach definitive conclusions in a similar way to the natural sciences? If so, this means the creation of society is not related to the actions of human beings; they only can be passive objects who are subjected to historical laws. However, in the case that every country can create its own conditions, can we think of people as active subjects, or are they the result of historical progress? And if it is not the people and society, which have internal forces such as classes-status or mode of production or rationalization, as the source of progress, is it external forces such as expanding trade, population, or improvement of technology?

The Enlightenment's inferring that religion, traditions, and domination were affected by historical studies led to the formation of a history that can be understood by the human mind (Çiğdem, 2021, p. 60). The feature that most characterized the Scottish Enlightenment was historical studies. Adam Smith, representing an understanding of economics that does not neglect the sociohistorical dimension, developed a four-stage theory of history that depends on the division of labor in society. While investigating the causes of the wealth of nations, the progressive understanding of history that he predicts will eventually reach the commercial stage has a teleological character (Callinicos, 2007). Although he explained this theory in his lectures at Glasgow University, he built his theses on this theory throughout his life. Because Smith was still living in a period when the destructive effects of capitalism were less clear than its progressive effects, the main purpose of Smith was to examine how to solve the problems of the final stage and ensure its sustainability (Callinicos, 2007). According to him, the division of labor in society creates an environment where each person pursues their own self-interest, which causes people in society to live in peace, and this relationship between the division of labor and the invisible hand approach brings welfare to all people (Callinicos, 2007). In Smith's four-stage theory, the division of labor holds an important place in how stages take their shape, and he is a pioneer of the idea that advancement and industrial institutions lead to the deterioration of ethical institutions (Çiğdem, 2021, p. 69). The essence of Smith's analysis is evident in that he examines an analysis of history and society through a materialist structure, freeing him from the theological analysis used in the analyses of previous philosophers.

Lastly, it should be noted that, in examining the origins of capitalism, the aims of Marx and Weber differ. Marx aimed to prove capitalism is not always valid because the law of production depends on history, and showing which forces tended to overthrow capitalism

required specifying them (Blackledge, 2006, p. 79). Weber's aim, however, was to explain the lack of capitalistic development in Germany because he was interested in what made Germany politically and economically much more powerful (Callinicos, 2007). According to him, industrial capitalism, as the last stage of development, brought power to Germany, and this was what German national unity needed (Wood, 1995). Although Weber was seen as a fundamental opponent of Marx, he agreed with Marx's views in some ways. Both of them gave importance to the agricultural transformation and its results, which created industrial capitalism—though Weber saw this movement as one part of rationalization, and, for Marx, it was a necessary condition for the development of capitalism (Callinicos, 2007, p. 153, 154). On the other hand, there are fundamental differences in their assessments of the development of capitalism. Weber believed capitalism actually existed in all ancient times and that the foundations of modern capitalism were laid as a result of the economic rationality that emerged as a result of the liberation of cities following the removal of political-cultural barriers and the understanding of work ethics formed by the emphasis of Protestant ethics on the virtue of work. Hence, Weber, who aims to examine the unique features of modern capitalism, finds it not in capitalism, which he equates with the economic field, but in the rise of rationalization and charismatic innovations. Marx, in contrast, transcends the boundaries of political economy, saying every social form constitutes a form of human activity with its own laws and logic, and this concept of mode of production is different from the logic of natural progress (Wood, 1995). These laws of progress find themselves as the existence of the free wage worker in capitalism. In this paper, we examine Weber and Marx's analysis of the emergence and development of capitalism on the basis of their similarities and differences. Moreover, we address the frameworks from Smith, Locke, and Sombart with reference to Marx and Weber's writings.

The focus of this study is not a debate about whether Marx or Weber are correct in their analyses, nor is it a comparison of the defining material aspects of their respective modes of intellectual representation—nor in analyzing how capitalism developed. It is a question of how they explain the formation of capitalism under the circumstances of their own times and historical contexts. We examine and evaluate the thoughts of Marx and Weber and others influenced by them regarding the development of capitalism through sociological, historical, political, and economic contexts. The aim is to show the point of departure of the two thinkers' debate on historical progress is not that Marx argued on the basis of economics and Weber on the basis of culture. Rather, the arguments in

support of this thesis suggest that, despite considerable discrepancies between Weber's and Marx's analyses, Weber's analysis is highly compatible with historical materialism in terms of both some of their findings and the subject of their research, such as the emergence of individual liberty, the development of the division of labor, and even the significance of ideology and religion, despite some disparities in their tone.

In this study, based on the issues they are attempting to address as well as their answer to inquiries about the origins and growth of capitalism, we discuss the main writings of Marx, such as *Capital*, *Grundrisse*, and the 1844 Manuscripts, and of Weber, such as *Protestant Ethic, Economy and Society*, and *General Economic History*, as well as their other writings, letters, speeches, and so on. To do this, we will gather perspectives on the topic of study from both Marx and Weber, as well as some of their followers and critics and subsequent debates. In the first part of this study, we analyze Marx's works and discuss Marx's emphasis on the specificity of the existence of capitalism and his explanations on the emergence of capitalism. We examine the theory of history established by Marx and the methodological framework he followed while establishing it together with the evaluations of his critics. By doing so, we will look at the main approaches to Marx that constitute the core issue in the debates on Marx vs. Weber, such as young Marx–old Marx, transition debates, and so on. In the second part, we delve into Weber's views on the origins and development of capitalism in the context of his own studies, the writers who interpreted his views, and his approaches to current political events because it was a main problem in which he was interested. Weber's theory of history and society and the methodological framework he followed while establishing it will be examined together with the evaluations of others to Weber. We then examine Weber's basic approaches to the origins and development of capitalism, and others' views on him, such as the context of ideal types, the role of the Protestant ethic, and so on. And finally, in the third chapter, we include a comparative overview of the analysis Marx and Weber made based on the arguments in the first and second chapters. The differences and similarities in the views of both of them about how capitalism exists at the beginning will be discussed with respect to their methodologies, subjects of analysis, and approaches to the emergence and development of capitalism. It should also be noted it is beyond the scope of this study to present an analysis of all of Marx's and Weber's analyses or to respond to all of the debates and approaches regarding Marx or Weber. The purpose of this study is to examine and compare Marx's

and Weber's analysis of the origins and development of capitalism, in this context, using the views of secondary authors.

CHAPTER 1

MARX ON THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM

1.1. CAPITALISM AS A SPECIFIC SOCIAL FORMATION

Marx's primary motivation is to show the capitalist system, as a newly emerging mode of production, by examining the specific and distinctive features that distinguish it from precapitalist systems and analyzing the specific historical conditions that create capitalism. Because the main distinctive features of capitalism, the formation of wage labor and, in accordance with this, the generalization of commodity production, are the features that determine the character of capitalism and differentiate it from other modes of production, examining these two features is essential to better understanding the origins of capitalism. He stated this in Capital volume I as follows:

“This result becomes inevitable from the moment there is a free sale, by the labourer himself, of labour-power as a commodity. But it is also only from then onwards that commodity production is generalised and becomes the typical form of production; it is only from then onwards that, from the first, every product is produced for sale and all wealth produced goes through the sphere of circulation. Only when and where wage-labour is its basis does commodity production impose itself upon society as a whole; but only then and there also does it unfold all its hidden potentialities” (Marx, 1995a, p. 444)

For Marx, the distinctive character of capitalism is the separation of laborers from their means of production—and thus the constitution of private property in the means of production and organization of production for the profit motive. One of the fundamental aspects of both the internal structure of production and capitalist society is the division of labor. Marx and Engels explained this, “Division of labour and private property are, moreover, identical expressions: in the one the same thing is affirmed with reference to activity as is affirmed in the other with reference to the product of the activity” (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 15).

For Marx, competition is the key concept here since capitalists must produce increasingly and pursue their ambition of profit to be able to stand within the system as capitalists. Autonomous producers compete over their share, which requires increasing relative surplus value rather than absolute surplus value. This requirement necessitates continual development of the technological and managerial production procedures—

and thus gives capitalism its unique dynamism. This process is expected to result in some changes in social regulations. The modern state must ensure the security of private property rights and support private enterprises to shield both new and existing investments. Moreover, the fact that wage-labor became the main character of society means the division of labor deepens and creates disconnected working environments, and the power of competition causes the individual to exist as an isolated individual in society.

All of these lead us to an important conclusion of Marx, that capital is not just a medium of exchange or a means of accumulating wealth and profit and only under certain conditions: it turns into a social relation. As Marx stated,

“A cotton-spinning machine is a machine for spinning cotton. Only under certain conditions does it become capital. Torn away from these conditions, it is as little capital as gold is itself money, or sugar is the price of sugar” (1934, p. 28).

Another critical point is that these distinctive features of capitalism are not exclusive to capitalism; both wage labor and commodity production also exist in precapitalist societies. What makes them *differentia specifica* of capitalism is that they have become widespread and decisive in all relations and changed society as a whole—and permanently.

This chapter covers Marx’s understanding of the development of capitalism within his general theory of history and society. In this framework, to make sense of his analysis of the rise and development of capitalism, we summarize his theory of history and society. In the first section (1.1.1), we examine Marx’s approach to abstraction and his method of choosing the object of study while approaching concrete events, the importance that Marx attributed to the human being, and the role of production concerning his general approach to the study of history. In Section 1.1.2, we evaluate the concept of alienation and his approach to idealist philosophy and political economy in the context of people’s roles and their importance in history. Therefore, we examine the place Marx gave to the ideas and superstructural elements in his analysis, his approach to defining categories and concepts, and the change of superstructure institutions during the transition to capitalism.

1.1.1. An Introduction to Marx's Understanding

While examining the features that give capitalism its distinctive character, mentioned above as bringing out the wage labor and generalized commodity production, two essential features reveal Marx's analysis of capitalism. The first is "its revolutionary character," which creates fundamental changes within the society's structure globally and permanently (Sayer, 2005, p. 6). And the second is Marx's approach to the new society as the result of modernity; Marx examines the important issues of modernity, such as modern state building, secularization, individualization, industrialization, urbanization, and rationalization, etc. by putting the production and division of labor, the distinctive character of humans, in the front line (Sayer, 2005, p. 7). In this framework, the bourgeois revolution is that one creates a new form of society:

"Thus capital creates the bourgeois society, and the universal appropriation of nature as well as of the social bond itself by the members of society. Hence the great civilizing influence of capital; its production of a stage of society in comparison to which all earlier ones appear as mere local developments of humanity and as nature-idolatry" (Marx, 1993, p. 409)

Marx's examination of capitalism is established on the historical investigation, and in this investigation, he follows a remarkable path for abstract concepts and real events. His investigations go from "conceptually more complex and perceptually particular to conceptually simple and perceptually general," with this respect, the population must be examined by its pieces as classes which is a much better area of investigation than population, and based on components such as wage labor (Hunt, 1984, p. 2). As Marx puts it:

"It would seem to be the proper thing to start with the real and concrete elements, with the actual preconditions, e.g., to start in the sphere of economy with population, which forms the basis and the subject of the whole social process of production. Closer consideration shows, however, that this is wrong. Population is an abstraction if, for instance, one disregards the classes of which it is composed. These classes in turn remain empty terms if one does not know the factors on which they depend, e.g., wage-labour, capital, and so on. These presuppose exchange, division of labour, prices, etc. For example, capital is nothing without wage-labour, without value, money, price, etc. If one were to take population as the point of departure, it would be a very vague notion of a complex whole and through closer definition one would arrive analytically at increasingly simple concepts; from imaginary concrete terms one would move to more and more tenuous abstractions until one reached the most simple definitions. From there it would be necessary to make the journey again in the opposite direction until one arrived once more at the concept of population, which is

this time not a vague notion of a whole, but a totality comprising many determinations and relations" (Marx, 2008, p. 122)

Marx's commentators have considered whether his investigation technique runs parallel to historical development (Hunt, 1984, p. 4). In his words, "the path of abstract thought, rising from the simple to the combined," and within the context,

"There would still always remain this much, however, namely that the simple categories are the expressions of relations within which the less developed concrete may have already realized itself before having posited the more many-sided connection or relation which is mentally expressed in the more concrete category ; while the more developed concrete preserves the same category as a subordinate relation. Money may exist, and did exist historically, before capital existed, before banks existed, before wage labour existed, etc. Thus in this respect it may be said that the simpler category can express the dominant relations of a less developed whole, or else those subordinate relations of a more developed whole which already had a historic existence before this whole developed in the direction expressed by a more concrete category. To that extent the path of abstract thought, rising from the simple to the combined, would correspond to the real historical process" (Marx, 1993, p. 102)

This approach of Marx does not mean that he ignores or disdains empirical results; He also states that social relations cannot be assumed *a priori* and must be evaluated based on empirical results (Blackledge, 2006, p. 29). He is against abstracting a real action or state and then returning and explaining that it is an abstraction after it has been examined (Hunt, 1984, p. 4); it is begging the question. Concerning the concepts of concrete/abstract, there are two different, particularly important interpretations of Marx's idea of historical development. The first is the Hegelian interpretation of Marx, which maintains that capitalism operates according to "non-historical or structural economic theory" (Hunt, 1984, p. 6). This thought results in the idea that all historical epochs or events are comprised of any historical moment. Hence capitalism must be reached as a necessity since it can be deduced from the concept of feudalism "as a logical, deductive conclusion" (Hunt, 1984, p. 6). And the second approach to the issue of understanding capitalism is that it gives importance to the distinctive features of capitalism that diverge capitalist societies from pre-capitalist societies and alter the qualities of society. This is the way that makes capitalism, as well as others, absolutely historically unique. Marx's investigation moves from an abstract understanding of the production of commodities to money relations and later capital as a movement from more general to more concrete. Subsequently, he derives commodity and money relations from their relationship to capital (Hunt, 1984, p. 7). Marx, however, employs both of these strategies in *Capital*,

both of which use induction and inductive reasoning—which should not be confused with a deduction (Hunt, 1984, p. 7). This offers his historical analyses, and the only way one may mistakenly view the features of historical determinism that give direct chronological transitions from feudalism to capitalism or capitalism to communism is if one credits inductive reasoning elements as if they are deductions.

It should also be highlighted that Marx does not prefer the individual to the society for a reliable understanding of society despite his analysis encompassing the smallest component unit. Using the isolated individual as a field of study in the analysis is an approach that Marx particularly criticizes:

“Production by an isolated individual outside society - a rare exception which may well occur when a civilized person in whom the social forces are already dynamically present is cast by accident into the wilderness - is as much of an absurdity as is the development of language without individuals living together and talking to each other” (Marx, 1993, p. 84)

Cooperation in society is an essential feature of human beings since people have to live together, so Marx disdains what he calls Robinsonades (Callinicos, 2007, p. 85; Marx, 1993, p. 83). There are two points worth mentioning: First, Marx sees the human being's potential for development as the condition of "the notion of essential human nature" (Özel, 2018, p. 113). This potential evolves differently in various social conditions and historical periods because Marx does not regard human development in a stationary position or as only a characteristic of a particular society (Özel, 2018, p. 113). Marx considers the human being as a species-being both because as a natural being in terms of its relationship with nature and because as a social being that shapes nature and society through production. And this brings the other central theme in Marx's writing; Production has a central place in the understanding of social, political, and historical wholeness, and this production is not an economic issue but is related to the role of the production process in society (Blackledge, 2006, p. 22). In *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels clearly state that:

“They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organisation. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their actual material life” (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 8)

Production is the way that people realize themselves in society and requires some level of using materials, imagination, and social existence. Marx explains this in *Capital* as follows:

“A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement. He not only effects a change of form in the material on which he works, but he also realises a purpose of his own that gives the law to his modus operandi, and to which he must subordinate his will” (Marx, 1995a, p. 123)

However, the individualized production in capitalism, in which people lose their knowledge about the wholeness of the production process due to specialization, alienates the human essence from human existence.

While Marx shows a resemblance with Smith and Ricardo by putting the examination of production in a prominent role in examining the development of capitalism, it differs from them in several respects. First, as mentioned above, while Marx does not use the isolated human being as a point of analysis, he denounces Smith and Ricardo for using this. In *Grundrisse*,

“Smith and Ricardo still stand with both feet on the shoulders of the eighteenth-century prophets, in whose imaginations this eighteenth-century individual - the product on one side of the dissolution of the feudal forms of society, on the other side of the new forces of production developed since the sixteenth century appears as an ideal, whose existence they project into the past. Not as a historic result but as history's point of departure. As the Natural Individual appropriate to their notion of human nature, not arising historically, but posited by nature” (Marx, 1993, p. 84).

Marx criticizes Smith and Ricardo for not seeing the evaluation of the individual as a creation of history, and as a result of this view, they found that the lonely and alienated appearance of the individual in a society where free competition exists is disconnected from all historical and social ties while the ties of feudalism are dissolving. However, it should be noted that Smith's treatment of the individual as an object of study does not imply that his studies of history alone are the study of individuals or that he sees individuals as the only ones that have shaped history (Meek, 1967, p. 39). Instead, his work represents a much more comprehensive theory of social development, for example, using production and the concept of labor as determining factors in his analysis of society

or examining governance and law in his four stages of history. Using modes of subsistence as an analysis of societies puts production at the center of the analysis, but an important feature that differentiates Marx's analysis from Smith's successive modes of subsistence based on the technology and technique of production of the period is that Marx's analysis is the mode of production (Callinicos, 2007, p. 84). Chapter 1.2.1 will cover in more detail the similarities and differences in the issue of how they consider production and division of labor in their analysis. It can be said that the Scottish Enlightenment laid the origins of the modern social theory, and they were pioneers in examining the problematics based on production and "the theory of history, theory of ethics and theory of political economy" as a whole, as in Marx (Meek, 1967, p. 50). To investigate historical sociology, for instance, Smith devoted the third book of *The Wealth of Nations* to the subject and separated it from his other works on moral philosophy (Hobsbawm, 1998, p.98). Moreover, another feature that brings the Scottish historical school, especially Smith, closer to Marx is that they freed the analysis from the patterns of theology and ensured the development of the materialist understanding of history while studying history and society (Meek, 1967, p. 40). Smith looked at the governance and legal characteristics in the various stages of societies' development, and these characteristics displayed different attributes depending on the mode of production: According to this materialist understanding of history, people's means of subsistence have an impact on their views and behaviors, although Smith was not consistent with this approach (Meek, 1967, p. 41). In this context, the most important factor in the development of the materialist understanding of history is the existence of the concept of labor since the general concept of labor was formed by the development of the capitalist division of labor and did not exist before capitalism, although there were different forms of and incomparably different types of labor in previous ages (Hobsbawm, 1998, p. 159). In these respects, it can be said that the Scottish historical school is similar to Marx's analysis, and Meek expresses this as follow:

“... in the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Scottish Historical School developed this Classical sociology to a stage where it was becoming remarkably similar, at least in its broad outlines, to Marxist sociology” (Meek, 1967, p. 35).

Despite the fact that the Scottish Historical School and the Marxist view of society undoubtedly have much in common, this interpretation of Meek risks falling into anachronism in terms of comparing authors who analyzed under different conditions at different stages of capitalism's development (Callinicos, 2007, p. 24). Since he wrote at

the dawn of capitalism, Smith occasionally tries to justify it by saying that capitalism is a necessity of civilized society that is ultimately better; however, at the same time, Smith saw capitalism's destructive and harmful characteristics. For example, Smith also perceived that the developed division of labor separated workers from their whole production process and left them one separate part of it. And this caused workers not to know how the whole process of production of that product works or that the view that capitalistic development of cities created poor and misery, which can be found in his much more moral consideration of capitalism (Sayer, 1987, p. 11, 12). Therefore, capitalism creates a society in which the development of individualistic exchange and division of labor increases the wealth of the society, and it should be protected with institutions that will provide and ensure a free market (Kaymak, 2020, p. 202). The provision of this civilized society condition is possible with the existence of the trinity formula consisting of wages, profit, and rent, which is crucial for Marx:

“In capital -- profit, or still better capital -- interest, land -- rent, labour -- wages, in this economic trinity represented as the connection between the component parts of value and wealth in general and its sources, we have the complete mystification of the capitalist mode of production, the conversion of social relations into things, the direct coalescence of the material production relations with their historical and social determination. It is an enchanted, perverted, topsy-turvy world, in which *Monsieur le Capital* and *Madame la Terre* do their ghost-walking as social characters and at the same time directly as mere things” (Marx, 1995b, p. 564).

According to Marx's criticism, in this case, the social relationship between production and producers becomes a natural consequence as it is reduced to the exchange, the market economy (Callinicos, 2007, p. 90, 91). The age of commerce now ceases to be a historical conclusion and becomes a natural conclusion that has to be reached; as a teleological approach. On the other hand, for Marx, capitalism, like other systems, is a temporary form of production, and the pursuit of capital accumulation creates its dynamism and the need for constant innovation (Callinicos, 2007, p. 90, 91). The tendency for the rate of profit to fall is Marx's way of showing how this sustained capital accumulation drive works: The owner of the means of production that exists in capitalism, willing to invest continuously, must innovate technically/technologically in order to advance relative surplus rather than the absolute surplus. This increases the productivity of labor, giving this individual producer an advantage over his competitors in the market, but then the overall rate of profit decreases as this technological innovation becomes widespread. This theory, put forward by Ricardo, is based on agriculture and the theory of population: As incomes in agriculture decrease, agricultural products will become more expensive so

that wages will increase and profit rates will decrease (Callinicos, 2007, p. 90, 91). As can be seen, while Ricardo's theory explains this theory with falling productivity and, accordingly, development in technology can slow down this natural law of economy, Marx's theory explains it with increased productivity. Additionally, for Marx, this law that shows a tendency, not an obligation, is peculiar to the capitalist mode of production:

"The progressive tendency of the general rate of profit to fall is, therefore, just an expression peculiar to the capitalist mode of production of the progressive development of the social productivity of labour" (Marx, 1995b, p. 146).

In addition, Marx states that the Malthusian iron law of wages, which says that wages will stay constant at the minimum subsistence level since the population increases faster than agricultural production, does not apply. And that wages, including the physical subsistence level of the wage-labor and the value produced, are determined by class war (Callinicos, 2007, p. 96).

Another important issue we should mention about Marx's understanding of history and of the development of capitalism is his criticism of reductionism. Marx was criticized by several authors for expressing the whole society and history with the framework of economics and ascribing them to solely economic relations. Using the assessments of production processes in the analysis of history was Marx's main method. Meanwhile, he advocated the unity of all concepts and that no schematic determination could be made from them (Blackledge, 2006, p. 25). As Marx and Engels noted in *German Ideology*:

"When reality is depicted, philosophy as an independent branch of knowledge loses its medium of existence. At the best its place can only be taken by a summing-up of the most general results, abstractions which arise from the observation of the historical development of men. Viewed apart from real history, these abstractions have in themselves no value whatsoever. They can only serve to facilitate the arrangement of historical material, to indicate the sequence of its separate strata. But they by no means afford a recipe or schema, as does philosophy, for neatly trimming the epochs of history" (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 12)

He aimed to avoid the error of simplifying history to production by claiming that each of the factors in society matters: "The concrete is concrete because it is the concentration of many determinations, hence unity of the diverse" (Marx, 1993, p. 101). While we will return to this in the next chapter, we must point out that for Marx, classes cannot be reduced to either status or consciousness in terms of the discussion of the driving force

of history. Classes give the contradictions of society, including status and consciousness, as a whole, and it is the relations of personal dependence that create this (Blackledge, 2006, p. 28). Additionally, Marx's position about explaining historical facts with several elements of society, specifically related to the economy, creates some interpretations. Firstly, predeterminism means people have no active influence on the events, and "the political result is fatalism" (Sherman, 1981, p. 61). Some readings of Marx's writings give rise to the notion that society will be created as a result of general ideas that are left without actions. If history is determined independently by human actions, the development of economic forces leads automatically to socialism; hence the political struggle has no importance (Sherman, 1981, p. 64). However, some Marxists believed in this idea of automatic development of forces but also advocated the struggles and criticized the inevitable result idea. The second is scientific determinism, which means there are explanatory factors behind our observations of facts. Those explanatory factors include both human actions and consciousness and the economic, social, and political structure of society (Sherman, 1981, p. 69). The deterministic forces here may indicate the factors that are certain to produce a direct result, as well as the factor that is likely to produce an effect; that is, they contain complex dynamic relationships that lie within them (Blackledge, 2006, p. 15). Some authors base the view that Marxism has a strict deterministic approach on the writings of Engels, while others say that this is due to the differences of opinion between Marx and Engels. Consistent with Hobsbawm's assessment, Engels' analyzes are at a less broad level than Marx's, and in some respects, he has a different area of interest (Hobsbawm, 1965, p. 53). Although it can be said that there are obvious differences in their writings, Marx and Engels formed a close friendship for struggle and intellectual life rather than an independent corpus (Blackledge, 2006, p. 20). In this respect, since it is not possible for Marx and Engels to continue their long friendship and collaboration without knowing each other's views, we will not dwell further on the distinction between them.

1.1.2. The Basic Structure of Marx's Writings; The Importance of Ideology and Superstructure

The writings of Marx on the emergence of capitalism and his emphasis on the role of ideology and superstructure are insightful to understanding his theory of history. In this respect, the first important point is the role and importance of people in shaping society. Marx's early works have two central themes; the first is his criticisms of idealist

philosophy and political economy in which human relations are seen not as relations and actions between subjects but as the interaction of objects (Swingewood, 1984, p. 66). The second is alienation; while humankind creates themselves and society through their activities, on the other hand, the world created by them becomes alien and hostile to them. In other words, it is the decisive role of the active subject in the social world that makes *1844 Early Manuscripts* important. In addition, in a famous passage from *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, he underlines the role of the man in history:

“Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under the circumstances chosen by themselves, but under the circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living” (Marx, 1972, p. 10).

In this fragment, he addresses a relationship that builds the course of history between the active subject and the structure of society that is taken from the past. But there is a concern with this explanation; if alienation turns people, in time, into objects who do not have any power to create change, then how is it possible that human beings as active subjects are a motor power of change (Swingewood, 1984, p. 68)? Later writers commented on which elements' relative weights were effective in solving the problems of *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, which Marx brought to the process of connecting the active subject as a part of society and the structure of society (Blackledge, 2006, p. 153). Some of them find a solution to this by saying that Marx changed his view after his early writings in his later writings from humanism to a more scientific or historical way of thinking. And after Marx matured his view of history, he gave more importance to the structure of society. And former writings of Marx are pre-Marxist thoughts that have to be eliminated before the scientific examination (Mandel, 1971, p. 164). On the other hand, others claim that Marx's view of history reached its mature form in the 1840s, and he did not give up on it (Blackledge, 2006, p. 20). Accordingly, his writings must be considered “an integral whole” (Hunt, 1997). Besides them, others say that there is a shift in the basic emphasis of his writings to giving more importance to the explanatory power of production, but this is not mean Marx gets rid of early thoughts on the importance of active human beings in history (Swingewood, 1984, p. 63, 64). Accordingly, Marx used the idea of the fetishism of the commodity more extensively in his later writings, such as *Capital*, even if he continued to be loyal to the concept of alienation. Commodity fetishism here constitutes a more scientifically grounded explanation for society, as it means that people lose the

authority of their labor power to the owner of instruments of production (Swingewood, 1984, p. 69).

Marx's content, which sees the real world not as the appearance of the 'idea' but as the reflection of the real world on human thought, has been "stay on their feet" of Hegel's dialectic (Mandel, 1971, p. 167). He transformed the concepts taken from Hegel and Feuerbach's philosophy into socio-economic categories by criticizing these categories (Mandel, 1971, p. 167). In the Afterward To The Second German Edition of Capital, he expresses it as follows:

"My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of "the Idea," he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of "the Idea." With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought" (Marx, 1995a, p. 593)

In the preface of *Contribution*, Marx underlines that the driving force of history is not consciousness when he says, "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness" (Marx, 2008, p. 4). While this statement was expressed by Marx against Hegel's approach that the ideal has the primary determinative power over the material, it seems to contain a certain amount of determinism (Sayer, 1987, p. 84, 85). Accordingly, the information about the material world, which is perceived by the senses, appoints the ideological world of society, so this schema of thinking indicates an equivalence relationship that the ideological world presents a match with social structure (Swingewood, 1984, p. 78). Marx uses both the superstructure, which includes institutions of culture, ideology, and politics, and the base, which includes human and technical resources (Swingewood, 1984, p. 81). Some see this as an equivalence relationship that gives away the functional deterministic approach, whose function is observed as mystifying social relations and hiding contradictions (Swingewood, 1984, p. 78). Thus, he explains his approach to the association between ide/ideal and the structure of society in the *Eighteenth Brumaire* by saying,

"Upon the different forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, rises an entire superstructure of different and distinctly formed sentiments, illusions, modes of thought and views of life. The entire class creates and forms them out of

its material foundations and out of the corresponding social relations" (Marx, 1972, p. 37).

And a question arises here; Can the real's superstructure be experimentally distinguished from other social formations and characterized as a distinct entity, or is it the form imprinted in consciousness throughout all material relations (Sayer, 1987, p. 84)?

Althusser's solution to this was to distinguish between Marx's writings by saying that Marx's approach to analysis matured in his latter studies. According to this, Marx had an epistemological break in 1845, and because of this, his writings moved from ideological philosophy to his new philosophy, dialectical materialism (Althusser, 2005, p. 33). He states that:

"This epistemological break' divides Marx's thought into two long essential periods: the ' ideological ' period before, and the scientific period after, the break in 1845" (Althusser, 2005, p. 34).

Accordingly, the concept of alienation is an approach that Marx later abandoned, and this is necessary for the transition to the scientific method (Mandel, 1971, p. 176). The understanding of humanism observed in Marx's early writings should be rejected as it considers the definition of ideology as an illusory and unreal projection of the external world (Swingewood, 1998, p. 290, 291). This approach, which Althusser criticizes, is against the idea that ideology grows in the consciousness and experiences of the "active subject" rather that, according to him, ideology cannot be reduced to political or economic levels; it is a form of relations between the individual and the world (Swingewood, 1984, p. 290, 291). He states this as follows

"Ideology, then, is the expression of the relation between men and their ' world', that is, the (overdetermined) unity of the real relation and the imaginary relation between them and their real conditions of existence" (Althusser, 2005, p. 233).

Marx's method of analysis in *Capital* is dialectical, and it should be seen not as an inversion but as the establishment of this contemporary science explained by a new philosophy (Sezgin, 2008, p. 71). According to Althusser, there is a situation in which many variables coexist relatively autonomously in the progression of history:

"that the new society produced by the Revolution may itself ensure the survival, that is, the reactivation, of older elements through both the forms of its new superstructures and specific (national and international) 'circumstances'" (Althusser, 2005, p. 116).

He expresses that the levels of social structure can be separated from the economic level (Sayer, 1987, p. 52). Besides, he argued that as overdetermination, in which each level of social formation explains the existence of relative autonomy, each level with relative autonomy determines other levels since they are internal to each other (Blackledge, 2006, p. 164, 165). Althusser's explanation of Marx's difference from Hegel is that he sees society, unlike Hegel, not only by observing the effects of an element alone but by the interaction of many different effects (Sezgin, 2008, p. 72). It should be noted that Althusser's deepening of the distinction between socio-economic formation and the mode of production, which was created by Marx, is an important contribution to his studies (Blackledge, 2006, p. 164).

In line with the thoughts expressed above, Marx denies the existence of an independent superstructure; they do not have an independent history;

"Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. They have no history, no development; but men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking" (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 11)

He expands this proposition to include politics and law:

"It must not be forgotten that law has just as little an independent history as religion" (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 40).

Treating the elements of the superstructure as if they have their own independent existence and history is reification, and the main purpose of denying the independency of the superstructure is to criticize the decisive role that the idealist understanding of history assigns to the superstructure elements and not to give them a secondary position (Sayer, 1987, p. 89). In *Capital* Volume 1, Marx states that superstructure has an important place in the production and reproduction of society by saying: "Protestantism, by changing almost all the traditional holidays into workdays, plays an important part in the genesis of capital" (Marx, 1995a, p. 201).

As seen in his later writings such as *Capital*, in which Althusser said that he has switched to the scientific method, Marx emphasizes the significance of superstructure institutions in addition to discussing the founding roles of religion and philosophy on the basis of alienation and the division of labor in the Manuscripts. Besides, Engels expresses that superstructure institutions determine the direction and form of change, not the passive reproduction of the economic structure (Swingewood, 1984, p. 74). Correspondingly, Thompson, a critic of Althusser, argues that it should not be understood as it is any level but that it is an important part of social relations by stating that

“For I found that law did not keep politely to a 'level' but was at every bloody level; it was imbricated within the mode of production and productive relations themselves (as property-rights, definitions of agrarian practice) and it was simultaneously present in the philosophy of Locke; it intruded brusquely within alien categories, reappearing bewigged and gowned in the guise of ideology; it danced a cotillon with religion, moralising over the theatre of Tyburn; it was an arm of politics and politics was one of its arms; ... “ (Thompson, 1995, p. 130)

In particular, the law exists as a network that makes property a social relation rather than a level, historical examples of which are 'the Law on Thefts of Wood', 'Bloody Code' or 'Enclosure Acts', which show that this structure of law does not take the form of the relative autonomy of one-time, since they shape the future situation of the property relations (Sayer, 1987, p. 52). And when it comes to the subject, Thompson, in opposition to Althusser, develops his own socialist humanism by saying that humanism is an integral part of Marxism (Blackledge, 2006, p. 171, 172). Accordingly, class exists not as a structure or category but in people's relationships. In Althusser's view, on the other hand, history was not made by subjects, but history developed as “a process without a subject” (Blackledge, 2006, p. 163).

Another important point in his writings is that Marx uses categories and concepts like they have multiple meanings. This multiplicity of meanings leads to different interpretations while explaining the role that concepts play in the interpretation of his works. Marx grasped the categories and concepts in real terms and saw them as an aspect of social reality (Sayer, 1987, p. 20, 21). In the preface to Volume 3 of *Capital*, Engels said that Marx did not strictly and sharply define categories:

“... They rest upon the false assumption that Marx wishes to define where he only investigates, and that in general one might expect fixed, cut-to-measure, once and for all applicable definitions in Marx's works. It is self-evident that where things and

their interrelations are conceived, not as fixed, but as changing, their mental images, the ideas, are likewise subject to change and transformation; and they are not encapsulated in rigid definitions, but are developed in their historical or logical process of formation." (Engels, 1894, p. 11)

According to a view, the definition of a category will spread to other categories, Marx implies, and isolated descriptions of factors are "necessarily 'one-sided' and possibly misleading" (Ollman, 2012, p. 59). Marx's categories are transhistorical, but their definite explanations are attained only in their historical context; that is, they are not defined as immutable over time (Sayer, 1987, p. 20, 21). Therefore, he did not see the world, like an atomist, as linked but separate and interacting categories, but instead as a "complex network of internal relations" (Sayer, 1987, p. 19). Accordingly, the superstructure is not an empirically distinguishable category, but the ideal form manifested in consciousness within the base itself, hence if elements such as the protestant work ethic, division of labor, etc. 'materialized' in the production process, then they became part of productive force (Sayer, 1987, p. 26, 27). Marx's statement is that he criticizes the definition of categories as discrete units and emphasizes the importance of their historical context as follows:

"In each historical epoch, property has developed differently and under a set of entirely different social relations. Thus to define bourgeois property is nothing else than to give an exposition of all the social relations of bourgeois production. To try to give a definition of property as of an independent relation, a category apart, an abstract and eternal idea, can be nothing but an illusion of metaphysics or jurisprudence" (Marx, 1955, p. 104)

This approach is criticized, as Marx criticized Feuerbach, for tending to hide contradictions and historical background by seeing concepts only as abstract images formed in consciousness. Whatever the reason lies behind this, Marx certainly uses concepts with historical meanings rather than definite meanings.

While looking at the analysis of superstructure in Marx's examinations of the transition to capitalism, we should also look at the evolution of superstructure institutions in Marx's periodization of the development of capitalism. Examining the development of capitalism, Marx noticed that there are two observed stages: The first stage is the manufacturing stage from the mid-16th century to the end of the 18th century, and the second is the modern industrial period from the later part of the 18th century to the current life of Marx, in which machine production became widespread. The first stage was observed as the

period when wage labor realized and changed social relations, and a new work discipline and understanding emerged. This means that there is a new "methodical calculation" in capitalism (Sayer, 2005, p. 24). The results of this new cooperation are expressed by Marx as follows:

"It is clear that this direct dependence of the operations, and therefore of the labourers, on each other, compels each one of them to spend on his work no more than the necessary time, and thus a continuity, uniformity, regularity, order, and even intensity of labour, of quite a different kind, is begotten than is to be found in an independent handicraft or even in simple co-operation" (Marx, 1995a, p. 242).

The development of an ethical understanding suitable for this new way of cooperation occurs with the creation of a new cultural understanding:

"The advance of capitalist production develops a working-class, which by education, tradition, habit, looks upon the conditions of that mode of production as self-evident laws of Nature" (Marx, 1995a, p. 541).

And the modern industrial stage is the period in which the control of production is focused in the control of the master, with the development of machinery, in which its conditions evolved as a necessity of the manufacturing period, and the transformation in the form of the accumulation from absolute surplus to relative surplus (Sayer, 2005, p. 24-27). At this stage, as a result of the gathering of the means of production in the hands of the capitalist, it resorts to the power of science and technology development and tries to increase its profits rationally. This "real subordination of labor to capital" is the form of the social connection between capitalist and worker. In addition, the division of labor in the workplace and the competition between firms combine to create specialization; now, each worker is only responsible for their own production and lacks knowledge of other parts or processes. As Marx put it:

"The special skill of each individual insignificant factory operative vanishes as an infinitesimal quantity before the science, the gigantic physical forces, and the mass of labour that are embodied in the factory mechanism and, together with that mechanism, constitute the power of the "master."" (1995a, p. 293)

To return to the idea of human beings in history, it can be arguable that Marx's early writings covered the topic of people in history within the concept of alienation. The concept of alienation of labor has four components: "estranges nature from man,"

"estranges man from himself," "estranges man from his species," and, finally, "estranges from the others" (Marx, 1974, p. 42). This alienation manifests itself in the capitalist system as a cause of private property, not the other way around at first:

"It is true that we took the concept of alienated labor (alienated life) from political economy as a result of the movement of private property. But it is clear from an analysis of this concept that, although private property appears as the basis and cause of alienated labor, it is in fact its consequence, just as the gods were originally not the cause but the effect of the confusion in men's minds. Later, however, this relationship becomes reciprocal." (Marx, 1974, p. 44)

By extending the alienation that Feuerbach focused on only as religious alienation to other fields, it shows the effects of the alienation of human existence from the human essence, such as religious alienation, economic alienation, and political alienation (Hunt, 1997). The understanding that Marx saw economic alienation as the ultimate determinant of other kinds of alienation, and that political and religious alienation is only a reflection of economic alienation, which is seen as the base, gives rise to the critique that Marx was an economic determinist and neglected other areas (Hunt, 1997). Against this claim, in Marx's view, alienation was seen in pre-capitalist societies as ideological alienation or religious alienation, etc., as a result of the social division of labor, but in the capitalist mode of production, it recreates the system by taking an extra aspect (Mandel, 1971, p. 180, 181). Marx's purpose in analyzing alienation was not to be interested in the "nature of alienation" or "historical origins of private property" but examining the "nature of private property" (Mandel, 1971, p. 161). The theory of economic alienation set the ground for his economic theory such as commodity fetishism, value theory, etc., while separating early works of the approach of alienation from his later pieces of economic theory creates diverse Marxes such as young Marx, deterministic Marx, etc. (Hunt, 1997).

The issue of the distinction between objectification and alienation made by Marx is unique; objectification is inevitable as people realize themselves, but alienation is observed historically, not universally (Swingewood, 1984, p. 65). Marx puts the explanation of objectification and his criticisms of the approach of political economy to it as follows

"The product of labor is labor embodied and made material in an object, it is the objectification of labor. The realization of labor is its objectification. In the sphere of political economy, this realization of labor appears as a loss of reality for the worker,

objectification as loss of and bondage to the object, and appropriation as estrangement, as alienation.” (Marx, 1974, p. 39)

While Hegel sees alienation as an inevitable part of human history while expressing objectification and alienation into each other (Swingewood, 1984, p. 65), separating alienation and objectification in this way is characteristic of Marx's approach.

Althusser's declaration that the early writings of Marx are philosophical, and the whole of his understanding is combining the philosophical categories with political economy, gives way to the idea that Marx constructs a new system of thinking and creates new science as mentioned above (Mandel, 1971, p. 157). According to Mandel, the primary fault of this view is accepting the Manuscripts as a concluding work of Marx that represents his whole ideology (Mandel, 1971, p. 158). Also, He contends that it is incorrect to assume that Marx substitutes the idea of the fetishism of commodities for alienation in the Capital. Analysis of capitalist societies is what constitutes the idea of the fetishism of commodities, whereas alienation, which also includes an analysis of the capitalist mode of production, encompasses a considerably wider broad range of subjects (Mandel, 1971, p. 183, 184).

While the other claim of Althusser is that the vision of alienation is a picture that existed in the works of the previous period and which Marx later surpassed, the concept of Alienation is mentioned in the *Grundrisse*, which was written in the period that he considered the timeline of mature works of Marx (Mandel, 1971, p. 177). In *Grundrisse*, The Chapter on Money,

“... Universally developed individuals, whose social relations, as their own communal [gemeinschaftlich] relations, are hence also subordinated to their own communal control, are no product of nature, but of history. The degree and the universality of the development of wealth where this individuality becomes possible supposes production on the basis of exchange values as a prior condition, whose universality produces not only the alienation of the individual from himself and from others, but also the universality and the comprehensiveness of his relations and capacities. In earlier stages of development the single individual seems to be developed more fully, because he has not yet worked out his relationships in their fullness, or erected them as independent social powers and relations opposite himself.” (Marx, 1993, p. 162)

Besides, Marx persisted in using the idea of alienation in Capital.

“Since, before entering on the process, his own labour has already been alienated from himself by the sale of his labour-power, has been appropriated by the capitalist and incorporated with capital, it must, during the process, be realised in a product that does not belong to him. Since the process of production is also the process by which the capitalist consumes labour-power, the product of the labourer is incessantly converted, not only into commodities, but into capital, into value that sucks up the value-creating power, into means of subsistence that buy the person of the labourer, into means of production that command the producers.” (Marx, 1995a, p. 430)

In conclusion, it is clear how important it is for Marx to study this new formation of social life in terms of examining the historical development of Capitalism. Since he saw production as the distinguishing feature of human life from other living things, he gave central importance to production in his studies, not in an economic deterministic sense, but as a complex relationship of economic and social elements. According to my thought, although the distinction between his early and later period writings seems to be a difference in nuance, he rose on the ideas he built in his early writings and did not make any major changes in his thoughts.

1.2. ON THE ORIGINS OF CAPITALISM

The birth of the capitalist system created market dependence, both for immediate producers, by taking their means of subsistence and making them wage-dependent laborers, and for those who own the means of production by making production too big for small-scale trade to compete, as in the former system. The distinctive characteristic of capitalism is the dominance of wage labor, in which labor is a good that can be purchased and sold. The occurrence of the capitalist form led to the collapse of the relations and institutions of the old system. Marx put this in *Capital*, “The economic structure of capitalist society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society. The dissolution of the latter set free the elements of the former” (Marx, 1995a, p. 521).

The result of this is that the emergence of the capitalist system was accelerated by the development of trade, the discovery of new lands and mines, and technical development, which contributed to the disintegration of the feudal system. But also, Marx especially stated the products sold in the market, the increase in circulation and exchange, and the concentration of capital in the control of a small number of people did not create the capitalist system. Thus, he underlined that money and goods are not capital just by themselves. For this to happen, there must be new production relations that create it.

The birth of capitalism created a radical and essential change in the design of society. The main problem here is about the source of these changes; what is the motor power or motivating force behind these changes? The first question on the subject is whether the basis of these changes should be sought in the forces available within the existing system or are due to effects external to the system. In other words, is the motivating power of change internal or external? If this effect develops exogenously, its source might be due to the expansionary trend created by the generalization of trade and production of goods, as Pirenne argued, or to demographic reasons such as population expansion and rural–urban migration. If the source of this change is internal, which essential element of the system, of “the mode of production” as Marx’s unit of analysis, brings about this change—is it the expansion of the forces of production or the contradictions in the relations of production? The development of the productive forces corresponds to the determinism that will be established by the development of the technical conditions of the current production, whereas the contradictions of the relations of production give us the class conflict and the property relations it will create

In the current chapter, we examine Marx's views on the origins of capitalism in a way that includes different issues. In the first section (1.2.1), the concern is the content of Marx's early works in which Marx, in *German Ideology*, showed how the new antagonism created by the deepening division of labor, especially in cities, changed social and property relations. In later works, such as *Capital*, he examined how the transformation occurs. Particularly, the beginning of the accumulation procedure of capital laid the foundations for the birth of the capitalist system. The view in which Marx adopted a deterministic approach closer to Smith's views and presupposes what needs to be explained in his previous works—and Marx broke with these views with the *Grundrisse*—constitutes one aspect of this analysis of his works. Did Marx presuppose the “birth of capitalism,” which he tried to explain due to the importance he gave to the advancement of cities and division of labor in his early works? Does he have a deterministic approach in these works, or is this a conception related to Marx's unit of analysis? What other differences are observed between Marx's earlier writings, such as *German Ideology*, and his later writings, such as *Grundrisse* and *Capital*? In the second section (1.2.2), we examine how Marx evaluates the bourgeois revolutions in these contexts: what is the role of the existing classes in the old society? Are classes there the determining element in the transition? In the shifting period from feudalism to capitalism, the analysis of Marx shows different methods of transition, and which of these ways has the dominant power

in transition is a debated issue among academics: the expansion of merchant capital or taking control of production by the merchant, or the revolutionary way where a producer becomes a merchant. Marx's analysis of the start of the capitalist accumulation process is another sample. The beginning of the accumulation of capital is concerned with the separation of labor from their means of subsistence and the control of capital over society. Another contentious issue in section 1.2.3 is what caused this beginning, which involves the system's inherent inconsistencies on one side and shocks from outside factors on the other. In the final section (1.2.4), we cover the various stages Marx looked at in his works and how they related to the transition. Do these stages show the only way to transition to capitalism, or is that an examination of the historical process? If the development of productive forces, which is another internal force, follows the same path all around history and the world, these stages must develop in an orderly fashion and end up with capitalism. Is this approach compatible with Marx's approach, specifically in *Capital*? Some controversies follow issues, both for those examining the beginning of capitalism and those exploring Marx's thoughts. They inspired different qualitative and quantitative studies that claimed to depend on Marx or on his framework. We include some of these debates in our writing, according to their relevance.

1.2.1. Role of the Division of Labor

Marx and Engels began *German Ideology* with an explanation of the existence of people, saying people create themselves in society by producing. Conscious production separates humans from other living beings (Marx, 1974, p. 42). Production includes both natural relations and social relations, and the productive forces, which contain the human labor force and the instruments of production, show the productivity of society. Therefore, for Marx, people's relationships with themselves and with society are determined by their productive activity (Callinicos, 2007, p. 85). The mode of cooperation, which is a force of production itself, and a certain mode of production in a society determines the nature of society: "How far the productive forces of a nation are developed is shown most manifestly by the degree to which the division of labor has been carried" (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 8).

The capitalist system is a unique instance of the growth of forces of production. The relationship between individuals who use labor power, who are alienated from their instrument of production, themselves, and the relationship between them and those who

control the means of production, results in the creation of private property. Then this relationship turns to the interrelation of private property and alienated labor (Marx, 1974). Marx, in *German Ideology*, was interested in the different phases of society that depend on the division of labor that shows the changing roles of individuals in society. And they state this,

“The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the actual means of subsistence they find in existence and have to reproduce. This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the production of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production” (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 8).

In his writings, production and the conditions determining the production have particular importance for expressing the role of division of labor, which is defined by the development of the forces of production. After this passage, Marx described the different stages of the division of labor, which show the realization of property relations determined by the existing stage. He explained the characteristics of different divisions of labor by outlining the division between town and country. Further antagonism results from the divergence between urban and country interests. Marx thus showed the effect of the change in the division of labor on the change in property relations and the change in the way of living in the town and country. Marx put this change in *German Ideology*: With the fact that the crafts (like weaving), which were once done together with agriculture, started to exist as a separate sector of production in towns since its former production in countries could not fulfill the requirements of extending population and circulation, the transformation of agricultural ties separated the peasants from the land and led them to towns. Direct producers fleeing the countryside was no longer coming to the guilds but to the manufacture since manufacturing was the dominant power now, and some of these peasants became “vagabonds,” which was strictly forbidden, and this gradually decreased with the rise of manufacturing (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 34). Furthermore, those who escaped the abuse of the guilds and the bad payouts found a place in manufacturing. Thus, the dynamics between those who control the means of production and direct producers were altered. The beginning of the manufacturing era resulted in the beginning of towns being freed from the guilds that maintained production in the feudal system. The movable capital of merchants and the manufacturers’ capital that

gained enormous weight against the “natural” estate capital changed property relations entirely. After that, the fortification of competition led to the divergence of commercial and industrial functions, bringing forth the division between mental and manual labor. The new type of labor division eventually changes how production instruments are distributed, which affects how communities and countries control their labor forces.

Explanations of how the mode of production changed and what caused it mostly depend on the production via the division of labor. This analysis leads to the idea that Marx’s early writings give importance to the transition in a “mechanically deterministic sense” (Brenner, 1989, p. 275). This relationship can be seen as a certain way of movement in the transition to capitalism. In this schema, specialization and cooperation, two components of the division of labor, are brought about by the growth in the forces of production. The division of mental labor and physical labor that results from the realization of the division of labor changes how property relations and classes are organized (Brenner, 1989, p. 275). The schema is explicitly explained by Brenner while clarifying the idea of differences between Marx’s early and later studies. Accordingly, early publications by Marx agree with Smith’s use of the commercialization model. The development of preexisting variables like trade expansion and market dependency led to the shift to the capitalist system: it presupposes what needs to be explained (Wood, 2002, p. 3). According to Brenner, in his early writings, Marx has several characteristics in common with Smith’s view of history that the decisive character is the division of labor. Correspondingly, the individual who depends on trade to survive is the focus of Smith’s study regarding the shift to the current capitalist system. Because they are no longer connected to the means of production, individuals must compete in the market to stay alive. The individual specializes in protecting and increasing his interest and makes technical developments to withstand competition. This lowers costs for the direct producer via specialization and increases efficiency via competition (Brenner, 2007, p. 61). Although Marx’s analysis is not based on the isolated individual, in Brenner’s view, both Marx and Smith agree the mechanism leading to this division of labor is the growth of trade and market relations as a universally valid pattern, though Marx focuses on each historical epoch of the division of labor for relations of class and of production (Brenner, 1989, p. 282).

The division of labor occupies an essential place in Smith’s four-stage theory of history, and it was the transformation of rural agriculture that created the Age of Commerce (i.e.,

capitalism, which was the most advanced stage of cities and exchange). However, unlike Marx, Smith is not concerned with the dispossession and the change in property relations created by the transition (Kaymak, 2020, p. 202). According to Marx, the transformation of agriculture explicitly refers to the process of creating private property, which involves separating laborers from their means of livelihood. The approach that brings Marx and Smith closer is that a new kind of division of labor gives capitalism its unique character—because both Smith and Marx showed this new division of labor had independent principles like any other. Although the social surplus was treated as part of the rent by most of the former thinkers, Smith viewed this new division of labor as rent, profit, and wage labor. He evaluated the source of profit as the productivity of labor; therefore, it was possible to talk about the origin of capital accumulation. It was important that profit be explained independently and in terms of the surplus taken away from the worker to show the origin of capital accumulation in the new division of labor (Meek, 1977, p. 7). However, Smith's definition of capitalism shows the final stage to be reached, and all other stages are organized accordingly. Therefore, Smith posits the existence of individuals who maximized their interests and produced commodities accordingly in other stages of society, whereas Marx offers a detailed examination of the features of the mode of production of every stage of division of labor. In conclusion, the common characteristic between Marx and Smith is the central position of production in analyzing society (Kaymak, 2020, p. 213).

Furthermore, Marx was aware of the problem of presuming what needs to be explained. Marx stressed the significance of elucidating the origins of current relations, such as the relations of bourgeois production and the division of labor, credit, and funds, which are taken as "fixed, immutable, eternal categories" by economists in the *Poverty of Philosophy*, which Brenner claims is one of his early writings (Marx, 1955, p. 70). As stated in the 1844 Manuscripts and the introduction to *German Ideology*, it is the production that makes a person socially exist, so the production and reproduction of life determine the course of history. It had some common features throughout history, but its division into periods varied according to the characteristics of production. Marx put this as follows:

"M. Proudhon, the economists, understands very well that men make cloth, linen, or silk materials in definite relations of production. But what he has not understood is that these definite social relations are just as much produced by men as linen, flax, etc. Social relations are closely bound up with productive forces. In acquiring new

productive forces men change their mode of production; and in changing their mode of production, in changing the way of earning their living, they change all their social relations. The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill society with the industrial capitalist. The same men who establish their social relations in conformity with the material productivity, produce also principles, ideas, and categories, in conformity with their social relations. Thus the ideas, these categories, are as little eternal as the relations they express. They are historical and transitory products. There is a continual movement of growth in productive forces, of destruction in social relations, of formation in ideas; the only immutable thing is the abstraction of movement — mors immortalis.” (Marx, 1955, p. 73)

The decisiveness of the productive forces is important because it creates consequences related to the social relations of production and property relations. The above quote has been seen as evidence of technological determinism in the early studies of Marx (1955), whereas Hilton saw this expression as a reference to contradictions in the relations of production; class conflicts between direct workers and those who have the authority of production show the existing mode of production (Üşür, 1992, p. 436).

In German ideology, relations of production and forces of production are portrayed together. “These conditions of existence are, of course, only the productive forces and forms of intercourse at any particular time” (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 45). The concept of forms of intercourse, expressed in *German Ideology* as a field of analysis of production, is an early expression of the relations of production developed in detail in *The Poverty of Philosophy* (Blackledge, 2006, p. 27). Moreover, the productive forces, which is another area of analysis, consisted of both human productive power and the existing technological structure, and the advancement of the forces of production was related to the importance of production for history and social relations (Blackledge, 2006, p. 27). Therefore, one can deduce Marx expounded on the transition from one form to another, which created new social relations that caused new class and property relations while demonstrating the role of forces of production and the relations of production. Consequently, the importance Marx attached to the expansion of trade and market relations did not mean they were the motor forces of history, though they had an influence on transition.

1.2.2. Bourgeoisie's Role in the Development of Capitalism and the Question of the Bourgeois Revolution

In Marx's explanations, the roles of classes in the transition from feudalism to capitalism constitute an essential point. There are distinct debates about bourgeois revolutions, both about the preconditions and class character that make up the bourgeois character of revolutions and about the extreme nature of revolutions, which form a cluster of many issues in the transition from socialism to capitalism (Üşür, 1990, p. 158). The second discussion relates to the bourgeois revolutions developing democracy from below, with the inclusion of the newly developing classes and internalizing democracy into the society—and therefore whether this developing democracy will be democratic in the transition from capitalism to socialism or show a severe revolutionary character (Davidson, 2012, p. 13). Although this discussion will not be discussed in detail here because in this section we examine the impact of bourgeois revolutions on the development of capitalism and the preconditions that created it, the characteristics of revolution should be mentioned. Marx explained in detail the importance and specific features of revolutions in transitioning from feudalism to capitalism. In the Manifesto:

“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 mediaeval commune; here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France), 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, cornerstone 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” (Marx & Engels, 1998, p. 33).

When the existing production conditions were insufficient to meet the progress, the bourgeoisie would displace the old forces and become a hegemonic power. The bourgeoisie combated the feudal power, nobility, and monarchy. As agricultural transformation uprooted laborers from the land and centralized means of production, it led to political centralization (Marx & Engels, 1998, p. 36), and the rise of the bourgeoisie gave birth to the proletarians, who found themselves in the war to defend their livelihood conditions. The English Revolution, which was headed by the “trading and industrial classes in town and country, the yeomen and progressive gentry,” with the support of parliament, was fundamentally a class war and demonstrated the interdependence of

economic and political impacts (Hill, 1979, p. 4, 5). However, the initially disorganized workers did not go to fight against the bourgeoisie but against “the enemies of their enemies, the remnants of absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial bourgeois, the petty bourgeoisie” (Marx & Engels, 1998, p. 41). The Communist Manifesto showed the revolutions of the bourgeoisie have historically played a revolutionary role. However, Marx certainly did not ignore the consequences of the brutal process that led to the formation of these revolutions by saying, "Thus the whole historical movement is concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie; every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie" (Marx & Engels, 1998, p. 41).

Finally, another issue that should be mentioned regarding this issue is Marx's approach to the nature of revolutions. Accordingly, the reason the bourgeois revolutions belong to the bourgeoisie, not to the countries, is they occur in response to the needs of the period in which they take place and radically change the structure of the society, according to the laws of capitalism. Marx expressed it this way in an article in 1848:

“The revolutions of 1648 and 1789 were not English and French revolutions, they were revolutions of a European type. They did not represent the victory of a particular class of society over the old political order; they proclaimed the political order of the new European society. The bourgeoisie was victorious in these revolutions, but the victory of the bourgeoisie was at that time the victory of a new social order, the victory of bourgeois ownership over feudal ownership, of nationality over provincialism, of competition over the guild, of the division of land over primogeniture, of the rule of the landowner over the domination of the owner by the land, of enlightenment over superstition, of the family over the family name, of industry over heroic idleness, of bourgeois law over medieval privileges. The revolution of 1648 was the victory of the seventeenth century over the sixteenth century; the revolution of 1789 was the victory of the eighteenth century over the seventeenth. These revolutions reflected the needs of the world at that time rather than the needs of those parts of the world where they occurred, that is England and France.” (Marx & Engels, 1977, 161).

According to this, bourgeois revolutions do not belong to England or France individually. Although the revolutions have been affected by the specific characteristics of the countries in terms of their development processes and results, the essential is they gave control to a new class, the bourgeoisie. One of the criticisms brought about by the bourgeois nature of the revolutions is that the essence of the revolutions cannot be bourgeois because the people who came to power after the revolution were not bourgeoisie. However, according to Marx, it is the bourgeoisie who achieved hegemony because the advantages of power after the revolutions focused on securing the rights of the bourgeoisie, private property, and the conditions for free trade.

The effect of revolutions on the transition to capitalism should be examined within the framework of the newly formed division of labor. The development of the bourgeoisie requires a transformation in both rural and urban areas, as it changes the structure of both agricultural relations and relations related to good production. It is necessary to mention the revolution in England, which is an example of classical bourgeois revolutions. The first thing to be mentioned is the conjuncture of England: The price revolution occurred because of the valuable mines coming from America, and the development of trade, moving from the Mediterranean economy to the Atlantic economy, helped settle the money-dependent relations in society (Üşür, 1990, p. 164, 165).

In the 12th and 13th centuries, Europe was experiencing growth in every sense: expansion in population, demand, and trade. Moreover, the growth of money relations caused indebtedness to be a trait of the lord, which necessitated the surplus, which was previously taken as labor but was now taken as money (Üşür, 1990, p. 166). This situation led to the fact that the existing agricultural relations between the workers and the lord were no longer due to traditional ties, family, and loyalty to the lord but to the contractual relationships, resulting in the free-wage worker. The second half of the 14th century was a period when everything worsened in Europe: the decline in population and demand due to the plague, the transition to a war-oriented economy, and peasant revolts caused the labor cost to increase, especially in places where money rent was passed, and the crisis caused harm to the lords (Üşür, 1990, p. 167). To sum up, in the 15th and 16th centuries, salaries rose, labor was in short supply, and money-rent was settled. As a result, the traditional method of managing the land was abandoned, and the new capitalist farmer began cultivating the field in accordance with market conditions (Hill, 1979, p. 17). They searched for the most profitable goods because they were currently functioning under market conditions. Furthermore, capitalist farmers switched from growing grains to raising sheep because of the demand for wool in both the local and international markets, which hastened the rise of the peasantry in the 15th century (Üşür, 1990, p. 168).

Moreover, rising wages in urban and rural areas led farmers to sheep husbandry, which could be done through less labor in larger areas. Moreover, because, now, agricultural ties had become contractual relationships, capitalist farmers were able to dismiss tenants unable to pay the increased rents, who had minor plots, and prevent the merger of estates into large land for prosperous sheep farming on a wide scale (Hill, 1979, p. 17).

As a result, only the development of the money-rent relationship and the leasing of the land by capitalist farmers could lead to the enclosure movement.

Towns equated with the guild system had priority in explaining the change in property relations. Marx saw it as the development of new power emerging from the old system and eliminating the fetters of the old one. The guild system conducted the continuity of old towns, which is formed by "limited commerce and the scanty communication between the individual towns, the lack of population, and the narrow needs" (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 32).

He also clarified the development of guild-free manufacturing after this stage and its effects on cities, such as the change in relationships between workers and employers, the elaboration of trade competition between nations, and the expansion of trade due to discoveries. The emergence of modern cities from the dominance of the guild system occurred as a result of the guilds' inability to fulfill the requirements of developing trade and competition, whereas the guild producers, who were no longer dominant, were petty-bourgeois, and the new dominant power of production was bourgeois (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 33). In the second period of this new division of labor, traders and manufacturers found themselves in different stages of development. This time, the growth of markets resulted in a rapid improvement for traders rather than manufacturers. However, the competition of nations brought new protective laws for manufacturers and merchants, although it was more important for the merchants as the dominant power of this period to get the privilege (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 35).

These acknowledgments are how the bourgeoisie obtained control of production and turn the property relations convenient to their interests. At the same time, the agrarian system of feudalism has been constructed according to the laws of capitalism, such as competition, generalized commodity production, and production with wage labor. Bourgeois became the dominant power by pursuing their own interest and by successfully revolting against the feudal power and the political barriers. Brenner saw "a quasi-automatic mechanism" behind the bourgeois revolutions, which Marx explained in *German Ideology*. He claimed, according to Marx's arguments, the bourgeoisie's domination and liberation from feudal ties was led by competition and trade and that it would happen in "only a matter of time" (Brenner, 1989, p. 280). However, Marx clearly

stated the importance of forces of production and relations of production on the road to class conflict by saying,

“We have shown that at the present time individuals must abolish private property, because the productive forces and forms of intercourse have developed so far that, under the domination of private property, they have become destructive forces, and because the contradiction between the classes has reached its extreme limit. Finally, we have shown that the abolition of private property in the division of labour is itself the association of individuals on the basis created by modern productive forces and world's intercourse.” (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 69)

However, the specific way these revolutions occur is not specified until volume 3 of *Capital*, where Marx described the two ways in which bourgeois revolutions will take place: the really revolutionary way and the way merchants gain control over the production:

“The transition from the feudal mode of production is two-fold. The producer becomes merchant and capitalist, in contrast to the natural agricultural economy and the guild-bound handicrafts of the medieval urban industries. This is the really revolutionising path. Or else, the merchant establishes direct sway over production. However much this serves historically as a stepping-stone -- witness the English 17th-century clothier, who brings the weavers, independent as they are, under his control by selling their wool to them and buying their cloth -- it cannot by itself contribute to the overthrow of the old mode of production, but tends rather to preserve and retain it as its precondition. The manufacturer in the French silk industry and in the English hosiery and lace industries, for example, was thus mostly but nominally a manufacturer until the middle of the 19th century. In point of fact, he was merely a merchant, who let the weavers carry on in their old unorganised way and exerted only a merchant's control, for that was for whom they really worked. This system presents everywhere an obstacle to the real capitalist mode of production and goes under with its development. Without revolutionising the mode of production, it only worsens the condition of the direct producers, turns them into mere wage-workers and proletarians under conditions worse than those under the immediate control of capital, and appropriates their surplus-labour on the basis of the old mode of production.” (Marx, 1995b, p. 227)

This quote clearly shows Marx said the advancement of merchant capital could not directly lead to a change in the mode of production, even if it was a contributing force. However, in the next page of this quote, Marx stated three ways to enable the transition to capitalism. For the third way, he says that “the merchant becomes directly an industrial capitalist” (Marx, 1995b, p. 228). This means merchant capital played a decisive role in the transition from feudalism to capitalism, such that it is associated with the argument in Marx's *German Ideology* that cities and merchant capital developed and broke free from the fetters of feudalism (Blackledge, 2006, p. 42).

Dobb stated, by following Marx's approach in the *Communist Manifesto*, that the bourgeois revolutions should be evaluated in terms of the results they created and that the revolution belongs to the bourgeoisie because they created capitalism. He also stated the bourgeois revolutions essentially followed the "really revolutionary way." The producer becomes a merchant and capitalist, and instead of only increasing its surplus extraction, it also creates a new system that can effect higher incomes by promoting productivity. The really revolutionary way changes the mode of production and may eventually go hand in hand with the development of traders. Merchants can play a role in the transition by exercising control over production; however, this path depends on the revolutionary way (Dobb, 1950, p. 128). Although Sweezy found Dobb's handling of bourgeois revolutions clear and enlightening, he stated that, in a really revolutionary way, the producers who turn into merchants and capitalists may not be just handicraft producers. Accordingly, the producer who turns into a merchant and a capitalist can also be "a producer, whatever his background, starts as both a merchant and an employer of wage labor" (Sweezy, 1963, p. 18).

In addition to the argument that the exchange of goods by the bourgeoisie will expand and improve monetary relations, Sweezy (1963) expressed that the bourgeoisie is not obligated to sell any commodity to acquire capital (p. 20). Within this discussion, another issue relates to the transition period's class and state structure. Dobb stated each mode of production includes the elements of "both of preceding and of succeeding periods," and the development of societies is continuous, but the definite altering of their path coincides with revolutions (Dobb, 1950, p. 11). Because Dobb equated the feudal system with serfdom as one of the determinants of internal contradictions, the class status of transitional society cannot include serfdom. Moreover, Brenner stated that, if the transition period is capitalist, it needs to be explained why landlords did not show a capitalist character in this period (Brenner, 1989, p. 296). He argued that bourgeois revolutions seemed unnecessary if, as Dobb had argued, the conflicts between feudal lords and serfs had ended serfdom in the land and were eventually transforming society into capitalism. Therefore, the approaches, which depend on the expansion of trade, should be excluded from the explanation of bourgeois revolutions since they are similar to Marx's early works when Marx had not yet matured his understanding of history (Blackledge, 2006, p. 123). Additionally, Brenner saw the role of cities by stating that merchant capitalism had developed, and feudal property relations restricted the development of capitalism (Blackledge, 2006, p. 124). Feudal lords pursuing capitalistic

profit did not need the state power to extract surplus value by extra-economic coercion. Instead, they needed a state that protected their property rights; as a result, both aristocracy and the monarchy were pleased with the state's new status and much more holistic power (Blackledge, 2006, p. 124). However, "the new merchant group" that emerged through the really revolutionary way had, according to Brenner, conflicts with the state, which imposed a series of subsidies, which they did not benefit from, and heavy taxation, a burden they carried, which led to the revolution (Blackledge, 2006, p. 126). Anderson said, although the political power remained ideologically feudal during the transition period, society became bourgeois, and Brenner should include this ideological aspect in his transition analysis by considering political relations (Wood, 2002, p. 45). Although Anderson and Brenner agreed the essential element of feudalism should be perceived as the intertwining of economic and political, Anderson stated feudalism would weaken as a consequence of the advancement of the renting relationship in the form of money and the expanding commodity economy (Wood, 2002, p. 44). Furthermore, Anderson believed class war, which he did not think caused the system's collapse, would eventually be resolved at the political level (Blackledge, 2006, p. 126).

1.2.3. Primitive Accumulation

"So-called primitive accumulation" is the way of expressing capitalist accumulation not showing up out of nowhere; it has a history, the history of economics original sin:

"The process, therefore, that clears the way for the capitalist system, can be none other than the process which takes away from the laborer the possession of his means of production; a process that transforms, on the one hand, the social means of subsistence and of production into capital, on the other, the immediate producers into wage-laborers." (Marx, 1995a, p. 521)

Capitalist accumulation is the circle of extracting surplus value; it presupposes the expropriation of labor by taking away the surplus, while the beginning of the accumulation is how the labor is separated from the means of subsistence, and others have possession of this means. This beginning came to be called primitive/primary/original accumulation, as contributed by political economists who had lived before Marx.

Marx put this beginning of capitalist accumulation as 'so-called primitive accumulation,' with several elements. Firstly, the word so-called shows the difference from its previous

usage by classical political economists although it was they who, while investigating the origin of profit, concluded that capitalist accumulation must have had a beginning. Classical political economists, who existed when capitalism was nascent and revolutionary compared to feudalism, believe that the capitalist system is the ultimate stage of progress and must be supported by policies convenient to 'laissez faire' (Meek, 1977, p. 16). These policies mainly served to the advancement of the accumulation of capital, such as increasing working hours and lowering the working age (Perelman, 2000, p. 18, 19). In this way, competition and free trade would lead to the peak of development. Marx's examination differs from Adam Smith's and the political economists' way of analyzing the primitive accumulation process: Marx's theory of primitive accumulation is the creation of the change in also social relations of production, while classical political economists' analysis depends on the growth of wealth and profit to set up the modern commercialized society (Wood, 2002, p. 31). Moreover, Marx showed that the classical political economy did not show the reasoning behind private property; instead, they dealt with private property, competition, or division between rent and capital or labor and capital as these were given (Marx, 1974, p. 38). And this leads us to the other feature; primitive means the beginning or origin of how the change in social and property relations occurs in the first place. In *Capital*: "It appears as primitive, because it forms the pre-historic stage of capital and of the mode of production corresponding with it" (Marx, 1995a, p. 521). A cruel way of separating producers from their old version of living constituted the way of creating new social relations. So, capitalism has historical specificity that diversifies it from others since primitive accumulation is the term for the beginning of accumulation prior to the capitalist system.

Since the beginning of capitalist accumulation starts with previous stages than the capitalist system, it is connected with the conditions of pre-capitalist exploitation. He states this as follows

"the transformation of feudal agricultural societies into industrial ones and the corresponding industrial struggle of nations on the world-market depends on an accelerated development of capital, which is not to be arrived at along the so-called natural path, but rather by means of coercive measures. It makes a tremendous difference whether national capital is gradually and slowly transformed into industrial capital, or whether this development is accelerated by means of a tax which they impose through protective duties mainly upon landowners, middle and small peasants, and handicraftsmen, by way of accelerated expropriation of the independent direct producers, and through the violently accelerated accumulation and concentration of capital, in short by means of the accelerated establishment of conditions of capitalist production. It simultaneously makes an enormous difference

in the capitalist and industrial exploitation of the natural national productive power.”
(Marx, 1995b, p. 536)

In Volume III of Capital, Marx states that capitalist rent, which he defines as a form of surplus above the average profit, cannot be attributed to the pre-capitalist modes of production. In this case, the surplus, created by the producer that has 'labor-time' to produce more than the self-supporting, reveals itself as the rent. Accordingly, the producer's surplus, which belongs to the producers who have self-sustainability and the right to use the land but not the right to own it, is taken from the producer by "other than economic coercion" (Marx, 1995b). This extra-economic coercion is not only brute force but also political power that leads to the taking of surplus (Üşür, 1992, p. 435). According to Marx (1995b), since the way of taking surplus determines the relations of the ruler and ruled, extra-economic coercion constitutes the specific feature of pre-capitalist conditions of production and also the conditions of primitive accumulation. Marx revealed this difference during the birth and course of capitalism as follows:

“Direct force, outside economic conditions, is of course still used, but only exceptionally. In the ordinary run of things, the labourer can be left to the "natural laws of production," i.e., to his dependence on capital, a dependence springing from, and guaranteed in perpetuity by, the conditions of production themselves '. It is otherwise during the historic genesis of capitalist production” (Marx, 1995a, p. 541).

One of the channels of primitive accumulation is the enclosure movement, which started in the 15th century and advanced with the "General Act of Parliament for the Enclosure of Commons" in the 18th century, causing “many farms and large flocks of cattle, especially of sheep” to be consolidated in the controls of a small number of people. (Marx, 1995a, p. 525). As a result, the huts in which the direct workers lived were demolished, and the self-supporting producers became workers in manufacturing, thus turning the farms into rented farms organized according to the rules of capitalism. Marx also noted the direct use of force by soldiers, and the appalling conditions of it, in the process of driving workers from the fields, which took place, for example, in Scotland, as part of the enclosure movement. They were hunted out, destroyed, burned, and killed in large numbers, forced to live in different ways than they used to (Marx, 1995a, p. 530). Furthermore, the bourgeois use all power, including its influence on state power, to save their interest and expand labor productivity. In order to constitute the dependence of the worker on the workplace, they suppressed the newly emerging wage labor by lengthening the working day, regulating the wages, implementing punishment on people

giving and receiving over the maximum wage level, and regulating the contracts that specify their unequal conditions between worker and master, etc. (Marx, 1995a, p. 542). In conclusion, primitive accumulation was accomplished by extra-economic force and political and legal power.

The establishment of capitalism changed the previous relations of production. The serf, which belongs to the pre-capitalist relations, had the right of use and remained attached to his estate or group for the continuation of the conditions of his life. This dependence was essential to the person who took the surplus in terms of the taken away of the surplus. What distinguishes the serf "from the slave or plantation economy is that the slave works under alien conditions of production and not independently" (Marx, 1995b, p. 539). In the capitalist system, the producer, who turns from the producer who has their own production conditions to the wage-worker, has the appearance of freedom. They join a contractual association with the employer to sell the labor power of their own free will (Marx, 1995a, p. 118). However, this situation detaches them from using the means of production for their own production requirements and obligates them to work for wages to earn their livelihood. Moreover, earning a subsistence for the household turns those not in the labor market before into wage workers, such as children and women (Marx, 1995a, p. 279). While capitalism separated the direct producers from the means of production and made workers wage-dependent workers, it also created the groups who own the means of production. In chapter 29 of *Capital* Volume I, Marx examines the emergence of the capitalist farmer. He states that the Roman serf, in the last part of the 14th century, was transformed into the farmer, who was also a small-scale expropriator, and after that, they became a half-farmer, which have a contractually determined part of the product and give the other part of the product to the landlord. In 15th-century England, this form evolved into the lessee farmer proper, who employed wage laborers and paid a portion of the surplus product to the landlord. Ultimately, they became capitalist farmers who "grew rich at the expense both of their laborers and their landlords" (Marx, 1995a, p. 547). The emergence of the industrial capitalist, on the other hand, was not gradual, "the public debt and fiscal system corresponding with it" took part in the emergence of this group and in arranging the existing resources in accordance with the needs of capitalism (Marx, 1995a, p. 558). In order to exist and continue under capitalist conditions, the capitalist must constantly expand the means of exploitation and raise the amount of capital. That accumulation process in the development of capitalism has two phases; 'concentration of capital,' which is observed as the gathering of all means of

production and the resources that provide production in the hands of capitalists, and 'centralization of capital,' which is the collecting of capital in a small number of hands by had led by competition in the market (Sezgin, 2008, p. 49).

Marxists and non-Marxist academics have maintained a series of debates, called transition debates, about the main driving force, i.e., the source of change, motor power, that created these changes. Thus, the first question to be answered here is whether the source of these changes will be explained by internal or external variables and what these variables will be. According to Dobb, since we can only define the beginning of capitalism with the dependence of the direct producer on the capitalist, the dynamics of change should also be sought in the internal dynamics. In this respect, the quantitative growth of trade and markets, or the appearance of the merchant class, does not give the transition a revolutionary feature; the qualitative features of the change of the mode of production should be examined (Dobb, 1950, p. 17). Dobb sees the dissolution of feudalism and the maturation of capitalism as separate processes, indicating the existence of a transitional period since the transition from feudalism to capitalism is not an overnight process. The transition period shows both the characteristics of the previous period and the characteristics of the capitalist period, that small production is for the market in this phase. The internal contradictions of feudalism and the need for the rulers to provide more income necessitate the emergence of capitalism with increased productivity (Dobb, 1950, p. 42). Merchant capital and the development of trade are important in this transition period as well, but Dobb does not give them a primary priority. The emergence of cities as trade centers as an inherent feature of feudalism can only occur if the trade is for the market and there are trends to increase labor productivity (Dobb, 1950, p. 135). Therefore, according to him, change does not occur due to the simple development of a single element but through the interaction of many main factors (Dobb, 1950, p. 13). Therefore, the beginning phase of capitalism should be sought in England, the birthplace of Capitalism, at the end of the 16th century and the start of the 17th century, in the form of the new association in which direct producers were connected to the capitalists, which was observed as "putting-out system" (Dobb, 1950, p. 18). As it is seen according to him, the change was born as a result of the development in the relations of production; the contradictions and relations between the classes brought the birth of a new mode of production. Similarly, Hilton argues that the development of the systems of pressure exerted by the lords to extract the surplus from the peasant was the source of the growth in production techniques and commodity production (Hilton, 1963,

p. 69). Accordingly, the city and the countryside, struggling for economic and political power, resulted in the feudal lords' incomes becoming less than their expenses. As a result, the increased struggle for rent and the expanding scope of state power led to the need to increase the extent of the surplus taken from the producer (Hilton, 1963, p. 69). Moreover, this increase in the amount of surplus was followed by landlessness and a decline in the living standards of the peasants and thus faced far-reaching struggles. Hilton revealed the results of these resistances as follows:

“This peasant resistance was of crucial importance in the development of the rural communes, the extension of free tenure and status, the freeing of peasant and artisan economies for the development of commodity production and eventually the emergence of the capitalist entrepreneur” (Hilton, 1976, p. 22).

In these explanations, the origin of change is observed as the class struggle between peasants and lords, which is internal to feudalism. The consequence of this emphasis on the production relations in Dobb and Hilton is not that they see them as disconnected from their technical foundations, that is, from the development of the forces of production. In fact, Hilton showed the importance of productive forces in transition analysis when he said that the development of productive forces could enable or set limits to developments in the relations of production (Blackledge, 2006, p. 135). This approach, which attaches importance to production relations and thus to the class war while not ignoring the development of productive forces; and at the same time recognizing that external factors can be a contributing force, is in line with the above-examined explanations of Marx (Üşür, 1992, p. 434). The problem here is, if they think that under the economic and social balance determined by the class war, and as the specific features of feudalism, the relatively undeveloped productive forces and not producing for the market create inefficiency, how does the dynamic of change occur, in other words, how does productivity increase to take place in this system, and lead to capital accumulation in the first place?

While saying that Dobb did not sufficiently consider the results of the rapid development of trade in feudalism, Sweezy states that Dobb, who states that the development of trade is proportional to the blossoming of cities, does not include the development of urban life in his explanations, and that his explanation of change based on internal contradictions, is mistaken (Sweezy, 1963, p. 7). Defining the feudal system as production for use and the capitalist system as production for exchange, Sweezy said that long-distance trade

exists as a “creative force”; Then, when the two systems came together, they affected each other (Sweezy, 1963, p. 8). What needs to be investigated here is the examination of the engine of change as the driving force that shifts the purpose of production from use to change. Since each mode of production can be identified with different types of labor, Sweezy states that this creative power of trade will not automatically lead to the disappearance of serfdom but exist as a motivating force:

“the triumph of exchange economy does not necessarily imply the end of either serfdom or demesne-farming. Exchange economy is compatible with slavery, serfdom, independent self-employed labor, or wage-labor” (Sweezy, 1963, p. 10).

That is, the connection between the forces of production and the relations of production in feudalism does not necessarily lead to production for exchange. There are two conclusions to be drawn from these analyzes of Sweezy, firstly, since feudalism is production for use, production for exchange is external to the capitalist system, that is, the factor that dissolves feudalism is external, and secondly, contrary to the analysis of Dobb and Marx, capitalism is defined at the level of circulation (Üşür, 1992, p. 437). Though, according to Marx in *Grundrisse*, in the expression of social relations, production, consumption, distribution, and exchange is a whole in which production overrides:

“The conclusion we reach is not that production, distribution, exchange and consumption are identical, but that they all form the members of a totality, distinctions within a unity. Production predominates not only over itself, in the antithetical definition of production, but over the other moments as well. The process always returns to production to begin anew” (Marx, 1993, p. 99).

Another focal point of the discussion, Brenner says that while class conflict determines the content of social relations of production, class relations are insensitive to the effects of economic forces while he criticizes the view that external shocks are the motivating force in transition:

"I would contend, class structures tend to be highly resilient in relation to the impact of economic forces; as a rule, they are not shaped by, or alterable in terms of, changes in demographic or commercial trends" (Brenner, 1976, p. 12).

Class relations are analytically divided into, first, direct relations between producers with themselves, and second, property relations between those who have their means of

production and others who do not. Once the second type of relationship is established, class relations are not affected by external shocks (Brenner, 1976, p. 10). Although he and Dobb have common ideas about the decisive role of production relations and class conflict, what separates Brenner from him is the importance he attaches to the political in his explanations and the difference in the chain of meaning he establishes. While Dobb makes an economic explanation of the political, for Brenner, the economic draws the framework of the political, and this approach shows itself in Brenner's understanding of feudalism, the embeddedness of political and economic (Üşür, 1992, p. 449). This political and economic unity appears in Brenner's interpretation that Dobb failed to analyze the internal feudal contradictions adequately and saw the rise of capitalism in the rise of the Bourgeoisie, which is external to feudalism (Brenner, 1978, p. 122). Brenner, who states that trade can only be a force that strengthens the structure of feudalism rather than destroying it, rejects the concept of growing trade as the defining element of the capitalist system (Brenner, 1977, 21,25). At this stage, we need to look at Wallerstein, who, similar to Sweezy, emphasized the role of commerce in the development of capitalism. In the capitalist world-system analysis of Wallerstein, the trade and profit motive is the defining element of the system, and it also moved the base of analysis from the nation-state-based analysis of Brenner to the international level (Denemark & Thomas, 1988, p. 48). States, which can act in accordance with the requirements of capital, are buyers of goods and make laws that protect trade. Hence, they will be strong states, making them advantageous against other countries in the short and long run. The surplus will now be transferred not only directly from the producer to the holders of the means of production but also from all over the world to the core countries (Wallerstein, 1974, p. 401). Explaining that the discovery of new areas caused some of the old 'peripheral and semi-peripheral' countries to become the core countries but also caused changes in the internal dynamism of the countries, Wallerstein clearly attributed the origin of the change to external effects and saw the existence of wage labor as a result of them, not as a characteristic element (Wallerstein, 1974, p. 409). This examination of the genesis of capitalism by Wallerstein has been criticized by Brenner. First, to locate the core-periphery analysis in the genesis of capitalism is to presume profit-driven trading and surplus transfer. This profit motive shows that there was capitalist rationality in the times when capitalism did not exist yet, which cannot explain the birth of capitalism. (Brenner, 1977, p. 45). Although Wallerstein and Sweezy differ from the commercialization approach in their relevance to the content of the class, they

agree to see capitalism as a system with a division of labor that depends on trade. As Brenner puts it,

"They see the rise of commercial relations as forcing the individual producers continuously to develop the productive forces through the mechanisms of 'profit maximization' and 'competition on the market'" (Brenner, 1977, p. 39).

Another approach that departs from the commercial expansion approach should also be noted: By describing market societies and non-market societies, Polanyi also highlights the features that give the transition its essential character; market society (Wood, 2002, p. 23). The market society is driven by profit motives and has a structure dominated by self-regulating market dependency through the price mechanism (Polanyi, 2021, p. 85). Wool obtained from lands converted into sheep farms by the enclosure movement became the subsistence of the landless peasants in manufacturing; however, this could only make the country 'profit-making' in the conditions of the profit-driven market society (Polanyi, 2021, p. 75). When talking about the revolution, he says that the large-scale use of machinery has led to the transition, but this is not enough: production with specialized and expensive machinery can only advance production and social relations when used by the profit-seeking merchant farmer (Polanyi, 2021, p. 82). In other words, the usage of machinery and the pursuit of profit establish the new society with a union that predominates by profit drive. Consequently, according to him, the capitalist system can only exist within the market society. While capitalist societies are indicated by the embedding of social relations into the economy, in pre-capitalist societies, economic relations are buried in social relations since the drive for profit and competition is absent (Wood, 2002, p. 23).

1.2.4. Historical Epochs

Another controversy regarding Marx's examination of the emergence of capitalism is whether he saw the transition as a unilinear evolutionary progressive mechanism. In the preface to *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, he stated the mechanical description of history has led to interpretations of his analysis of the history of societies as "necessary stages that all societies must pass through." Thus, because of that unilinearity argument, Marx has been criticized for seeing Europe's attainment of capitalism as the only and necessary way for all countries. He stated this as follows

“In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or -- this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms -- with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society. In broad outline, the Asiatic, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as epochs marking progress in the economic development of society.” (Marx, 2008, p. 4)

The issue here is the conditions that created capitalism will lead to its destruction; in other words, the forces of production will prepare the necessary material conditions for the demolition of the contradictions of the capitalist relations of production, which will overthrow the capitalist system (Kaymak, 2018, p. 31).

In *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations* (1965), which is a part of *Grundrisse*, Marx showed “the periodic development of conflicts between the forces and relations of production” in different pre-capitalist social formations (Hobsbawm, 1965, p. 11). When explaining precapitalist societies, Marx stated he does not intend to explain people’s bond with natural and inorganic conditions but rather their detachment from inorganic conditions and from the means of production (Marx, 1965, p. 87). The way he showed this was to show that the only form of society in which people are separated from the means of production is the capitalist society—through the existence of the wage worker and capital. The fact that he defined precapitalist societies one after another in terms of specific forces of production and relations of production creates controversies on whether Marx saw the progression of history as unilinear progress. In *German Ideology*, precapitalist forms, which are evaluated according to various stages of development, are “tribal, ancient communal and state ownership, and feudal or estate property ownership,” whereas in *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, precapitalist forms of society are “Asiatic, ancient, feudal.” In the *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, in which Marx deepened his studies, Hobsbawm (1965) stated Marx defines four stages that also have different substages (p. 32). According to Hobsbawm, communal property shows itself in two ways, “direct communal property” and “communal property” (Hobsbawm, 1965, p. 37). Direct communal properties exist with their dependence on natural conditions and relations of people seen as communal proprietors and those who work for a living. It has

two fragments, Asiatic and Oriental, which have different essentials depending on their “communal conditions for real appropriation”; for those conditions, Marx gives an example as irrigation systems, means of communication, and so on (Marx, 1965, p. 70). The second form of property, communal property, creates the cities as a part of agricultural production, and another important point is the creation of “contradictions.” It has two segments, Ancient, in which the private property is not communal but for the individual occupier, and Germanic, in which members of society have both a part of “communal property and private possession” of some part of the land (Marx, 1965, p. 75). Another pre-capitalist formation is feudalism, in which the guild system and feudal aristocracy have dominance over production. Lastly, he defined the capitalist system as the only one with wage workers and capital in a dominant form, created by separating direct producers from their means of production.

The town-country distinction (or the distinction between agricultural and non-agricultural production), which is a basis to show the divergence of property relations in also his early works, continued to be used in the Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations, which is one of the works where the historical approach is more mature (Hobsbawm, 1965, p. 35). According to Hobsbawm, these stages do not show any unilinearity or course of progress; these are “analytical, though not chronological, stages” that aim to explain the different kinds of relations in different societies (Hobsbawm, 1965, p. 37).

Moreover, Shanin, who is another one who claims Marx has unilinearity in some of his works, said Marx’s works should be studied in three periods, “early Marx of the 1840s, a middle Marx of the 1850s and 1860s . . . and the late Marx of the 1870s and 1880s” (Shanin, 1983, p. 30). According to him, the middle Marx period, which includes *Capital*, is the period in which Marx studied the development of history as a series of “necessary stages” that did not allow for further transitions that eventually had to lead to capitalism and, from there, to socialism. He said that, as part of the unilinear evolutionary approach of Marx to historical progress, the development of forces of production was the determining factor in the occurrence of capitalism. Accordingly, the reason he studied precapitalist modes of production is not to say there has been a transition from different stages to capitalism (and to socialism) but to show the stages of history that preceded capitalism. Because such an analysis cannot explain the transition from the precapitalist forms to socialism, it cannot provide a sufficient result for the developing revolutionary upsurge in Russia; for this, it must accept “a multiplicity of roads of social transformation”

(Shanin, 1983, p. 15, 18). Because the emergence of capitalism, according to Marx, is progress for human emancipation, his analysis of historical epochs gives the impression there is unilinear development. However, Marx's analysis of historical trends of societies depends on the socioeconomic examinations of Western Europe as the birthplace of capitalism. It does not serve as a law of history for all countries for all times (Kaymak, 2018, p. 31). Additionally, another pillar for the criticism of the unilinear evolutionary progress of capitalism has been the "De te fabula narratur" quoted by Marx in the preface to *Capital* (Marx, 1995a, p. 582). Taken in the context of this quote, it means the plight of workers in England will spread to workers in other countries over time, and the only way to exist with the imperatives of capitalism is to adjust the necessities of modern industry. This does not mean it has to follow the same path in countries where capitalism does not exist yet. Rather, the development of capitalism is inevitable in countries where capitalism has shown up once (Sayer & Corrigan, 1983, p. 79). Likewise, Marx is concerned with whether the developments in the social mode of production in other countries can create the conditions for socialism in Western Europe (Kaymak, 2018, p. 34).

In addition, the view that capitalism will follow the same path wherever it arises exists not only in *Capital* but also in *German Ideology*, one of his early works. Once capitalism comes into existence, its imperatives must be fulfilled. Marx and Engels stated,

“Generally speaking, big industry created everywhere the same relations between the classes of society, and thus destroyed the peculiar individuality of the various nationalities. And finally, while the bourgeoisie of each nation still retained separate national interests, big industry created a class, which in all nations has the same interest and with which nationality is already dead; a class which is really rid of all the old world and at the same time stands pitted against it” (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 38).

To understand whether Marx interpreted the development of capitalism as a part of a unilinear developmental stage that should be observed for all places, it is necessary to examine his approach to the precapitalist countries such as India, Ireland, and Russia, which are important arguments in this discussion.

Marx's observations on the precapitalist status of India and Ireland, as well as his approach to a potential socialist revolution in Russia, a country where capitalism has not yet developed, are relevant issues to consider in this context. The first point to consider is Marx's comments on India, which have been widely interpreted. Accordingly, the

following quotation from Marx shows his analysis of India carries racist overtones and aims to legitimize the English invasion because his analysis linearly identifies capitalist development as a Eurocentric and determining force of the productive forces, independent of other social relations (Blackledge, 2006, p. 37). Marx and Engels expressed this as,

“Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history. What we call its history, is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society.
... England has to fulfill a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating - annihilation of old Asiatic society and the laying the material foundations of Western society in Asia.” (Marx & Engels, 1979, p. 217)

According to this approach, in accordance with Marx's development thesis, the conflict between the productive forces and relations of production in India and the level of development of the productive forces were not sufficient, so a transition to capitalism could not be experienced (Sayer, 1987, p. 20, 21). India has existed passively, influenced by the countries where capitalism has emerged; in this context, Marx advocated for the idea of imperialism because of the development of the capitalist mode of production. In fact, advocating for an intervention of developed countries where capitalism is not sufficiently developed can be traced back to Locke: accordingly, he legitimized imperialist intervention in countries that could not use their lands profitably enough because the source of profit is not the productivity of labor but the productivity of land (Wood, 2002, p. 111). However, there is no reason to believe Marx celebrates the development of capitalism or England's imperialist invasions. Marx considered Indians to be both sufferers of imperialism and potential actors of their own emancipation as he developed his study of the significance of imperialism in the region (Blackledge, 2006, p. 37). According to Marx, the future of India's peasants will likely be similar to that of the peasants in Europe a few centuries back. Marx, therefore, did not defend capitalist advancement and considered the current state of the Indian countryside to be devastating (Blackledge, 2006, p. 38). Marx's position can be inferred from the fact that Marx's explanations of the development of capitalism also explain the circumstances and contradictions of capitalist and precapitalist societies, as mentioned before, because the development of productive forces does not occur separately from other social relations—and from the fact Marx's analysis of the Asian mode of production covers a very wide geographical range, from Mexico to the Celts to India (Sayer, 1987, p. 65).

Another example of the unilinearity argument is that Marx demonstrates how different nations experience the development of capitalism in different ways, such as in Britain and Ireland. In *Capital*, he stated,

"England, a country with fully developed capitalist production, and pre-eminently industrial, would have bled to death with such a drain of population as Ireland has suffered. But Ireland is at present only an agricultural district of England, marked off by a wide channel from the country to which it yields corn, wool, cattle, industrial and military recruits." (Marx, 1995a, 503)

Marx's analysis of the Irish in *Capital*'s first volume shows it is not possible to place his analysis of the development of capitalism in a one-way and linear development scheme (Kaymak, 2018, p. 32).

Another widely debated argument as to whether Marx adopted a one-way evolutionary model of progress is Marx's modification of the French edition of *Capital*. Accordingly, after the German editions of *Capital*, which he made in the period corresponding to the middle Marx, while printing a French edition during the late Marx period, Marx revised the section on primitive accumulation and adopted an approach that allowed transitions to capitalism in multiple ways. The relevant sections of the chapter of 'The Secret of Primitive Accumulation' from the German (1) and French (2) editions are respectively provided below, with Wada's English translation:

- (1) "The expropriation of the agricultural producers, of the peasant, from the soil, is the basis of the whole process. The history of this expropriation, in different countries, assumes different aspects, and runs through its various phases in different orders of succession, and at different periods. In England alone, which we take as our example, does it have the classic form." (Wada, 1983, p. 49)
- (2) "At the bottom of the capitalist system is, therefore, the radical separation of the producer from the means of production The basis of this whole evolution is the expropriation of the peasants It has been accomplished in a final form only in England ... but all the other countries of Western Europe are going through the same movement." (Wada, 1983, p. 49)

Marx was influenced by the developments in Russia, according to Wada and Shanin, and changed the French edition and predicted an evolution that allowed Eastern Europe and Russia to transition to socialism in different forms (Wada, 1983, p. 49). According to the views of Marx and Engels' *Capital* in the German edition, Russia's existing productive forces must reach a certain stage and change the relations of production; that is, the collective ownership of the lands must either become capitalistically organized or

disappear, which means the realization of the bourgeois revolution that will lead to a socialist revolution (Wada, 1983, p. 53). As a result, communal production on lands becomes a barrier to socialism; although Wada claimed Engels held this viewpoint rather than Marx, he noted they both agreed to see the capitalist mode of production as a higher stage (Wada, 1983, p. 53). However, Wada also stated that, while Marx and Engels were dealing with the conditions for a possible proletarian revolution to take place in Russia, they also established ties with Europe with their assessment that the future of communal property in Russia depends on the proletarian revolution that will take place in Europe (Wada, 1983, p. 54).

Wada and Shanin used “the ‘Letter to the Editor of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*’ and the ‘Letter of *Zasulich*’ and its four different drafts” as instances of a sequence of letters to demonstrate how Marx changed his opinions (Wada, 1983, p. 41). Therefore, they asserted that Marx abandoned the unilinear evolutionist perspective he held in the middle of the Marx period and adopted a strategy that allowed for many transitions due to the rise of the potential of a revolution in Russia and the viewpoints of Chernyshevskii (Kaymak, 2018, p. 20).

As mentioned earlier, the level of development of the productive forces in the transition to socialism expresses the economic needs and material needs that can only be created by capitalism, which is the conclusion Marx reached with a detailed examination of the development of Western Europe (Kaymak, 2018, p. 27, 31). As Marx stated in his ‘Letter to the Editor of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*’ in 1877, he objected to interpreting his approach to history as a teleological approach in terms of phenomena that could be applied and observed throughout history:

“Now, in what way was my critic’ able to apply this historical sketch to Russia? Only this: if Russia is tending to become a capitalist nation, on the model of the countries of Western Europe, and in recent years it has gone to great pains to move in this direction it will not succeed without having first transformed a large proportion of its peasants into proletarians; and after that, once it has been placed in the bosom of the capitalist system, it will be subjected to its pitiless laws, like other profane peoples. That is all’ But this is too little for my critic. It is absolutely necessary for him to metamorphose my historical sketch of the genesis of capitalism in Western Europe into a historico-philosophical theory of general development, imposed by fate on all peoples, whatever the historical circumstances in which they are placed, in order to eventually attain this economic formation which, with a tremendous leap of the productive forces of social labour, assures the most integral development of every individual producer. But I beg his pardon. This does me too much honour, and yet puts me to shame at the same time.” (Marx & Engels, 1989, p. 200)

Accordingly, the process of separating peasants from the means of production and turning them into wage-dependent laborers is called primitive accumulation and reveals itself as a Western European phenomenon (Kaymak, 2018, p. 31). Marx's primary concern throughout his writing career was the creation of the conditions necessary for the development of socialism in Europe; hence, his interest in Russia was a reflection of the relationship he had with the circumstances in Europe.

Furthermore, Marx's opposition to the teleological interpretation of history is observed not only in later works corresponding to "old Marx" but also in his early works. Marx, in his early works, stated the development of history is not formed as premeditated steps to be overcome, and we can see this in the quote from *German Ideology*;

"while what is designated with the words "destiny," "goal," "germ," or "idea" of earlier history is nothing more than an abstraction formed from later history, from the active influence which earlier history exercises on later history" (Marx & Engels, 1968, p. 21).

It can be concluded the evolutionary viewpoint was, for Marx, the tool he used as a summary device in his analysis, not his basic method or purpose (Sayer & Corrigan, 1983, p. 79).

CHAPTER 2

WEBER ON THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM

2.1. CAPITALISM AS HUMAN NATURE

As a great social theorist, Weber defined himself as a political economist, which is evident in his uniting a broad perspective analysis of political economy with his own area of interest. He was a bourgeois political economist who saw the nation's interests as dependent on industrial development, which reveals the tension between liberalism and nationalism (Callinicos, 2007, p. 170). As he put it,

“This brings us to some concluding reflections of a more practical political nature. We economic nationalists measure the classes who lead the nation or aspire to do so with the one political criterion we regard as sovereign. What concerns us is their political maturity, which is to say their grasp of the nation's enduring economic and political power interests and their ability, in any given situation, to place these interests above all other considerations.” (Weber, 2010, p. 20)

Weber's approach to economics and politics shows he was not a sociologist of religion, as is often assumed. He aimed to present an analysis of the emergence of modern capitalism to solve the problem of Germany's relative backwardness, which left Germany behind in the political competition. We address Weber's analysis of capitalism, and his approach to the emergence of modern capitalism, in detail in section 2.2, but, before moving on to this subject, it would be useful to take a look at his methodology and general intellectual framework.

To examine this, in section 2.1.1; we discuss (i), the place of the individual, whom he sees as an active subject in change and then the evaluation approach in the analysis of the values that guide people's actions and the existing concrete realities; (ii) Weber's approach to these issues, which illustrates his methodology and is the basis of both the interpretative and the causal method of the social sciences; (iii) elective affinity as a method of selecting the different factors that exist to bring them together into a meaningful whole; (iv) ideal types as a means of abstraction necessary to collect different factors in the analysis; (v) his position in the Methodenstreit debate, which manifests itself as both the result and the cause of his method; and finally (vi) his distinction between economic actions and political actions, which is observed in his approach to

“economic.” In section 2.1.2, through the framework he used in his analysis of the emergence of modern capitalism, we examine (i) the way he handles the concept of “work ethic”; (ii) the evaluation of ancient civilizations in terms of the different forms of capitalism throughout history; and finally (iii) the conceptual and historical importance of “rationalization” in his analyzes.

2.1.1. An Introduction to Weber’s Methodology

In analyzing society and history, Weber both comprehended the role of the individual as an active subject and drew a broad analysis framework on how to make this analysis. For this reason, in order to examine Weber's understanding, especially of the emergence of modern capitalism, his approach to the individual, his methodology, and the tools he uses should be examined.

Weber's writings emphasize the significance of individual agency and free choice in forming social structures and institutions. Although he acknowledged that social and cultural conditions might influence individual conduct and place restrictions on individual freedom, he believed that individuals had the ability to change their circumstances and that their actions could have a substantial impact on society (Giddens, 1995a, p. 55). For example, Weber stands with individualism and free will against the advanced state organization created by the progress of bureaucracy in the *Economy and Society*:

“How can one possibly save any remnants of "individualist" freedom in any sense? After all, it is a gross self-deception to believe that without the achievements of the age of the Rights of Man any one of us, including the most conservative, can go on living his life.” (Weber, 1922, p. 1403)

The important thing to note about Weber's focus on human action is that he recognizes that societal acts and changes have their roots in human behavior. Also, it should be highlighted that for Weber, an individual's activity represents a collectivist understanding of action rather than an individual's action. Hence, even though he gives importance to the free will of individuals for the change of society, this does not mean that the framework of his analysis builds upon a single individual as the unit of study. Instead, he has an understanding of including all of the elements of society in his analysis. As Weber puts it:

"The term 'social relationship' will be used to denote the behaviour of a plurality of actors in so far as, in its meaningful content, the action of each take account of that of the others and is oriented in these terms." (Weber, 1947, p. 118)

While Weber's social action here refers to intentional, meaningful actions, he does not ignore the unintended consequences of an action. How to evaluate social action lies in his analysis of values and facts since human action both needs to be interpretative for given meaning and to be considered causally in terms of the means-end relationship to action (Swingewood, 1984, p. 144).

The significance that Weber allocates to facts and values is crucial to understand how to construct his analysis. A general explanation of capitalism and the history of human beings that Weber tries to put forward will take on a 'chaotic' appearance unless, according to Weber, it is analyzed with an appropriate methodology and abstraction (Özel, 2018, p. 115). First, Weber disapproves of the approach that proceeds from the whole to the pieces because he regards comprehensive elements like social institutions, states, or bureaucracy as the outcome of pieces like subjective actions (Swingewood, 1984, p. 146). Weber's method in examining facts is to reach objective results by giving meaning to values that do not have meaning in themselves and are based on certain concrete facts. In *The Protestant Ethic*:

"The result is that it is by no means necessary to understand by the spirit of capitalism only what it will come to mean to us for the purposes of our analysis. This is a necessary result of the nature of historical concepts which attempt for their methodological purposes not to grasp historical reality in abstract general formula, but in concrete genetic sets of relations which are inevitably of a specifically unique and individual character." (Weber, 1930, p. 14)

In this context, Weber's approach to facts is to reflect them to values in appropriate forms and to explain the social structure. Accordingly, Weber states that "only a small portion of existing concrete reality is colored by our value-conditioned interest, and it alone is significant to us" (Weber, 1949, p. 76). Weber's approach also shows the role of the individual in his analysis; Since he saw the smallest element in his analysis as the explanatory element, the actions of individuals could only be the element that guided history and society. When individuals attribute meaning to a meaning category they perform, it can turn into a social action (Swingewood, 1984, p. 143). This is a building block in his analysis that also shows the contribution of ideas for shaping society. According to Weber's theory of the link between the whole and its component pieces, the explanation of society and history's complexity is best explained by the parts rather

than by the whole; Weber disagrees with biologists who hold the evolutionist belief that complexity increases with the growing structure without considering its value (Callinicos, 2007, p. 153). Therefore, Weber argues that it is not correct to see the ultimate facts as the most complex ones, but the simplest facts are the most complex, which is why he makes his explanations by considering all of the little pieces of society like religion or status (Callinicos, 2007, p. 153). This brings us to the second issue; This approach of Weber also shows his approach to the positive sciences; he seems close to the system of values represented by facts and Neo-Kantianism as a reaction to empiricism spread under the influence of Darwinism, and also he seems close to Nietzsche's approach in terms of believing in the importance of power and caring about conflicts of values although he finds the evolutionist approach wrong (Callinicos, 2007, p. 153, 154). According to Weber, the values that affect human behavior are in conflict; he expresses it as "'scientific' pleading is meaningless in principle because the various value spheres of the world stand in irreconcilable conflict with each other" (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 147). Weber's approach is a combination of interpretative understanding and causal explanation (Swingewood, 1984, p. 150). Weber disproved that the social sciences make precise predictions as it is in the positive sciences since social sciences comprise "causal complexity" (Özel, 2018, p. 115). Although Weber is against empirical positivist approaches in social sciences, he respects ethical impartiality and says that social scientists should not reflect their own values in interpreting empirical materials (Swingewood, 1984, p. 145). While the aim of social science is to make an objective sense of the values in the given structure of society, the way to reach objective and scientific knowledge in the analysis of society is through interpretive understanding and causal explanation (Swingewood, 1984, p. 145). Therefore, according to Weber, social sciences can not contain strict laws, and conceptualization has an important place in his analysis because positivist law explanation models cannot show the importance of values (Callinicos, 2007, p. 157). Two issues should be encountered in Weber's analysis related to his approach to facts and values; The first is the way in which he chooses the facts to constitute values, that is, since not all facts can be reduced to the same category of meaning, how does Weber decide which facts to choose to comprise values? The second is the concept of ideal types that Weber uses in his analysis of society.

Firstly, it is crucial to comprehend Weber's analysis that he takes into account several realities while combining them into a single study of society. Therefore, elective affinity, which is one of the main tools for Weber to analyze society and history, indicates that

different configurations must be in a state of "mutual attraction, mutual influence, and mutual reinforcement" in order to be combined (Löwy, 1989, p. 75). Although this method of Weber is translated into English as 'certain relationships' by Parsons, it is used as 'elective affinity' with a more intense and strong meaning (Löwy, 1989, p. 75). According to Weber, elective affinity is the only basis for generalizations:

"For the forms of social action follow "laws of their own," as we shall see time and again, and even apart from this fact, they may in a given case always be co-determined by other than economic causes. However, at some point economic conditions tend to become causally important, and often decisive, for almost all social groups, at least those which have major cultural significance; conversely, the economy is usually also influenced by the autonomous structure of social action within which it exists. No significant generalization can be made as to when and how this will occur. However, we can generalize about the degree of elective affinity between concrete structures of social action and concrete forms of economic organization, that means, we can state in general terms whether they further or impede or exclude one another-whether they are "adequate" or "inadequate" in relation to one another." (Weber, 1922, p. 341)

Weber uses functional appropriation to determine how certain cultural values and norms are more compatible with particular economic systems and forms of production. Weber's understanding that this selection method is functionally compatible with each other also means that belief, not science, is the determinant in the selection of a phenomenon, which means that "the problem of ideology" is ignored while making objective choices (Swingewood, 1984, p. 146). However, in light of the fact that elements are chosen based on functional appropriateness, there is no "causal superiority relationship" between cultural values and the facts produced by human action, at least not more superiority than people give to their meaning, and as a result, the explanation of society and history must be essentially pluralistic (Callinicos, 2007, p. 163, 164). While he explains phenomena in the history of humans and the evolution of capitalism, he makes this statement,

"On the one hand, capitalism in its modern stages of development requires the bureaucracy, though both have arisen from different historical sources. Conversely, capitalism is the most rational economic basis for bureaucratic administration and enables it to develop in the most rational form, especially because, from a fiscal point of view, it supplies the necessary money resources." (Weber, 1922, p. 224)

Accordingly, capitalism and bureaucracy, which are two different types of organization, are connected to each other by elective affinity, and there is no superiority relationship between them (Callinicos, 2007, p. 163, 164). Weber uses his methodological position on fact and value to build criticism of both idealism and Marxism (Giddens, 1995a, p. 33).

While he adopts some of the views of conventional Marxism about religion, he criticizes that they see it as not a factor in the development of society on the grounds that it underestimates the importance of the influence of religion (Giddens, 1995a, p. 33). Accordingly, Weber adopts a methodology that does not establish any superiority relationship, as opposed to the view that there is a deterministic relationship between the base and the superstructure, which is in line with the orthodox interpretation of Marxism. Weber explains this as follows:

“Concerning the doctrine of the more naïve historical materialism, that such ideas originate as a reflection or superstructure of economic situations, we shall speak more in detail below. At this point it will suffice for our purpose to call attention to the fact that without doubt, in the country of Benjamin Franklin’s birth (Massachusetts), the spirit of capitalism (in the sense we have attached to it) was present before the capitalistic order. There were complaints of a peculiarly calculating sort of profit-seeking in New England, as distinguished from other parts of America, as early as 1632. It is further undoubted that capitalism remained far less developed in some of the neighbouring colonies, the later Southern States of the United States of America, in spite of the fact that these latter were founded by large capitalists for business motives, while the New England colonies were founded by preachers and seminary graduates with the help of small bourgeois, craftsmen and yeomen, for religious reasons. In this case the causal relation is certainly the reverse of that suggested by the materialistic standpoint.” (Weber, 1930, p. 20)

On the other hand, there is also the argument that the Marxist interpretation of religion, ideology, or elements of the superstructure in general, and Weber's approach of elective affinity, which is used to explain the relationship between the capitalist development and factors of society such as religion and ideology, are comparable. Löwy's (1989) first argument on this subject, this causal explanation argument, does not necessarily represent a departure from the Marxist materialist understanding, and there are two reasons for this. First, Weber's deterministic account of Marxism, which can be observed from Weber's above criticisms, is aimed at the "naive materialists" who are figures in the Second International (Löwy, 1989, p. 75). Secondly, according to Löwy, Weber seems to argue that the puritanical morality of the settlers led to the birth of colonization, and the materialist understanding of capitalist order was not a factor in this. But he also took an approach that colonization and establishing the capitalist order in America might be brought about by the settlers' understanding of the capitalist order (Löwy, 1989, p. 77). Thus, this quote by Weber on materialism, although it is not enough to state whether he does give a materialistic explanation of history, cannot be definitive in the sense that it provides a causal explanation that opposes the materialist method, and it can even be said that it offers a similar framework for various non-deterministic interpretations of Marxism. It is clear that Weber's elective affinity method cannot be considered in

opposition to Marx's materialist approach, although detailed explanations will be given in the next section about the methodological and analytical similarities between Weber and Marx.

The second point of concern is how Weber uses abstractions in his analysis, which manifests itself in the form of ideal types. Ideal types have been used to give an idea about the abstraction and selection methods of the different phenomena and actors of society and in which direction they might prefer to follow (Swingewood, 1984, p. 147). Ideal concepts created through abstraction for the elucidation of real social processes are a tool to show the conditions and relations in which they exist;

“There is only one criterion, namely, that of success in revealing concrete cultural phenomena in their interdependence, their causal conditions and their significance. The construction of abstract Ideal-types recommends itself not as an end but as a means.” (Weber, 1949, p. 92)

According to Weber, there are three forms of ideal types; (1) historical formations for phenomena such as protestant ethic and modern capitalism that show historical specificity, which concept will be examined in detail in section 2.2; (2) abstract ideal types for phenomena such as bureaucracy that show cultural periods; (3) types of social action, which will be examined in the context of rational action in section 2.1.2 (Swingewood, 1984, p. 148). Abstract ideal types show their importance in the transition to modern capitalism through Weber's usage of them in the determination of the pure types of authority as rational, traditional, and charismatic (Callinicos, 2007, p. 158). For instance, Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy, which is often associated with the legal-rational type of authority, is a model of a perfectly rational and efficient organization. It is characterized by a hierarchy of authority, formal rules and procedures, specialized roles, and impersonal relationships between members (Giddens, 1995a, p. 45, 49). Therefore, the ideal type is not meant to describe any real organization exactly but rather to serve as a framework for analyzing and evaluating a limited portion of actual processes and organizations (Özel, 2018, p. 115).

Another aspect of Weber's analysis that deserves attention is the way he approaches *the Methodenstreit* debate arguments in relation to his methods for comprehending facts and values as well as history. In the *Methodenstreit* debate, Weber, at first, considered himself a member of the German Historical School, which had a descriptive understanding of history through examining society as an evolving whole, and then he

sided with the marginalists (Callinicos, 2007, p. 148, 149). For example, Weber criticizes Sombart, who belonged to the German Historicist School, for not correctly determining the categories of capitalism, which resulted in his analysis's mistake of equating capitalism with the development of trade and monetary economy. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (hereafter Protestant Ethic),

“What he calls the economy of needs seems at first glance to be identical with what is here described as economic traditionalism. That may be the case if the concept of needs is limited to traditional needs. But if that is not done, a number of economic types which must be considered capitalistic according to the definition of capital which Sombart gives in another part of his work, would be excluded from the category of acquisitive economy and put into that of needs economy.” (Weber 1930, p. 27)

However, Weber was also influenced by Sombart, such that although he left the German historicist school to accept the marginalists' framework of analysis, he continued to adopt a broad framework that took into account factors such as the division of labor in the analysis of society.

“The attempt has been made, particularly by Sombart, in what are often judicious and effective observations, to depict economic rationalism as the salient feature of modern economic life as a whole. Undoubtedly with justification, if by that is meant the extension of the productivity of labour which has, through the subordination of the process of production to scientific points of view, relieved it from its dependence upon the natural organic limitations of the human individual.” (Weber, 1930, p. 36)

But, in a more general perspective, Weber criticizes the German Historical School, saying that it considers abstract concepts as concrete facts and that the concept of ideal types is needed for the evaluation of society, economy, and history (Callinicos, 2007, p. 158). He puts this

“Pure economic theory, in its analysis of past and present society, utilizes ideal-type concepts exclusively. Economic theory makes certain assumptions which scarcely ever correspond completely with reality but which approximate it in various degrees and asks, how would men act under these assumed conditions, if their actions were entirely rational? It assumes the dominance of pure economic interests and precludes the operation of political or other non-economic considerations.” (Weber, 1949, p. 44)

Weber sided with the marginalists, particularly Menger, who differentiate human behavior to focus on a single aspect of the economy, although he considers that the study of economics requires thorough analyses that take into account social, political, and ethical considerations (Callinicos, 2007, p. 149). Weber is also similar to Bentham in seeing the

maximization of human welfare as the goal of the sciences, which is evident in Weber's concern for the welfare of the German nation in his writings (Callinicos, 2007, p. 152). Moreover, Weber is in favor of the marginalist revolution's reinterpretation of the concept of value, that is, removing it from the scope of the labor theory of value and using the new version of value in the analysis of society. This situation manifests itself in his view that interpretative analysis should be used with a value-based methodology in the scientific analysis of society.

This attitude of Weber is also evident in his approach to materialism, which will be explored further, but the background of the facts-values relationship about the issue should be mentioned here. Accordingly, even though Weber strongly disputes historical materialism for not being interested in other elements of society, these arguments are not directed against Marx or his way of analyzing the world. Weber's perception is that when Marx examines the development of historical stages, he has the understanding that stages progress in a linear evolutionary manner and that the source of this progress will be the progress of the productive forces in a mechanistic manner that does not involve human action. And the development of the productive forces here depends on the developments that Weber sees as external elements, such as technology and trade, so this scheme has an economic deterministic path. Weber opposes Marx's treatment of history as "developmental stages," with the view that analyzing history requires an "explanatory interpretation" of it, hence analyzing history should not show any "general theory of history" in a deterministic sense (Giddens, 1995b, p. 297). According to Weber, this approach saw the importance of the economy but did not see the other components of society, such as the importance of religion, and this is due to they do not sufficiently grasping the importance of active human action and what it can be effective on. According to him, the result of the economic determinism of Marxism was that the passive evolution of man as a historical species made thought, ideology, and meaning categories a shadow phenomenon and ceased to be the driving force or influencer of the change of history and society (Swingewood, 1984, p. 143). Weber's approach to Marxism is also based on his distinction between economic and political, which can be traced to Weber's perception of contemporary political problems. Accordingly, he emphasizes that the migration of Prussian workers cannot be understood in an economic sense because this situation should be evaluated in the concept of seeking freedom as their economic concerns are secondary (Giddens, 1995a, p. 32). Although this subject will be discussed in 2.2.2 in the context of Prussian immigrants, the important point to be mentioned is that

the reason for Weber's separation of the economic and the political and attributing the economic to the secondary can be found in his definition of the economic (Wood, 1995, p. 174, 175). It should be noted that Weber does not see a necessary relationship between economic and political processes; Being politically strong or having adequate leadership may not necessarily lead to being economically strong or industrially mature and vice versa (Callinicos, 2007, p. 151). However, since Germany's industrial backwardness makes it powerless in the field of international competition, industrialization in Germany is important for him. In this respect, economic development processes are an area of struggle since economics is not an impartial science (Callinicos, 2007, p. 152). Moreover, the distinction between economic, economically relevant, and economically conditioned by Weber while defining economic action allows him to show social relations in the economic field and to criticize the importance Marxism gives to the economic field. Accordingly, 'economic' means peaceful efforts to gratify utilities, and Weber has elaborated on this distinction as illustrated in the following passages:

“"Economic action" (Wirtschaften) is any peaceful exercise of an actor's control over resources which is in its main impulse oriented towards economic ends. "Rational economic action" requires instrumental rationality in this orientation, that is, deliberate planning. We will call autocephalous economic action an "economy" (Wirtschaft), and an organized system of continuous economic action an "economic establishment" (Wirtschaftsbetrieb).” (Weber, 1922, p. 63)

There are various economic acts that are not "economic" for achieving benefits; He uses the phrases "economically relevant" for phenomena that have an impact on demands or tendencies needed to achieve utilities and "economically conditioned" for phenomena influenced by the economic ones (Giddens, 1995b, p. 297). Weber put this as follows:

“After what has been said, it is self-evident that firstly), 'the boundary lines of "economic" phenomena are vague and not easily defined; secondly), the "economic" aspect of a phenomenon is by no means only "economically conditioned" or only "economically relevant"; thirdly), a phenomenon is "economic" only insofar as and only as long as our interest is exclusively focused on its constitutive significance in the material struggle for existence.” (Weber, 1949, p. 65)

For instance, in terms of the development of capitalism in Western Europe, religion will be both economically relevant and economically conditioned, as it is both influenced and influenced by the economic (Giddens, 1995b, p. 297). Therefore, the inference regarding the way Weber defines the economy and this distinction he makes will be as follows: Since the main issue is the meeting of utilities, how the production is made, and how the surplus is taken away will be out of the discussion because the gratification of utilities

has a peaceful conceptual framework in the field of exchange (Wood, 1995, p. 168). And in this way, Weber puts the relevance of economic one into the economy of capitalism, which Weber sees it exist throughout history.

2.1.2. Weber's Theory of History: Ancient Barriers and Rationalisation

In order to comprehend Weber's approach to history and the birth of capitalism, it is necessary to look at how much weight he places on the notions of the mode of production and work ethic as well as his conception of capitalism. Thus, it is required to examine his analyses of the ancient feudal economy and the free-wage worker. And this is because his analyses of the emergence of modern capitalism are based on the confluence of the dominance of rationalization and the creation of new work ethics.

Weber explains the existence of modern capitalism with the existence of certain specific prerequisites. For him, the motive of making a profit, which existed as a prerequisite for the existence of capitalism throughout history, manifests itself in modern capitalism as the organization of production in a rational way. The pursuit of profit maximization requires the existence of a new work ethic suitable for the new mode of production. This relationship that Weber established necessitates a look at the meaning of work ethic.

First of all, it should be noted that Weber wrote the *Protestant Ethic*, in which he examined the relationship of the 'working' with the development of capitalism in detail, in 1905 but continued to make changes until 1920; as Parsons stated, "he made considerable changes, and appended both new material and replies to criticism in footnotes" (Parsons, 1930, p. 9). However, the essence of his understanding of the work ethic had not changed; before and after the changes, he continued to see the work ethic as an important character for capitalism to increase productivity (Barbalet, 2008, p. 47). According to Weber, while the work ethic was a moral activity brought about by the Reformation, it had a traditional form, but when this unintentionally became a part of the spirit of capitalism and became dominant, it led to the birth of modern capitalism (Barbalet, 2008, p. 53). Moreover, Weber's definition of work emphasizes self-control, personal autonomy from nature, and the restraint of desires and exhibits both rational and irrational characteristics simultaneously:

“It had developed a systematic method of rational conduct with the purpose of overcoming the status naturæ, to free man from the power of irrational impulses and his dependence on the world and on nature. It attempted to subject man to the supremacy of a purposeful will, to bring his actions under constant self-control with a careful consideration of their ethical consequences.” (Weber, 1930, p. 72)

While the work ethic becomes dominant, it becomes a part of the personality rather than just a physical feature or a set of habits, which is considered a basic characteristic of the bourgeois life in Weber's work ethic (Barbalet, 2008, p. 50). Although Weber's analysis of work ethic deals with the new discipline to be developed by both workers and entrepreneurs, as it will be revisited in the context of the development of capitalism in section 2.2, the basis of his analysis is a part of bourgeois culture since the general concept of work ethic builds on the increase in productivity. Thus, workers are excluded from the conceptual framework of work because it is not the worker who produces and will have the virtues of work but the owner of the means of production (Wood, 1995, p. 156). The examination of the worker as a whole with the entrepreneur is not unique to Weber, such that the notion that the owner of the means of production is the real producer can be traced since the 17th century when the bourgeoisie became class conscious of themselves (Wood, 1995, p. 156). Moreover, Weber's understanding of work ethic has two dimensions, which causes an ambiguous understanding for workers. While it is a discipline that requires adaptation to new working hours and wage-based work to increase productivity, it also means an increase in the cultural status of workers. However, rather than an increase in the social status of the worker, this is actually a change in the cultural position of the bourgeois, as work becomes a virtue, and the virtue of work belongs to the entrepreneur (Wood, 1995, p. 201). And this framework of Weber shows why he addresses himself as a bourgeois scholar when he gives “the inaugural lecture delivered in May 1895” (Weber, 2010, p. 22).

Another point that is related to the ‘work ethic’ is his understanding of capitalism. Weber's understanding of Capitalism does not represent a stage in historical development schemes. As stated earlier, he is against the idea of historical development stages as he considers this deterministic, and according to him, ‘capitalism’ is observed in different forms throughout history since he considers capitalism in terms of economic relations such as trade. He puts this:

“The concept spirit of capitalism is here used in this specific sense, it is the spirit of modern capitalism. For that we are here dealing only with Western European and American capitalism is obvious from the way in which the problem was stated.

Capitalism existed in China, India, Babylon, in the classic world, and in the Middle Ages. But in all these cases, as we shall see, this particular ethos was lacking.” (Weber, 1930, p. 17)

As can be seen in this excerpt from the *Protestant Ethic*, Weber's main area of interest is the conditions for the emergence of modern capitalism in Western Europe, and for this, he entered into a detailed analysis of society and history. And according to Weber, the profit motive, which Weber says has existed since the beginning of history, or the expansion of trade and the influx of precious metals, which he says acted as an exogenous factor in the development of modern capitalism, are not the originators of this ethos (Weber, 1930, p. 21). He thinks the rationally organized work ethic is absent in other capitalisms: a new ethos against the traditional concept of work that sees it as a curse (Wood, 1995, p. 155). And this new work ethic was propagated by the Protestant ethics in Western Europe. According to Weber, the roots of capitalism were in ancient times and feudalism, which was a gap in the progress of capitalism and human history (Wood, 1995, p. 155). As Weber puts it:

“However, when the political centre of the Empire shifted from the coastal areas to the interior, and slave supplies dried up, then the natural economy imposed its pressures towards feudalism on the once commercialized superstructure of the ancient world.

Thus the framework of ancient civilization weakened and then collapsed, and the intellectual life of Western Europe sank into a long darkness.

... But of course no Greek or Roman authors appeared. They slept in hibernation, as did all civilization, in an economic world that had once again become rural in character. Nor were the classics remembered when the troubadours and tournaments of feudal society appeared. It was only when the mediaeval city developed out of free division of labour and commercial exchange, when the transition to a natural economy made possible the development of burgher freedoms, and when the bonds imposed by outer and inner feudal authorities were cast off, that – like Antaeus – the classical giants regained a new power, and the cultural heritage of Antiquity revived in the light of modern bourgeois civilization.” (Weber, 2013, p. 288)

As can be seen from this passage from Weber's treatise on the features of antiquity, feudalism represented a return to the natural economy, to the agricultural economy, while later, the development of trade and division of labor enabled the cities to break free from feudal fetters. Accordingly, there was an important feature that distinguished the ancient city from the medieval city, which made it suitable for the development of capitalism: The importance of cities for Weber lies in the power that medieval cities gave to the creation of modern capitalism (Wood, 1995, p. 159). According to Weber, medieval and ancient

cities are distinguishable as the center of production and consumption: while the ancient cities are “the center of consumption,” medieval cities are “the centers of production”:

“The question to be considered now, therefore, is this: did a capitalist economy exist in Antiquity, to a degree significant for cultural history? To begin with, there is this general factor: the economic surplus of the ancient city – and this applies to the Near East as well as to the archaic polis of the Mediterranean lands – always had its original basis in the rents which the landed princes and noble clans derived from their estates and from levies on their dependants. This was true to a degree unknown today except in the case of certain capitals centring on a royal court; a more appropriate comparison would be Moscow during the period of serfdom. The significance of this source of wealth, and with it the specific political conditions of the economic ‘flowering’ of the cities – and hence too their swift decline – remained very important throughout all Antiquity. The ancient cities were always much more centres of consumption than production, whereas the opposite is true of mediaeval cities.” (Weber, 2013, p. 35)

The main reason for Weber's approach to ancient and medieval cities is that he wanted to emphasize the prevalence and logic of rentier property, that is, a culture based on debtors-creditors and landlords-slaveholders, which is different from the property culture of modern capitalism (Wood, 1995, p. 159). Moreover, in this work of Weber, which examines a wide area from agriculture to the military, from consumption habits to the financial position of states, the social position of citizens is closely related to the state payments made to them. These payments were not related to their economic but political positions in his conceptual framework of seeing the producer as the landlord or the petty bourgeoisie (Wood, 1995, p. 162).

In conclusion, Weber's work ethic and his work on capitalism and ancient and medieval cities illustrate his approach to modern capitalism and its genesis. When ancient barriers are removed, cities transform, and the spirit of capitalism becomes dominant. Production in the cities was reorganized for market demands: it created the rationalization of production, which means the reorganization of the production process with a new work ethic for the maximization of profit rather than the social appreciation of workers (Wood, 1995, p. 160).

The last issue to be addressed in this section is the place of Rationalization in Weber's analysis. The concept of rationality is a “comprehensive collective process” that stands for the conduct of methods and actions that serve to separate from all mystics (Swingewood, 1984, p. 173). The practices such as keeping accounting records and calculations, pursuing profit, making profit-cost analyses, individualization, and change

in people's social position and division of labor are required and brought by capitalism for rationalization. As Weber puts it:

“Now this process of rationalization in the field of technique and economic organization undoubtedly determines an important part of the ideals of life of modern bourgeois society. Labour in the service of a rational organization for the provision of humanity with material goods has without doubt always appeared to representatives of the capitalistic spirit as one of the most important purposes of their life-work.” (Weber, 1930, p. 36)

According to Weber, rationalization, which will increase the efficiency of capitalist production, spreads throughout society and determines society's way of living. Moreover, Weber's idea of rationalization differs from other perspectives because it is optimistic and holds that humanity will be prosperous by combining social justice values with the scientific values of the Enlightenment (Swingewood, 1984, p. 173). Weber's attitude towards enlightenment develops dually: on the one hand, he is influenced by their belief in the advancement of reason and freedom and his critical and libertarian views; on the other hand, he criticizes their progressive perspective of history (Wood, 1995, p. 178): This can be observed, especially, when he is accepting both the benefits and harms of modern capitalism as an advancement. What was important for Weber was that the capitalist mode of production would create rationality to replace the traditional economy. As Weber states:

“Similarly it is one of the fundamental characteristics of an individualistic capitalistic economy that it is rationalized on the basis of rigorous calculation, directed with foresight and caution toward the economic success which is sought in sharp contrast to the hand-to-mouth existence of the peasant, and to the privileged traditionalism of the guild craftsman and of the adventurers' capitalism, oriented to the exploitation of political opportunities and irrational speculation.” (Weber, 1930, p. 37)

Weber states that the definition of capitalism differs from Sombart's definition of consumption and earnings as the driving motive because this consumption motive can only belong to the traditional economy, while modern capitalism is the domination of production with the organization of the productivity of labor (Weber, 1930, p. 37).

Furthermore, according to Weber, rationalization has a substantive feature that creates new and specific meanings, values, and ideals on the one hand and a formal feature that creates the premise of interests and acts in a calculative way on the other hand (Swingewood, 1984, p. 173). Accordingly, while formal rationality is related to the instruments of action, value rationality is for the aims (Callinicos, 2007, p. 158). The

reason why Weber put forward two different forms of rationality is to explain the dynamics of social change. Substantive rationality or value-rationality is the creator of change as creating dedicated people to the charisma and expressing values that are different from the daily flow of life, formal rationality or instrumental-rationality is conditioned by existing situations and limited by economic institutions and means adaptation to the existing (Mommson, 1992, p. 152). "Social action types," of which Weber says there are four types, give an idea about this: "(1) instrumentally-rational (zweckrational), (2) value rational (wertrational), (3) affectual (especially emotional), (4) traditional" (Weber, 1922, p. 24, 25). Accordingly, the first and second types of actions require a conscious choice in terms of the means-end relationship compared to the third and fourth action types (Swingewood, 1984, p. 148). And Weber methodologically opposes the instrumentally-rational and value-rational forms of action to irrational action (Giddens, 1995a, p. 42). However, It should be clarified that Weber's understanding of rationality has a "contextual basis of rationality"; that is, a rational action can be irrational at different times and circumstances (Barbalet, 2008, p. 49). To sum up, rational action has two paths to follow; firstly, the increased value-rational action creates change and charisma, which is essentially irrational, and secondly, increased formal-rationality forms the bureaucratization, which is the character in the routinization of charisma (Özel, 2018, p. 115).

The second important point about rationalization is that this approach to the means-end relationship gives an idea about Weber's understanding of marginalist revolution and capitalism. Weber explains this relationship as

"Choice between alternative and conflicting ends and results may well be determined in a value-rational manner. In that case, action is instrumentally rational only in respect to the choice of means. On the other hand, the actor may, instead of deciding between alternative and conflicting ends in terms of a rational orientation to a system of values, simply take them as given subjective wants and arrange them in a scale of consciously assessed relative urgency. He may then orient his action to this scale in such a way that they are satisfied as far as possible in order of urgency, as formulated in the principle of "marginal utility." Value-rational action may thus have various different relations to the instrumentally rational action. From the latter point of view, however, value-rationality is always irrational." (Weber, 1922, p. 26)

Weber's emphasis on "marginal utility" here is aimed at extending the principles of marginalist revolution to the analysis of society (Callinicos, 2007, p. 158). This means that Weber generalizes capitalist principles by applying economic behavior, that is, the principle of choosing the most suitable means for the purpose according to the marginal

utility principle to society (Wood, 1995, p. 170, 171). Moreover, according to Weber, rationalization did not only mean the reorganization of an economic system, but it is also a system of domination because rational means were meaningful in the struggle for power (Callinicos, 2007, p. 171):

“Money is not a mere "voucher for unspecified utilities," which could be altered at will without any fundamental effect on the character of the price system as a struggle of man against man. "Money" is, rather, primarily a weapon in this struggle, and prices are expressions of the struggle; they are instruments of calculation only as estimated quantifications of relative chances in this struggle of interests.

...

Strict capital accounting is further associated with the social phenomena of "shop discipline" and appropriation of the means of production, and that means: with the existence of a "system of domination" (Herrschaftsverhältniss)." (Weber, 1922, p. 108)

Accordingly, it is irrational that the motive of making money is becoming a non-despised act and even becoming dominant in society, and can only be explained by the influence of religions (Löwy, 1989, p. 81). In Weber's understanding, different world religions reflect different forms of rationalization, and Protestantism is the form that gave rise to modern capitalism in Western Europe (Callinicos, 2007, p. 165).

2.2. ON THE ORIGINS OF MODERN CAPITALISM

Weber saw the development of modern capitalism as the dominance of the spirit of capitalism, but he did not offer a precise judgment on how to define the spirit of capitalism. Instead, in order to define the spirit of capitalism, he expressed that it must be understood as “a complex of elements associated in historical reality which we unite into a conceptual whole from the standpoint of their cultural significance” (Weber, 1930, p. 13). According to Weber, the way to overcome the difficulty of explaining the spirit of capitalism that collects and analyzes selected social, cultural, and economic characteristics is using Weber's elective affinity method. Finally, Weber concluded the capitalist spirit “is an ethos. This is the quality which interests us” (Weber, 1930, p. 17). According to Weber's conclusion from the result of this examination, “that attitude of mind has, on the one hand, found its most suitable expression in the capitalistic enterprise; on the other, the enterprise has derived its most suitable motivating force from the spirit of capitalism” (Weber, 1930, p. 28).

In section 2.2.1, we explore Weber's analysis of the spirit of capitalism, the birth and development of modern capitalism, and the remarks and criticisms from both his day and subsequent times. In this respect, the following issues are addressed: (i) Weber's views on Protestantism and Catholicism and on their importance for the development of capitalism; (ii) the controversy over whether Weber's use of Protestantism to explain the emergence of modern capitalism was a theological justification or an element of his analysis of society and history, as was evident both in his lifetime and since; (iii) in light of this, Weber's description of the structure of modern capitalism, which includes the newly forming classes, how the manner of life was fashioned, and so on, and its relationship with powerful nation-states, which was his primary area of focus; (iv) his consideration of what other causes might have had an impact on the creation of modern capitalism in the perspective of his observations that it has not evolved equally over the world; and (v) Weber's emphasis on power struggles and its dynamics, which could lead to the birth of modern capitalism.

In section 2.2.2, we evaluate Weber's assessments of the development of modern capitalism and its requirements in Germany and what kind of society it might create: (i) Weber distinguished between economic and political power in explaining what it would take for Germany to become a strong nation-state; (ii) the importance of leadership in his writings and, in this context, his distinction between charismatic and bureaucratic authorities and how this manifests itself in modern capitalist society; (iii) the processes of intellectualization and disenchantment of the world, which is observed as the successor problem of charismatic authority, which eventually leads to bureaucratization, and that the transformative power of Protestantism no longer exists in societies where bureaucratization is observed; and (v) trapped inside the iron cage created by the planned economy and the capitalist division of labor, rationalization loses its transformative power and hence results in the collapse of modern capitalism.

2.2.1. The Emergence of Modern Capitalism and the Protestant Ethic

It is expressed that religion, Protestantism in Western Europe, is fundamental to explaining the emergence of modern capitalism in Weber's writings. There are different approaches to Weber's analysis of how the Protestant ethic affected the development of society. It is important in this regard to note whether Weber's use of religion and the development of religion while explaining the change in society in the Protestant Ethic,

means he interpreted history and society using an idealist approach or whether he examined the effects of Protestant ethics as one of the explanatory elements in the development of society. The main question of this chapter is, according to Weber, how does Protestantism affect the birth of capitalism? Weber's interest was closely related to the situations that Germany experienced following the emergence of capitalism, so Weber's area of interest was how the establishment of this new order could take place, as well as its importance for the establishment of the German nation-state. In this respect, it was necessary to politically and economically strengthen the bourgeoisie, which were the dominant power of the new system. Weber's grounds in the Protestant Ethic were to explain the historical basis of recently emerging essentials of society, such as the political consciousness of this newly developing bourgeois group in Germany (Giddens, 1995a, p. 18). This also shows the arrangements and establishments that preserve the aristocratic system and culture and hinder the development of capitalism. Weber based the reason peasants' becoming workers developed differently in America, England, and Europe on the fact that Europe has ancient aristocratic roots that caused different social and political conditions, whereas the United States was a more newly developed country (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 372).

The first issue to be clarified is Weber's link between the Protestant ethic and modern capitalism because Weber has examined both the characteristics of the Protestant ethic and its importance in the explanation of capitalism to build connections. According to Weber, Catholics also had political power in commercially essential places at a certain period of history, although they did not bring about economic innovation. Therefore, it is not the historical or political positions of the sects but their intrinsic characteristics that should be evaluated when investigating the importance of the Protestant ethic in the development of modern capitalism and the spread of rationality. He puts this,

"If any inner relationship between certain expressions of the old Protestant spirit and modern capitalistic culture is to be found, we must attempt to find it, for better or worse not in its alleged more or less materialistic or at least anti-ascetic joy of living, but in its purely religious characteristics." (Weber, 1930, p. 11)

Asceticism, which for Weber "signifies the carrying out of a definite, methodical conduct of life," occupies an essential place in his analysis because the concept of asceticism draws attention to the examination of the internal characteristics of the sects (Weber, 1923, p. 364). Moreover, he is precise about the fact that every sect of Christianity includes some ascetic features: Protestants use this concept to criticize the ideal form of Catholics' asceticism, and Catholics use it to criticize Protestantism regarding the

secularization of life. Regarding the issue of what are the features that separate Protestantism from other sects, his attention was on the approaches of sects to social and worldly life. Although, in Catholic belief, the “individual qualification for salvation” depends on the balance of good deeds and transgressions, along with the devotion to the church, this relies on the ethical conduct of the life that carries out the whole of the existence of a person in Protestantism (Weber, 1978, p. 1115). Although there is a necessity of being a member of it, the Calvinist church does not provide any salvation from sins; rather, members carry on their religious belief “in a deep spiritual isolation” (Weber, 1930, p. 63):

“In Catholicism, as in Lutheranism, it is in the last analysis only the representative of the “office” who must determine with the individual communicant if the latter is qualified for communion. In Calvinism, the entire social life is unambiguously directed toward the exaltation of “God's glory,” a burden which is in this way alien to the other great churches.” (Weber, 1978, p. 1116)

According to Weber, Protestantism destroyed the walls between the church and social life in this way. Through this, Protestantism rejected the irrational ascetic practices implemented by Catholic churches and contemplation, as well as directed the “exercise of asceticism” to “the inner-worldly way of life” (Weber, 1978, p. 1122). Weber stated the Lutheran and Catholic churches favor the preservation of the old system because they see a more controllable relationship between serfs and lords, even though the Lutheran church is an improvement on the Catholic church in the understanding of work ethic. He stated,

“The church belongs to the conservative forces in European countries; first, the Roman Catholic Church, which, in Europe, even on account of the multitude of its followers, is a power of quite different importance and character than it possesses in Anglo-Saxon countries; but also the Lutheran Church. Both of these churches support the peasant, with his conservative way of life, against the dominion of urban rationalist culture” (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 370)

Because the lord–serf relationship under this system was more manageable and preferable to the individualistic and separated from old forms of control produced by the solely commercial interactions developed by capitalism, the Church was pleased with the patriarchal labor relations (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 371). In Christianity, the organization of society is observed according to God’s command and obedience to the commandments of the church, and the everyday life of society should be arranged in accordance with the “calling.” The arrangement of social life is carried out in accordance with the rules of religion to fulfill God’s commands. However, the use of calling as a profession, which at first meant fulfilling religious duties, became possible with the new

meaning that Luther brought in the Reformation (Weber, 1930, p. 40). In Calvinism, God's commands gain an ethical dimension unique to society's life. In the Protestant Ethic,

“God requires social achievement of the Christian because He wills that social life shall be organized according to His commandments, in accordance with that purpose. The social activity of the Christian in the world is solely activity in *majorem gloriam Dei*. This character is hence shared by labour in a calling which serves the mundane life of the community. Even in Luther we found specialized labour in callings justified in terms of brotherly love. But what for him remained an uncertain, purely intellectual suggestion became for the Calvinists a characteristic element in their ethical system.” (Weber, 1930, p. 64)

Weber stated the domination of Protestantism changed the way people understood work and gain, and this indicated the start of a new era. Moreover, the approach that gives its spirit to capitalism in Protestantism is to earn more money and put in extra effort—and hence avoid enjoying life in order to fulfill God's command. He put this as follows:

“Along with a moderate vegetable diet and cold baths, the same prescription is given for all sexual temptations as is used against religious doubts and a sense of moral unworthiness: “Work hard in your calling.” But the most important thing was that even beyond that labour came to be considered in itself the end of life, ordained as such by God. St. Paul's “He who will not work shall not eat” holds unconditionally for everyone. Unwillingness to work is symptomatic of the lack of grace.” (Weber, 1930, p. 105)

Meanwhile, it should be noted that Weber specifically examined the development of the idea of calling in the context of the development of the capitalist work ethic, that calling was not perceived in the same way since the birth of Protestantism. For Luther, working to earn more than necessary was traditionally condemned, as the profession represented worldly work (Weber, 1930, p. 44). This condemnation goes hand in hand with remaining in the job and statute that God's will leads, and this is what Weber called for Luther, an economic traditionalist. However, dependence on worldly affairs and specialization developed together, reaching a point where individuals' private occupations matched God's grace. Therefore, according to Weber, the idea of calling for Luther was arguable for what Weber investigates as the development of a capitalistic spirit, and, accordingly, it will be possible to observe this subject of study in other Protestant sects (Weber, 1930, p. 45). However, Weber specifically stated that what he was looking for in other sects of Protestantism was not to show that the capitalist spirit was the purpose of their working life: “We cannot well maintain that the pursuit of worldly goods, conceived as an end in itself, was to any of them of positive ethical value” (Weber, 1930, p. 48).

Besides the work ethic and discipline radically changing the way of life of the workers, the pursuit of profit has likewise become dominant. In this respect, the rational use of

goods in a way that will increase the productivity of labor can be expected from the representatives of the capitalist spirit in business life (Weber, 1930, p. 36). In Protestantism, the virtues of working were also appropriate to the wealthy as a commandment of God. He expressed this as follows:

“Even the wealthy shall not eat without working, for even though they do not need to labour to support their own needs, there is God’s commandment which they, like the poor, must obey. For everyone without exception God’s Providence has prepared a calling, which he should profess and in which he should labour.” (Weber, 1930, p. 106)

Protestantism, according to Weber, is full of narratives that it is ominous to chase and accumulate money, but what makes it immoral is that having too much wealth can drive people into inactivity and idleness. Wealth must be operated and utilized to work as part of God's command. This is the ethical significance of Protestantism:

“The real moral objection is to relaxation in the security of possession, the enjoyment of wealth with the consequence of idleness and the temptations of the flesh, above all of the distraction from the pursuit of a righteous life. In fact, it is only because possession involves this danger of relaxation that it is objectionable at all.” (Weber, 1930, p. 104)

For Weber, the internal structure of the capitalist world finds itself in the asceticism of Protestantism; according to this denomination, every mortal was a sinner, and he could achieve salvation only through asceticism and fulfilling God’s command, and a society that builds in this way accelerates the development of capitalism (Callinicos, 2007, p. 160). The efforts to organize themselves, society, and nature in this way are the basis of Weber’s explanations of the accumulation of capital and the transformation of humans in accordance with the laws of capitalism. By making the pursuit of profit a virtue, Protestantism makes the inner law of modern capitalism more applicable to society. Developing impersonal relations and ending traditional relations was a step that the Catholic Church could not take for the development of modern capitalism. It was only with modern capitalism that the person pursuing profit also brought impersonal relations: “It is this fact of impersonal relations which places certain human affairs outside the church and its influence, and prevents the latter from penetrating them and transforming them along ethical lines” (Weber, 1923, p. 357). However, the change in humans mentioned here was not simply the transformation of a human into that living in pursuit of their own interests because, for Weber, this motive for the pursuit of interest exists at all times. The main change here was that the pursuit of economic profit was now supported by a new work ethic that would give it a rational form. In “The Evolution of the

Capitalistic Spirit" (Weber, 1923), which is a chapter of General Economic History, Weber stated,

"Traditional obstructions are not overcome by the economic impulse alone. The notion that our rationalistic and capitalistic age is characterized by a stronger economic interest than other periods is childish; the moving spirits of modern capitalism are not possessed of a stronger economic impulse than, for example, an oriental trader." (Weber, 1923, p. 356-7)

What Weber saw here was a change in people's orientation of mode of life; people living with traditional ties now began to live in accordance with the rules of modern capitalism, and this created new life, which the Catholic Church found "repugnant" because it was based on "higgling, overpricing and free competition, and were based the principle of just price and the assurance to every one of a chance to live" (Weber, 1923, p. 357–358).

Weber explained this change as follows:

"As far as the influence of the Puritan outlook extended, under all circumstances—and this is, of course, much more important than the mere encouragement of capital accumulation—it favoured the development of a rational bourgeois economic life; it was the most important, and above all the only consistent influence in the development of that life. It stood at the cradle of the modern economic man." (Weber, 1930, p. 106)

The Protestant ethic, which required the division of work by calling in order to attain "disciplined monetary gain," was what gave rise to rationalism in modern capitalism (Giddens, 1995a, p. 44). The specific place of the division of labor, according to Weber, in the development of modern capitalism will be discussed later in this chapter, but it should be noted now that for Weber, this division of labor was both peculiar to modern capitalism and essential to its development.

All of the above leads to the discussion, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, of whether Weber gives deterministic importance to religion in an idealist line or uses religion as an element in his explanation of history and modern capitalism. To interpret Weber's analysis within the framework of "an idealistic interpretation of history" as much as a historical materialistic interpretation would be to misinterpret the importance he actually places on the Protestant ethic in the development of capitalism (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 59). He said Protestantism gives rational forms by changing the existing relations; that is, it gives an impetus to the existing capitalism (Giddens, 1995a, p. 44). To determine whether Weber's analysis contains religious undertones, first, we examine Weber's views on the discussions of his studies of Protestant ethics, and, second, we address the connection, which Weber built up, between the newly emerging bourgeoisie and Protestantism.

First of all, the role of Protestantism in the development of capitalism is not simply an idealistic historical narrative for Weber. Since Weber's religious analysis in his study of Protestant ethics was also a matter of debate in his own time, his own interpretation of these arguments has significance, which is Weber's fear that conservatives will interpret his research from an idealistic framework (Löwy, 1989, p. 73).

Weber explained the nature of his own work in "Anticritical Last Word on the Spirit of Capitalism" (Davis, 1978), which he wrote in response to criticism directed at him for incorporating the Protestant ethic into his work to explain the development of modern capitalism. First of all, Weber specifically underlined that his aim was not to explain the economic behavior of a single human being or the expansion of industrial capitalism; instead, it was "the development of humankind as it was produced through the confluence of religiously and economically determined factors" (Weber, 1978, p. 1111). Weber's area of interest was not the development of the individual or the connection that person establishes with religious beliefs but rather what direction these religious beliefs have in the progress of societies. In other words, he was interested in the divergence of society with both the past and other societies to analyze the change in societies. This brings us to the second approach: According to him, there is harmony between Protestantism and capitalist society, and Protestantism spreads the rationalism that already exists within the churches in accordance with the needs of capitalism. As we saw above, Protestantism differs from Catholic and Lutheran sects in different ways, but the important point that unites them is that they actually contain a rationalist lifestyle. Weber specifically noted the following:

"the economic prosperity of the monasteries was almost always considered a consequence of God's blessing and was, along with bequests, in the largest measure a consequence of their rational economic administration... Monastic asceticism required independence from the "world" and especially repudiated naive pleasure. Protestant asceticism did exactly the same, and both converged in the method of exercise (this is finally the meaning of the word "asceticism")-a stringent use of time, work, and silence as a means of suppressing instinctual urges. " (Weber, 1978, p. 1121).

However, this does not mean Weber saw a cause-effect relationship between Protestantism and capitalism. Although the Protestant ethic created conditions such as the spread of rationalism that created capitalism, he did not see it as an obligation for the emergence of modern capitalism. As he stated in the Protestant Ethic:

"On the other hand, however, we have no intention whatever of maintaining such a foolish and doctrinaire thesis as that the spirit of capitalism (in the provisional sense of the term explained above) could only have arisen as the result of certain effects of the Reformation, or even that capitalism as an economic system is a creation of

the Reformation. In itself, the fact that certain important forms of capitalistic business organization are known to be considerably older than the Reformation is a sufficient refutation of such a claim." (Weber, 1930, p. 49)

Lastly, Protestantism gives impetus to capitalism by making this rationality the way of living of the whole society. It brings a new kind of divergence of class, in which every class has its new duties according to both religious beliefs and industrial capitalism. This new "stringent use of time, work, and silence" finds itself in different ways in vocations or callings as an ethical connotation. This is further evidence that Weber did not intend to make a statement on religious systems, and he specifically stated in the Protestant Ethic, "In such a study, it may at once be definitely stated, no attempt is made to evaluate the ideas of the Reformation in any sense, whether it concerns their social or their religious worth" (Weber, 1930, p. 48). Although Weber's analysis includes both religious and economic elements, his inclusion of classes and statuses in his analysis also means he takes into account other factors that establish progress in society.

The second issue related to whether Weber made a religious analysis or not is that Weber's aim in examining the Protestant ethic was to examine its relationship to the rising classes of modern capitalism. As he stated,

"It is true that the greater relative participation of Protestants in the ownership of capital, in management, and the upper ranks of labour in great modern industrial and commercial enterprises, may in part be explained in terms of historical circumstances which extend far back into the past, and in which religious affiliation is not a cause of the economic conditions, but to a certain extent appears to be a result of them." (Weber, 1930, p. 4)

When we consider this statement about Protestantism, Löwy seems right when he states, according to Weber, "in Germany capitalists became Protestants and not Protestants capitalists" (Löwy, 1989, p. 74). The main tendency in *The Protestant Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism* is to examine the influence of Protestantism on the development of modern capitalism and, with this respect, newly emerged rationality (Löwy, 1989, p. 74). The religious force owing to Protestantism, and its spread, provided moral support for modern capitalism (Löwy, 1989, p. 74). Though, the central importance of rationalism was not the only cause of the emergence of modern capitalism since there were divergences between the stages of development of this rationalization. In *the Protestant Ethic*:

"It might thus seem that the development of the spirit of capitalism is best understood as part of the development of rationalism as a whole, and could be deduced from the fundamental position of rationalism on the basic problems of life. In the process Protestantism would only have to be considered in so far as it had formed a stage prior to the development of a purely rationalistic philosophy. But any serious attempt

to carry this thesis through makes it evident that such a simple way of putting the question will not work, simply because of the fact that the history of rationalism shows a development which by no means follows parallel lines in the various departments of life." (Weber, 1930, p. 37)

In other words, the relationship of capitalism with the bourgeoisie is not in the form of Protestants becoming bourgeois by being drawn into the calling and profit motive. Rather, the bourgeoisie, which has existed for ages in different forms, and its culture, which seeks to acquire profit, was supported by Protestantism so they could become dominant in society.

So far, we have seen that the "spirit of capitalism" does not present a causal spiritual relationship; instead, it is an exposition of an interaction of spiritual attitudes and other components of analysis of society that Weber chooses according to elective affinity (Löwy, 1989, p. 72). However, this importance is not found as a determining element but as a component in the process. That means religion does not exist either as an independent factor in the development of modern capitalism nor as a passively influenced factor by it; religion has an autonomous existence. The autonomy of religion brings to mind not only the different developments of internal elements of the religious systems but also its character in social relations; however, as we mentioned before, Weber's concern is inherent in the latter: its role in shaping history. According to Weber, every belief system influences and is influenced by external interests and ways of life, as well as social division and stratification that overlap with it (Callinicos, 2007, p. 165).

This leads to the third main point of this chapter: We see above the aim of Weber's writings is not to explain the development of capitalism nor the theory of history (Mommsen, 1992, p. 140). Rather, his political concern, which can be pursued from his writings, is to examine the delay in the development of capitalism in Germany. Although there was an enclosure movement that led self-sufficient peasants to become wage workers in Britain, Germany had not reached this part of industrialization yet, and this "retardation of German development" showed itself in Weber's writings on the East of the Elbe (Giddens, 1995a, p. 30, 31). Because of the industrialization of agriculture and the attractiveness of industrial areas in the other parts of Germany, East Elbe, the homeland of the Junkers, faced the emigration of peasants to other areas in Germany. Until they lost their power in this way, Junkers constituted the power behind Bismarck, who desired a united Germany (Giddens, 1995a, p. 17). According to Weber, this migration spread to places where German culture was more widespread, and it became a boundary problem that endangered the unity of the nation. Eventually, the emigration

stopped, but the Junkers, who gave the feature of political unification to the country before, would not comprise this duty anymore. However, Weber stated the new power of Germany should be sought in the industrialized state—while making clear the comparison between the newly prospering industry and the declining aristocracy (Giddens, 1995a, p. 18). Weber put the situation of East Elbe as follows:

“It is not yet possible to speak of a real 'contest' between capitalism and the power of historical influence, in this case of a growing conflict between capital and ownership of the land. It is partly a process of selection, and partly one of deprivation. Quite different conditions prevail not only where an unorganized multitude of peasants are powerless in the chains of the financial powers of the cities, but where there is an aristocratic stratum above the peasants which struggles not only for its economic existence but also for the social standing which for centuries has been granted it. This is the case especially where such an aristocracy is not tied to the country by purely financial interests, as is the English landlord, or only by the interests of recreation and sport, but where its representatives are involved as agriculturists in the economic conflict and are closely connected with the country. The dissolving effects of capitalism are then increased. Because ownership of the land gives social position, the prices of the large estates rise high above the value of their productivity.” (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 368)

Three points draw our attention in this excerpt regarding the situation of the Elbe and, thus, the birth of modern capitalism: First, the situation of the new classes in Germany differed from that of England, the birthplace of capitalism. Later, the aristocracy—the dominant class in the previous society—lost its social standing. Lastly, the farmers had to acquire a new status in the new society because they could no longer depend on the aristocracy for their position. Weber specifically noted the change in the position of the Prussian aristocracy could not be explained only in economic terms because they also lost their social position. Weber saw the English landlords' position differed from Prussian landlords with respect to their ties with political and social power, and this constituted a social characteristic: The English landlord, “as a social product, he is a genuine child of capitalism, arisen under the pressure of the contrasting effects, which capitalism produces in completely populated countries with an aristocratic social structure” (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 381). Moreover, in the following page of this quote, we can see Weber's position on the social position of aristocracy because he referred to rents as “the economic basis of all aristocracies which need a gentlemanly unearned income for their existence” (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 369). In the age of ennobling the working ethic and discipline, aristocracies' features of “unearned income” and living in the pleasure of leisure must be replaced with the capitalistic spirit because this is the meaningful specialty that the best interests of the nation lie in. Moreover, the entrance of capitalist laws into agricultural lands increases the price of the land:

“The use of the land as a capital investment, and the sinking rate of interest in connection with the traditional social evaluation of rural lands, push up the price of land to such a height that it is always paid partly *au fonds perdu*, that is to say, as *entree*, as an entrance fee into this social stratum. Thus by increasing the capital required for agricultural operations, capitalism causes an increase in the number of renters land who are idle. In these ways, peculiar contrasting effects of capitalism are produced, and these contrasting effects by themselves make the open countryside of Europe appear to support a separate 'rural society.' Under the conditions of old civilized countries, the differences caused by capitalism assume the character of a cultural contest. Two social tendencies resting upon entirely heterogeneous bases thus wrestle with each other.” (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 367)

Weber’s approach to this issue is clear: The cost of attaining a certain status represents an obstacle to the development of the capitalist spirit for capitalism. The capitalist approach collects products produced from rural areas but also concludes that the community is overpopulated because it is not produced efficiently enough in accordance with capitalist conditions. Therefore, a society organization suitable for the new conditions is necessary for the old peasant and the aristocracy, and the rising industry. According to Weber, rational calculation methods should be used in order to consider the existence of the concept of capital in relation to modern capitalism (Wood, 1995, p. 170). Weber explains this as

“In an economy which makes use of capital accounting and which is thus characterized by the appropriation of the means of production by individual units, that is by "property" profitability depends on the prices which the "consumers," according the marginal utility of money in relation to their income, can and will pay” (Weber, 1922, p. 93)

As mentioned in the prior and current chapters, capitalism existed in previous ages as a motive for making money from trade and money. However, it is the changing of the intensity and direction of this motive with rational calculation methods that modernize modern capitalism, and in this way, property relations show themselves in their modern form. Therefore, Weber defined capitalism as an economic entity based on trade and profit that has existed throughout time (Wood, 1995, p. 170). He demonstrated that this description is insufficient to account for the existence of contemporary capitalism. Capital accumulation is important to the development of industrial capitalism, and Weber's main concern is how to overcome the conditions, which are not economical, that prevent modern capitalism from existing, especially in East Elbe. To solve the problem of backwardness in the development of the capitalistic spirit in East Elbe, the necessities of modern capitalism must operate in rural areas as rational ways of production and distribution:

“For meanwhile capitalism had also gnawed at the social character of the Junker and his laborers. In the first half of the last century the Junker was a rural patriarch. His

farm hands, the farmer whose land he had appropriated, were by no means proletarians. In consequence of the Junker's lack of funds, they did not receive wages, but a cottage, land, and the right of pasturage for their cows; during harvesttime and for threshing, a certain portion of the grain was paid to them in wheat, et cetera. Thus they were, on a small scale, agriculturists with a direct interest in their lord's husbandry. But they were expropriated by the rising valuation of the land; their lord withheld pasture and land, kept his grain, and paid them wages instead. Thus, the old community of interest was dissolved, and the farm hands became proletarians." (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 382)

Peasants produced for the mansion and received a part of it for their share as a reward for their labor, but later on, due to the increase in the price of the lands and Junker's transformation into commercially operating landowners in response to their loss of political power (Callinicos, 2007, p. 150, 151), the management style of the lands changed, and the peasants cultivating the lands were no longer paid a certain part of the product, but instead a wage. As a result, they became wage-dependent workers, even in rural areas. As for the special situation of the East Elbe, the peasants working in the east of the Elbe began to migrate towards the cities as a result of the attraction of the developing industry in other regions. In other words, there was a fundamental change in the lifestyle of both the workers who migrated and became wage workers in the industry and those who now became wage workers in capitalist production farms in the rural areas. Weber also saw the inevitability of workers' migration to the cities and their adaptation to the new order for the development of capitalism. The new conditions of capitalism fundamentally changed the old traditional way of production and life. He stated this in one of the notes of the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism:

"The same Polish girl who at home was not to be shaken loose from her traditional laziness by any chance of earning money, however tempting, seems to change her entire nature and become capable of unlimited accomplishment when she is a migratory worker in a foreign country... Furthermore, accommodation in labour barracks, etc., may involve a degradation to a standard of living which would never be tolerated at home. The simple fact of working in quite different surroundings from those to which one is accustomed breaks through the tradition and is the educative force." (Weber, 1930, p. 137)

Weber pointed out that this transformation did not happen peacefully for workers who had to adapt to the new conditions. But, the new work ethic for workers was actually adapting to changes in line with the new rational calculation forms implemented by the capitalist to make production more efficient such as adaptation for working hours. Of course, in terms of the development of the capitalist spirit, more than this can be expected from the worker, such as showing commitment to the job.

The new social morality created by this calling is the founder of capitalist culture, but it is not meant to be adopted individually by each individual in modern society. Whether the

individual is a worker or a capitalist entrepreneur, as long as the individual is associated with society, society imposes these principles on it (Weber, 1930, p. 19). The profit motive identified with modern capitalism existed before modern capitalism, but its dominance in society created modern capitalism, and its rival was traditionalism (Weber, 1930, p. 23). When examining evolving classes, Weber makes use of the piece rate, which he states that it is applied particularly in agricultural areas to increase the productivity of the capitalist entrepreneur. Accordingly, the entrepreneurs paid high piece rates to the workers in order to increase the labor intensity; as a result, the profits of the entrepreneurs increased along with the increase in the intensive workforce. In this way, the piece rates of the workers were increased repeatedly, and it was anticipated that workers would improve their work performance in order to earn more money than their regular income (Weber, 1930, p. 23). However, the traditionalist approach of workers, according to Weber, causes them to seek to obtain their old income by working less than previously, rather than earning more by increasing the intensity of their work: "Wherever modern capitalism has begun its work of increasing the productivity of human labour by increasing its intensity, it has encountered the immensely stubborn resistance of this leading trait of pre-capitalistic labour" (Weber, 1930, p. 24). Moreover, following the reverse of this method and giving workers piece rates that cannot provide for their physical livelihood will also reduce their productivity, although it is said to encourage workers to work harder to earn higher wages. In this context, Weber expressed that the presence of a surplus population is necessary for the quantitative development of modern capitalism but costs the qualitative development of it because it creates inefficient workers. Weber concluded that, as a result of the earnings motive hitting the wall of traditionalism and inefficiency, for both high and low wages, respectively, it was only a calling that can make modern capitalism work properly:

"Labour must, on the contrary, be performed as if it were an absolute end in itself, a calling. But such an attitude is by no means a product of nature. It cannot be evoked by low wages or high ones alone, but can only be the product of a long and arduous process of education. Today, capitalism, once in the saddle, can recruit its labouring force in all industrial countries with comparative ease. In the past this was in every case an extremely difficult problem." (Weber, 1930, p. 25)

There are two points we should pay attention to here: first, as Weber states in the last part of the first quote, as it emerges properly, modern capitalism overcomes the problems of traditionalism and inefficiency that society once had and will continue to move forward and spread. Second, capitalism is based on a work ethic and a sense of responsibility toward work, and the role of religion in achieving the necessities of one's calling is also seen:

“The ability of mental concentration, as well as the absolutely essential feeling of obligation to one’s job, are here most often combined with a strict economy which calculates the possibility of high earnings, and a cool self-control and frugality which enormously increase performance. This provides the most favourable foundation for the conception of labour as an end in itself, as a calling which is necessary to capitalism: the chances of overcoming traditionalism are greatest on account of the religious upbringing” (Weber, 1930, p. 26).

This new social ethic will minimize the resources that the employer will use to find or train a newly trained worker, and the worker's adaptation to this new capitalist spirit is also a part of the rational production process. According to Weber, the separation of workers from their means of the instrument and their land through the rationalization process shows itself as a political necessity for Germany to become a strong national state in Europe (Giddens, 1995a, p. 19). Therefore, from the logic established by Weber, having a new rational work ethic was an innovation brought by the capitalist spirit for the employer, and it was a necessity for employees to adapt and survive (Wood, 1995, p. 163). This shows Weber’s advocacy of the industrialized state, and this was one of the reasons Weber was called the Bourgeoisie Marx, someone with a fairly vast subject of research and bourgeois advocacy. Moreover, although Weber was a proponent of industrialization, the boundary problem also represented a threat to the deterioration of Germany’s culture and also created a portion of the problem of representation and leadership for Germany, which we mention in the next part.

To sum up, Weber defined capitalism in economic terms, and rationalization was necessary for the formation of the capitalist spirit that created modern capitalism, and the separation of workers from the means of production in the formation of rationalization represents only one of the processes that can create this. However, as mentioned, according to Weber, contemporary capitalism did not inevitably arise due to Protestant morality and rationalism spreading throughout society, as demonstrated in Western Europe. There are different rationalization processes in history and in different parts of the world, so the impetus of Protestant ethics would not be equally seen everywhere (Weber, 1930, p. 10). We also encountered one of Weber’s inquiries: what factors might have led to the formation of modern capitalism, or why did other rationalization processes not lead to the development of modern industrialized capitalism, as in Europe?

Weber, in *‘General Economic History’* (1923), explained what the factors that created capitalism in the previous analyzes of others were and why he thought they were not explanatory of the development of modern capitalism. Moreover, although Weber examined the development of modern capitalism and why it has not developed

elsewhere, he also delved into what factors might be the driving force of it or could have simply had an effect on it. Accordingly, expansion in population, the inflow of precious metals, geographical factors, spending for military requirements, or demand for luxuries are effective for the development of societies' move into modern capitalism; however, they are not decisive in creating the emergence of modern capitalism. In fact, Weber acknowledged Marx when he discussed the population growth, saying "every economic epoch has its own law of population," although he stated this statement was very general (Weber, 1923, p. 352). Moreover, the inflow of precious metals helped the development of capitalism by causing a large amount of capital to be gathered in the hands of a small group—but the emergence of modern capitalism as a consequence of this still depended on the "nature of the labor system" (Weber, 1923, p. 353). Additionally, the geographical characteristics of countries were not decisive in the development of modern capitalism because it also formed in inland regions where the industry was much more developed, rather than port cities that focused on trade. Lastly, Weber noted that the military requirements, which constitute the special requirements of Western armies, and luxury demands were external forces that helped the development but not the determining forces (Weber, 1923, p. 354). Therefore, none of these circumstances were directly responsible for the emergence of modern capitalism, but they did affect the previously existing or newly arising conditions in that direction.

According to Weber, the fundamental reason capitalism could not develop in other regions was that traditionalism hindered the development of the rationality of capitalism. As modern capitalism developed in Western Europe, it made craftsmen part of the production system, either as wage earners in factories or producers in the putting-out system. However, it did not develop everywhere else, as it did in Europe. For example,

"In India the castes stood in the way of the complete subjugation of the craftsman by the merchant. Down to recent times the merchant was unable to obtain possession of the means of production to the extent we find true elsewhere, because these were hereditary in the caste" (Weber, 1923, p. 161).

The absence of obligations, as mentioned above, such as the existence of free labor, freedom of the market, and appropriation of physical means of production included by rational accounting for the creation of modern capitalism prevented the development of capitalism in these countries such as India and China. Also, the important point is that, according to Weber, different features of rationalism may develop in different ways in the development of capitalism because capitalism is always present in different forms. But it cannot be considered with certainty that this will always lead to the development of

modern capitalism everywhere. According to Weber, for example, the requirements of modern capitalism are more developed in Germany than in England and the Netherlands, where modern capitalism is more developed (Giddens, 1995a, p. 38). Therefore, rationalization is necessary for the emergence of capitalism, but it is not enough for it since different forms of rationalization can be shown in different societies even if modern capitalism is not developed in these societies.

Besides the process of rationalization, Weber gave major importance to the struggle for power in the state for the development of modern capitalism. Weber's analysis of the struggle for power depended partly on whether there was a power struggle in the units in which society will be examined, such as classes and status, and the other part was based on the essential qualities of this struggle for power. According to Weber, power refers to "the chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will in a social action," and power and economically conditioned power are distinct, although "the emergence of economic power may be the consequence of power existing on other grounds" (Weber, 1922, p. 926). To show this, Weber clarified the distinction between classes and status in *Economy and Society: Class*, which is examined in three groups as property, commercial, and social classes by Weber, "refer only to the same (or similar) interests which individual shares with others" and status indicates "an effective claim to social esteem in terms of positive or negative privileges" (Weber, 1922, p. 302, 305). And when he talks about the characteristics of societies, he drew connections between status and classes: 'Social class,' which results from all of the class categories and can be found "within individual and generational mobility," is the one that is closest to status (Weber, 1922, p. 307). Additionally, status groups are frequently produced by 'property classes' that are based on distinctions in properties. The class and status analysis of Weber mostly concern the struggle for power and its capacity to influence social change. For him, property classes do not have to arise as a result of class conflict, but rather the result of existing conditions and their place in determining the contradictions of society has no major importance. The juxtaposition of the property class is the only way this class can radically change society, and it has a revolutionary conflict: this might occur between "land owners and the declassed or creditor and debtors," but even these conflicts would not result in changes in the economic system, and rather it concludes with "redistribution of wealth" (Weber, 1922, p. 303). The class situation is defined by "property and lack of property" and show itself in social action. It is specified by the mode of distribution that depends on the economic fact of market conditions, such as the law of marginal utility and purpose of exchange. Therefore, people whose conditions did not

depend on the market are not classes, they are status, and their struggle should not count as class struggle. Weber put this as

“The creditor-debtor relation becomes the basis of "class situations" first in the cities, where a "credit market," however primitive, with rates of interest increasing according to the extent of dearth and factual monopolization of lending in the hands of a plutocracy could develop. Therewith "class struggles" begin.

Those men whose fate is not determined by the chance of using goods or services for themselves on the market, e.g., slaves, are not, however, a class in the technical sense of the term. They are, rather, a status group.” (Weber, 1922, p. 928)

As we can see in Weber's writings, the concept of class situation solely refers to the economically conditioned power and is explained in economic terms. The last point it should mention about class struggle is that Weber thinks that the character of class war has changed in modern times:

“The propertyless of Antiquity and of the Middle Ages protested against monopolies, preemption, forestalling, and the withholding of goods from the market in order to raise prices. Today the central issue is the determination of the price of labor. The transition is represented by the fight for access to the market and for the determination of the price of products. Such fights went on between merchants and workers in the putting-out system of domestic handicraft during the transition to modern times. Since it is quite a general phenomenon we must mention here that the class antagonisms that are conditioned through the market situations are usually most bitter between those who actually and directly participate as opponents in price wars.” (Weber, 1922, p. 931)

Status might include classes, but it is not determined by them because status is formed as a result of the stratification of society. A change in status could bring about significant societal consequences because “Every definite appropriation of political powers and the corresponding economic opportunities tends to result in the rise of status groups, and vice-versa” (Weber, 1922, p. 306).

It should be noted that the status groups have privileges created by "a monopolization of ideal and material goods or opportunities, in a manner we have come to know as typical" and move together with stratification. Besides, in this way, status includes the distribution of social honor, which is the main determinant of "striving for power" (Weber, 1922, p. 926). While social honor is closely related to status, it can also be linked with the class situation since the status situation partially includes the class situation. But this link between class and social honor, according to Weber, does not necessarily exist because property relations, which are the main determinant of the property class, have antagonism with social honor in the modern age (Weber, 1922, p. 932). And Weber's examination of class and status highlights one of our primary concerns with regard to the emergence of modern capitalism: The rise of modern capitalism, the dominance of the

spirit of capitalism, or the glorification of work ethic and entrepreneurship destroyed the status society and privileges of status groups, and it created a class society dominated by the market economy. He stated this as

“Quite generally, among privileged status groups there is a status disqualification that operates against the performance of common physical labor... Very frequently every rational economic pursuit, and especially entrepreneurial activity, is looked upon as a disqualification of status.” (Weber, 1922, p. 936)

The disqualification of status groups that Weber speaks of relates to the rise of capitalism in two ways that are both related to the market economy. First, the old distribution of power is replaced by a new distribution of power regulated by the market economy. An economy operating according to the laws of the market does not take into account values such as honor or styles of life, it acts functionally. Therefore, this “extra-status” order can be for everyone because it is based on economic power (Weber, 1922, p. 936). And the second one is a result of the stratification of society, which can restrain the free development of the market. As mentioned above, status goes hand in hand with the monopolization of “the estates of knights, peasants, priests, and especially the clientele of the craft and merchant guilds,” and this monopolization restrict the development of the free market even though it can strengthen the economic power of the country in that era. Finally, it should be noted that in connection with Weber's analysis of the lack of rationalism in ancient times and the barriers that prevented it, examined in 2.1.2; we see that Weber equates classes with production and status groups with consumption. As he states:

“With some over-simplification, one might thus say that classes are stratified according to their relations to the production and acquisition of goods; whereas status groups are stratified according to the principles of their consumption of goods as represented by special styles of life.” (Weber, 1922, p. 937)

Accordingly, the transformation of the organization of cities from the organization for consumption to the organization for production also represents the transition from status society to class society. Therefore, we can see that, in Weber's writings, in the modern era, status groups have been conditioned by the economy, and society has become a class society: the rise of modern capitalism has changed the old status relations and permanently altered society (Weber, 1922, p. 935). As a consequence, both classes and status have an important place in the struggle for power—and thus the development of modern capitalism, according to Weber; however, this change is not limited to the conflict of economic interests or changes in the economic system (Giddens, 1995b, p. 298).

2.2.2. Capitalist Society

In the preceding section, it was discussed that Weber's interest in Germany's undeveloped industrial capitalism stems from his belief that the country should survive as a strong nation-state as a result. According to Weber, Germany's unification and continued existence as a powerful nation-state cannot be achieved by merely enhancing economic power; even with scant consideration for economic reality, the achievement is still possible. When Weber claims that the emigration of West Prussian agricultural laborers disrupts the cultural unity of the German nation-state, he makes clear the idea of the ignorability of class situations:

“Clearly, the 'standpoint of economic class' is not always decisive in matters of economic policy; in this case, it was the circumstance that a weaker hand took over the helm of the ship of State from a strong one.” (Weber, 2010, p. 12)

Although Weber said that the situation of the economy and classes could be ignored in the struggle for political power, he gives major importance to international trade. He argues that Germany should be strong in international competition as a requirement of being strong in the political area; therefore, the industry should be developed, and the old feudal traditions and practices should be eliminated (Giddens, 1995a, p. 21). The most significant illustration of Weber's approach to this issue is his opposition to the feudalization of the bourgeoisie: The union between the Junkers, which constituted the power of the Prussian monarchy, and "the chiefs of increasingly cartelized heavy industries such as coal and steel" was formed in the country, with the support of Bismarck (Callinicos, 2007, p. 148). Moreover, Weber opposed Germany becoming a self-sufficient economy supported by East Elbe's agriculture, which was the source of Bismarck's power through the capitalization of agriculture of Elbe, which can lead to the emigration of agricultural workers (Callinicos, 2007, p. 151). Due to this process, rentier capitalism may rise, and the German bourgeoisie might remain away from political experience, while Weber goes against this strategy (Callinicos, 2007, p. 151). Accordingly, Germany needed appropriate leadership to be politically and economically competitive, so Weber made assessments about the situation of classes and social status groups in the country (Giddens, 1995a, p. 22). In an opening speech he gave after the war, Weber examined the issue of which power was important for the German nation-state after German unity was achieved. Accordingly, Germany had to replace the old leadership with a new one as the aristocracy lost power. However, the bourgeoisie was

not able to change leadership on its own, and even the German bourgeoisie had not yet played a role in the capitalist development of the state in an ahistorical way. He states this as follows:

“The political immaturity of broad strata of the German bourgeoisie does not have economic causes, nor is it due to the frequently cited 'politics of interest' which affects other nations just as much as it does the Germans. The reason is to be found in its unpolitical past, in the fact that it was not possible to catch up on a century of missed political education in a single decade, and in the fact that rule by a great man is not always a means of educating the people politically. The vital question for the political future of the German bourgeoisie now is whether it is too late for it to make up the lost ground.” (Weber, 2010, p. 25)

Weber thinks that the underdevelopment of the bourgeois is not due to their economic inadequacy but to their lack of political education due to their insufficient involvement in the political arena. Nevertheless, he thinks that the power that can make Germany politically strong is in the industry and the bourgeoisie because the way to be strong in the international arena is to be strong in international trade. As he puts it:

“When, after the wars leading to unification, the nation was confronted with the first signs of positive political tasks, namely the idea of overseas expansion, these philistines lacked even the most rudimentary economic understanding needed to grasp what it would mean for Germany's trade in far-off oceans if the German flag were to be seen flying on the surrounding coasts.” (Weber, 2010, p. 25)

And, as Weber examines how the industry is the only force fit for political leadership, he also asks, if not the bourgeoisie, then who can be appropriate for the leadership? “Will other classes be the bearers of a greater political future?” (Weber, 2010, p. 25). Germany was in a position in which the aristocracy lost its power because of the industrialization of agriculture and the emigration of workers and in which workers did not have the capability to lead the country; rather, they should and are waiting for their appropriate leader (Giddens, 1995a, p. 23). Weber explain this as follows:

“The highest strata of the German working class are far more mature economically than the self-centred propertied classes would like to admit, and this class also has the right to demand the freedom to stand up for its interests in the shape of the openly organised economic struggle for power. Politically, the German working class is infinitely less mature than a clique of journalists who would like to monopolise its leadership would have it believe... We oppose them politically because there is nothing more destructive of a great nation than for it to be led by a body of politically uneducated philistines - and because the German Proletariat has not yet sloughed off this characteristic.” (Weber, 2010, p. 26)

Consequently, the most suitable position for the duty of guiding the best interest of the country was left for the industry since only an industrialized state can deal with other nations in the political arena. And this emerging result of the leadership of the industry is also related to some effects on the cities and rural areas: Political leadership of the nation-state and the source of the power of leadership shifted to cities since the aristocracy lost its power. He states:

“The manors of the east were the bases for the ruling class of Prussia, which was dislocated and scattered over the countryside, and they were the social point of contact for the officials. With the decay of these estates, however, with the disappearance of the social character of the old landed nobility, the center of gravity of the political intelligentsia is shifting irresistibly into the cities. This shift is the decisive political factor in the agrarian development of eastern Germany.” (Weber, 2010, p. 23)

To conclude, the way Weber views the leadership issue demonstrates that he does not think there must be a consequential relationship between political and economic processes, and also economic processes are crucial for nation-state power struggles (Callinicos, 2007, p. 151). Weber seems to have a dual point of view here: on the one hand, he argues that the political process should take precedence over the economic one in the power struggle, as in the first proposition; on the other hand, as in the second, he declares that the political power struggle requires being strong in international commerce. However, considering that Weber is the advocate of industrialization and the rules of the market, we see here not a dual logic but his perspective that evaluates the political and economic processes together for the power of the German nation-state: The German bourgeoisie should develop for international trade and make the country strong in the economic area, and should also carry the political leadership of the country, making sure the future of strong German nation-state (Callinicos, 2007, p. 151). It should be noted that Weber fervently embraced the imperialistic foreign policy perspective that is a part of his opinions on the strength of the German nation-state (Mommsen, 1992, p. 11).

Weber's approach to the country's rational pursuit of leadership in the interests of the country for dominance in the political arena does not mean that Weber disdains the parliamentary system or democracy (Giddens, 1995a, p. 25). As we examined in section 2.1.1, Weber draws up an opposition between charisma and bureaucratic rationality, and one pillar of this opposition is observed in the parliamentary system. As a recall, charisma is extraordinary and irrational: it rejects traditional authorities of the past and all given standard lifestyles and rules in the principle of its nature. On the other hand, bureaucracy

is rational since it constitutes "the intellectual analysis of rules" (Weber, 1922, p. 244). Also, another important difference between traditional or bureaucratic systems and charisma is that charisma rejects the idea of economic regularity, which also means a commitment to property incomes: According to Weber, charisma is anti-economic, rejecting regular income flows, but booty and extortion can be applied to satisfy needs (Weber, 1922, p. 355). In this context, Weber argues that charismatic power depends on the personal characteristics of a natural leader and their dedication, as opposed to the appointed leaders of the bureaucratic order, and the loyalty of followers and recognition of given authority as a requirement of the charismatic leader's mission (Weber, 1922, p. 1117).

In order to condense Weber's views on how to create and maintain leadership in modern society, it can be said that; With the development of liberal political understanding in Germany, the understanding of democracy emerged as a necessity. However, this democracy must have a transformative power in accordance with the birth of modern capitalism, and this can only be achieved with the presence of a charismatic leader. Weber states that forms of government in which everyone has inclusion in governance, such as direct democracy, are neither possible nor desirable. Democracy should not be perceived as a form of government that will end the domination of humankind over each other. Rather it should be understood as acceptance of the authority of a charismatic leader by the majority, and since a joint decision is not possible, the minority must accept the decision of the majority. As he puts it:

"Once the majority principle has come to prevail, it is considered the moral duty of the minority to yield to the right cause proven by the election and to join the majority after the event. Yet charismatic domination begins to yield to a genuine electoral system once succession is determined by the majority principle. However, charisma is not alien to all modern, including all democratic, forms of election." (Weber, 1922, p. 1126)

Weber favors powerful personalities competing for the consent and trust of the voters to rule by elites or classes, and this choice of leader and its guarantee can only take place within a democratic political system where citizens exist on an equal basis (Mommsen; 1992, p. 16). The source of Weber's views on domination can be observed in current political events: According to this, what is needed for the unity of the nation and to get rid of the war is the political unity of the citizens and the elections of the majority can determine this; Also, the utopian war aims of politicians and the intervention of different groups can only be prevented by a system that must be dealt with in order to gain the

trust of the citizens (Mommsen; 1992, p. 12). Moreover, Weber sharply disagrees with the administration of bureaucratic power elites, which is the result of a lack of political leadership. Therefore, compared to modern forms of democracy like the American presidential system and Swiss direct democracy, parliamentary democracy is the best under current circumstances (Mommsen, 1992, p. 16). Weber's analysis of the nature of democracy depends on whether it is dynamic: accordingly, plebiscitary leader democracy is the direct opposite of increasing formal rationality because it has a dynamic order that includes the competition of leaders. Similarly, social democracy with "bureaucratic mass-membership parties," according to Weber, enhances social dynamism when it is combined with charismatic leadership and is unavoidable under industrial state capitalism (Mommsen, 1992, p. 14). While Weber states that the latter is not a disaster, the most effective way is in a plebiscitary leader democracy.

According to Weber, the charismatic leader's impact does not always remain steady, and the problem of a successor arises when the charismatic leader, who has transformative power due to the potential to create a new mode of orientation, loses his characteristics and disappears: Political and economic advantages of charisma through being outside the routine begin to turn into ordinary events that take place every day since the followers of charisma want to perpetuate their advantages with the motive of a standard of living and future security (Weber, 1922, p. 249). Therefore, Charisma has to either become routinized or become traditional over time. Weber states that the routinization of charisma, if it's progressive, has two possible solutions for the successor problem, which is related to the recognition and acknowledgment of charisma:

"To be sure, this recognition of a charismatically qualified, and hence legitimate, person is treated as a duty. But when the charismatic organization undergoes progressive rationalization, it is readily possible that, instead of recognition being treated as a consequence of legitimacy, it is treated as the basis of legitimacy: democratic legitimacy." (Weber, 1922, p. 266)

Recognition of the authority of charisma after routinization is not seen as a duty; it is the duty of charisma to make itself accepted as qualified. It can be nominated by administrative staff as a nomination or can be elected by plebiscitary such as modern party leaders in modern capitalist society. According to Weber, democracy is both a possibility and a necessity for the development of the charismatic leader's transformative power in the modern capitalist society and in this respect, democracy is understood as "a means to an end" (Giddens, 1995a, p. 52). The encounter of the transforming and

creative power of charisma with the regular requirements of daily life is the confrontation of charisma and routinization, and democracy is the rationalized form of charismatic authority (Callinicos, 2007, p. 175, 176). Weber says that the powers of a plebiscitary democracy, which is a form of charismatic authority, can be extended to the officials, but he does not call it a bureaucratic form since it does not contain a hierarchy. And it becomes a charismatic leader's immediate responsibility to act for the benefit of the masses that elect the leader.

Weber proposes three potential outcomes which are related to charisma, economy, and social structure in the process of the routinization of charisma. First of all, this change of charisma naturally leads to routinization: recognition of charisma by plebiscite creates the loyalty of those he governs, and he typically has two goals now; to destroy traditional patriarchal or feudal orders and, to create and protect the economic interests of the low, who elected him in the first place, as this is the source of his legitimacy. Hence, the transformation of charisma and accomplishment of these aims lead to "the formal rationalization of economic activity" (Weber, 1922, p. 269). Secondly, Weber asserts that plebiscitary orders might weaken the formal rationality of the economic life "so far as their interests in legitimacy, being dependent on the faith and devotion of the masses, forces them to impose substantive ideas of justice in the economic sphere" (Weber, 1922, p. 269). And the third case is that elective officials' appearance can disrupt formally rational economic activity because they are chosen based more on their political affinity than their technical expertise. However, according to Weber, although there might be a potential that the routinization of charisma does not guide a rational economic activity, the normal path for charisma that revolutionizes society by changing the mode of the orientation of people is the routinization at the end and this lead to rational economic activity as a definite result.

Moreover, Weber states that as a result of the expansion of democracy, the task of the charismatic leader is to meet the needs and desires of the masses, and this broadly satisfying the demands brings with it routinization and bureaucratic centralization both in the political and economic spheres. Weber expects the irrational revolutionary power of charisma in modern capitalist society to lead to bureaucratic rationality eventually. In the political arena, the possibility that the expanding officialdom will lead to bureaucracy poses a danger; in Weber's opinion, the lack of leadership caused by Bismarck's loss of power in Germany will lead to "uncontrolled bureaucratic domination" (Giddens, 1995a, p. 23). In the economic sphere, Weber saw bureaucratization as a threat because a

centralized economy could not provide the necessary competitiveness in the international arena for failing to motivate the required growth in productivity. In this regard, Weber, in an assessment he made in 1917-1919, drew attention to the danger of large industry being politically influential and saw the main task of democracy as liberating the political sphere from the influence of the bourgeoisie, although he expresses that the driving force of the economy was the leadership of the industry and its entrepreneurship (Giddens, 1995a, p. 28). Weber's viewpoint on socialism and socialist parties can also be checked here: He passionately criticized them by suggesting that only a capitalist society could provide a future for the proletariat since a socialist society, which has a planned economy, would lead to a bureaucratized state (Giddens, 1995a, p. 28). Although capitalism involves the concentration of economic power in the hands of cartels, banks, and monopolies, it creates a separation between the public and private sectors and prevents the strengthening of these forces; this can not be the case in socialism (Callinicos, 2007, p. 171). Therefore, a centrally administered economy might lead to an expansion of bureaucracy. According to Weber, elections in modern states must include some charismatic elements to win the elections; these charismatic elements are what departs from the bureaucratic process (Giddens; 1995a, p. 26). But eventually, "the bureaucratization of the division of labor" shows itself as technical-educated administrative in the political arena as well as "separation of workers from their means of production" and "academic research and finance" (Giddens, 1995a, p. 26). Moreover, it can be concluded that Weber sees that the duty of political leadership could turn into a technical task over time. Therefore, according to Weber, there is no alternative in the modern state than bureaucratization.

The transformative power of rationalization, which ultimately results in bureaucratization and the demise of the capitalist spirit, is given significant weight by Weber. Accordingly, the eventual result of the bureaucratization process is the intellectualization of the world. In modern capitalism, institutions and the mode of life adopt the bureaucracy of division of labor as a key characteristic, carrying out their operations technically or mechanically. (Giddens, 1995a, p. 44). The process of intellectualization is a part of rationalization and hence of the growth of the capitalist spirit: Intellectualization presents itself both for religious groups and for those who produce goods since the production and mode of life now organize itself according to a new spirit. In *Economy and Society*:

"The bourgeoisie depends economically on work which is continuous and rational (or at least empirically rationalized); such work contrasts with the seasonal character of agricultural work that is exposed to unusual and unknown natural forces; it makes

the connection between means and ends, success and failure relatively transparent. The product of the potter, weaver, turner and carpenter is much less affected by unpredictable natural events, especially by organic reproduction that involves the mystery of "creation" for which only phantasy can provide an explanation. The resulting rationalization and intellectualization parallel the loss of the immediate relationship to the palpable and vital realities of nature, because the work is done largely within the house and is removed from the organically determined quest for food; perhaps it is also relevant that the largest muscles of the body are not used. The forces of nature become an intellectual problem as soon as they are no longer part of the immediate environment." (Weber, 1922, p. 1178)

With this mechanistic process, the much more development of capitalism leads to the "disenchantment of the world" that changes the people's relationship with the mystic world. This process guides the collapse of the narratives of religious interpretation of the world (Giddens, 1995a, p. 45). He puts this as follows:

"As intellectualism suppresses belief in magic, the world's processes become disenchanted, lose their magical significance, and henceforth simply "are" "and "happen" but no longer signify anything. As a consequence, there is a growing demand that the world and the total pattern of life be subject to an order that is significant and meaningful." (Weber, 1922, p. 506)

The disenchantment process, in Weber's view, is a historical phenomenon that continues over history and demonstrates the conflict between moral principles and the realities of everyday life (Mommsen, 1992, p. 140). According to Weber, now, the effects of religion on social life would be minimized since every task of social life is conducted with the rules of rationalization. In *The Protestant Ethic*:

"The Puritan wanted to work in a calling; we are forced to do so. For when asceticism was carried out of monastic cells into everyday life, and began to dominate worldly morality, it did its part in building the tremendous cosmos of the modern economic order. This order is now bound to the technical and economic conditions of machine production which to-day determine the lives of all the individuals who are born into this mechanism, not only those directly concerned with economic acquisition, with irresistible force. Perhaps it will so determine them until the last ton of fossilized coal is burnt. In Baxter's view the care for external goods should only lie on the shoulders of the "saint like a light cloak, which can be thrown aside at any moment." But fate decreed that the cloak should become an iron cage." (Weber, 1930, p. 123)

Advancement of bureaucratic rationality leads to the features of alienation in modern society, which can be described as dehumanization as a result of rational-mechanistic tasks that "develop more perfectly" under the conditions of bureaucratization (Giddens, 1995a, p. 47). And this subordination of people because of the specialization of mechanistic tasks "imprisoned people in the iron cage of the specialized division of labor" (Giddens, 1995a, p. 47). Because of the standardization of life, iron cages replace the

individual human being with mechanical systems and organization in modern society. This analysis of Weber shows the point that capitalism will eventually reach through rationalization: the process of bureaucratization is the source of instability in capitalism, and for the collapse of modern capitalism, Weber shows the increasing formal rationality and the loss of freedom of the human trapped in the iron cage (Özel, 2018, p. 120). At the conclusion of this process, modern capitalism loses its capacity for transformation through rationalization and transitions to its state of being an orderly structure with formal rationality, which results in its demise.

According to Mommsen, there is a paradox in Weber's Iron Cage theory (Callinicos, 2007, p. 171). According to Weber, rationalization, which operates with and enables a person's self-realization, is "the optimal possible social action," while increasing rationality and bureaucratization repudiate "the life conduct based on ultimate personal values" (Mommsen, 1992, p. 133). In other words, the independent and self-realized human form that emerged as a result of rationalization and the human form that was trapped in the iron cage and dependent on the new mode of living and isolated conflict with each other and also contain each other because both are the result of rationalization (Özel, 2018, p. 120). Moreover, another part of this paradox is that one of the requirements of rationalization is to encourage market competition as much as possible, which can happen in the absence of state intervention, while the bureaucratization that is a result of rationalization leads to a centralized economy, which Weber is strongly opposed (Callinicos, 2007, p. 171).

While conservatives and socialists thought there could be a way out of the iron cage, given the humanist culture and the vanishing of the capitalist division of labor, Weber was pessimistic and doubtful of such a possibility (Giddens, 1995a, p. 48). However, according to Weber, the assumption that the capitalist division of labor is eroding has been demolished by bureaucratization, and humanism has been substituted by the professional education of officials in administrative tasks. As mentioned in 2.1.2, Weber contends that while the scientific method on the meaning of the world might be objective, it inherently contains subjective value judgments (Callinicos, 2007, p. 157); this represents the tension between ultimate values and ethics. Hence, this professional education mentality in the disenchanting world results from the technical approach gained from the special training to the understanding of the meaning of the world (Mommsen, 1992, p. 135). In this way, Rationalization takes over the world through bureaucratization

and ensures the dominance of the scientific and rational method, but this does not contain a value judgment that would justify its ways of understanding (Callinicos, 2007, p. 178); from Weber's point of view, the conflict between morality and judgment ultimately leads to the triumph of ethics due to growing rationalism. Once this result is achieved, the world remains consistent until charismatic bursts happen, creating a new understanding (Callinicos, 2007, p. 178). According to Weber, charismatic political leadership is the only way that can disrupt the routine in modern bureaucratic society and enable individuals to realize themselves; this is a necessity both for the liberty of individuals and for the preservation of the liberal political environment (Mommsen, 1992, p. 19). As Mommsen notes in the context of the paradox, Weber masterfully integrates the opposing poles of society into his understanding of both society and history (Callinicos, 2007, p. 177).

CHAPTER 3

A COMPARISON OF MARX AND WEBER

3.1. WEBER ON MARX, MARXISTS, AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Weber advocated for the growth of the bourgeoisie for the unification of the German nation-state and opposed the socialist revolution in Russia and the socialist struggle in Germany, and particularly, he did not anticipate the future in an optimistic manner like Smith and Marx did in different respects (Frank, 1975, p. 431). Weber presented his arguments against Marx and Marxism in the majority of his work, both for the development of capitalism, for the study of society, and for explaining its methodology (Frank, 1975, p. 432). Weber's approach to Marx can be seen from three different perspectives: The first and most accepted one is that Weber's approach is a frontal attack on Marx's and Marxists' way of understanding history and society (Giddens, 1995a, p. 32). The second is that Weber's methodology is just the upside-down form of Marx's schema of economic determinism, in which Weber just uses religion instead of economics (Swingewood, 1984, p. 152). Weber strongly argued that this kind of reasoning is not accurate because he considers religion as one of the explanatory factors to the elements in society, according to their value given by society. The last perspective is that Weber's and Marx's concepts and reasonings are compatible when evaluating history and society (Giddens, 1995b, p. 289). However, it is essential to look at Weber's opinions on Marx before analyzing the connections between Weber's and Marx's analyses of the origins and development of capitalism because it is crucial to demonstrate how the differences between Weber's and Marx's analyses build.

Weber's critique of Marx's analyses and historical materialism relies heavily on his description of historical change and his methodology to illustrate it (Giddens, 1995b, p. 297). The approach that Weber's analysis carries internally to the critique of Marxism is observed in several issues, which are closely related to each other, that correspond to the methodologies and analyses of the historical change of Marx and Weber. The first is his criticism that Marx did not give sufficient importance to the superstructure elements and did not see the components of society, such as ideology, culture, and religion, as sufficiently effective in explaining the historical change. The second concern is Weber's emphasis on the active subject: according to Weber, unlike in Marxism, individuals, or

rather collective actions, are the driving force of history, and he criticizes that Marxism's analysis of the development of productive forces ignores the active role of the individual. Thus, the birth of modern capitalism was not systematic but rather the result of actions between subjects, which may not always have historical significance (Swingewood, 1984, p. 150). Third, according to Weber, for these reasons, Marx's economic-based class analysis does not sufficiently explain social change. The importance of status groups in explaining the importance of society should not be underestimated. Finally, and in connection with the above acknowledgments, an important part of Weber's methodology is his critique of Marxism's approaches to his distinction among economic, economically relevant, and economically conditioned actions and, more generally, between economics and politics. This distinction for Weber is the basis for showing his criticism that Marxism makes an economic-based analysis while explaining historical change and sees the political one as a shadow of the economic one.

We explore the above propositions below in the context of comparing methodology and the analysis of the rise and development of capitalism, but, first, a brief glance at the reasons for Weber's attitude toward Marxism is needed. First of all, although Germany's lack of progress in capitalist development is a recurring theme in Weber and Marx's writings, the country's circumstances in their time exhibited various features (Giddens, 1995b, p. 293). In his writings, Marx was aware of the underdevelopment of the working class and the bourgeoisie in Germany. His expectation that the wage worker's existence would dominate society was primarily based on whether bourgeois revolutions would take place in Germany (Giddens, 1995b, p. 292). Although Marx's position carries an expression as if he expects bourgeois revolutions to require some sort of collaboration with liberals, the main issue here is Marx's idea of emancipation that the working class and all classes should achieve. The 1848 uprising led to the future implementation of some policies that would allow Germany to cast off its traditional feudal ties, but the unsuccessful effect of this uprising on Junker power increased Weber's concerns regarding the national unity of Germany, which can be widely observed in his writings (Giddens, 1995b, p. 292). This reveals another key issue: Weber's approach to contemporary parties and political formations is interconnected to his approach to socialism and capitalism. Although Weber did not place himself with any political party throughout his life, there were parties that he contacted due to his political stances (Giddens, 1995a, p. 23). Weber's participation in the "Association of Social Policy" was related to his approach to socialism and capitalism, in which he stood against the state

control that socialism would bring (Mueller & Weber, 1982, p. 152). This organization advocates policies for social welfare, and Bismarck initially opposed these kinds of policies but later implemented these policies as a projection of the oppression against socialists and with relation to the existing war economy (Mueller & Weber, 1982, p. 152). Weber distinguished himself from the conservative approaches found in this organization because he was against its support of the "semi-feudal agrarian structure" and the "mystic fervour" it contained (Giddens, 1995a, p. 23).

It should be noted here that some conservatives' support for the feudal aristocracy also includes the cooperation of the bourgeoisie and the working class, and this corresponds to the state socialism they expected to exist within a centrally managed market economy (Mueller & Weber, 1982, p. 158). The simultaneous existence of both a market economy and a centrally administered economy manifests in how support and payments to the entrepreneur exist as pensions rather than profits. Weber argues that this state socialism will eventually lead to compulsory cartelization, a kind of monopoly. Although Weber agrees with conservatives in terms of "nationalistic aspirations," he agrees with right-wing "National Liberals" in terms of the necessity for industrial progress for the destiny of modern capitalism (Giddens, 1995a, p. 23). It should also be noted that Weber's anti-tariff view and his support of "the three-tier system," which national liberals were against and social democrats were in favor of, is evident here, causing him to distance himself from the national liberals (Giddens, 1995a, p. 23). Although he has a moral affinity with the ideals of social democrats regarding the promotion of democracy, Weber criticized the affinity of their leaders to Marxism (Giddens, 1995a, p. 24). Weber expressed that, if the leaders of the SDP came to power, it would lead to a centrally managed economy and thus to an increase in bureaucratization (Giddens, 1995a, p. 24). Weber also interpreted the revolution in Russia in a similar manner, as one with an extensive state bureaucratization and the growing influence of officials, rather than a proletariat dictatorship (Mueller & Weber, 1982, p. 157). The conclusion to be drawn from Weber's views on "state socialism," which clearly differs from the socialism in the *Communist Manifesto*, and his prediction about socialism in Russia is that Weber's main question about socialism is how it will function without a market and how it will function without resulting in excessive bureaucracy (Mueller & Weber, 1982, p. 161).

This scrutiny regarding Weber's approach to socialism does not mean he finds himself affiliated with socialism as a political approach: this can be observed from his insulting

rhetoric toward Marxists, such as Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, who were committed to a revolutionary transition to socialism (Giddens, 1995a, p. 28). Although Weber held similar views to evolutionist socialists such as Bernstein on such topics as the formation of class consciousness, the fact that he does not foresee a revolutionary break with capitalism, and the conceptual separation of the political and the economic, Weber's rejection of an evolutionary perspective on the process of history set him apart from evolutionary socialists (Giddens, 1995b, p. 296). Although the distinction between socialists requiring revolutionary action and evolutionary socialists will not be explored further here, evolutionary socialists and Weber share an interpretation of Marx's analysis of history as successive historical phases that will eventually lead to the transition from capitalism to socialism. It is possible to follow Weber's views on Marxism from this; however, it should be remembered that Weber was aware of Marx's brilliance as a thinker, as well as the importance of his writings for science:

“The document which lays the foundation of this form of socialism is the Communist Manifesto, written in 1847 and published and distributed in January 1848 by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Of its kind, this document, however strongly we may reject its crucial theses (at least I do), is a scholarly achievement of the highest order. One cannot deny this, nor may one do so, because nobody would believe one's denial and because it is impossible to deny it with a clear conscience. Even the theses in it which we nowadays reject contain an inspired error which has had very far-reaching and perhaps not always pleasant political consequences, but which has had very fruitful effects on scholarship, more so than many a work of uninspired correctness.” (Weber, 2010, p. 287, 288)

Weber contends that the *Communist Manifesto* is erroneous despite its success as a scientific document. Although the *Communist Manifesto* has a scientific character, Weber says it is a prophecy because it expresses the transition from capitalism to socialism as a transition between stages. In his words:

“Rather the Communist Manifesto is a prophetic document; it prophesies the demise of the private economic, or, as it is usually called, capitalist organisation of society, and the replacement of this society, as a transitional stage in the first instance, by a dictatorship of the Proletariat. However, beyond this transitional stage lies the true, ultimate hope: the Proletariat cannot free itself from servitude without putting an end to all rule by man over man. That is the real prophecy, the core of the manifesto, without which it would never have been written and without which it would never have achieved its great historical effect. How is this prophecy to be fulfilled? That is stated in one of the cardinal points of the manifesto: the Proletariat, the mass of the workers, will first, through their leaders, seize political power for themselves. However, this is a transitional stage which will lead to an 'association of individuals', as it is called there. This, then, is the last stage of historical development.” (Weber, 2010, p. 288)

This transition, according to Weber, is proof of what Marx saw in history as successive stages. Weber stated the *Communist Manifesto* describes several ways to transition to revolution, although some were revised later. First of all, he claimed competition among the entrepreneurs will reduce the wages of the workers to the bare minimum and even leave them unemployed, creating an “industrial reserve army” and a poor mass, and this will lead to a socialist revolution by not ensuring the continuation of the system. Second, he stated competition among entrepreneurs will throw a large number of entrepreneurs out of the market, reducing the number of entrepreneurs to such an extent that they can no longer hold control of the system. Third, he stated the overproduction crises that the capitalist system will create regularly will lead to the end of the system. In his interpretation of the *Communist Manifesto*, Weber explained these ways, which he said describe the transition from capitalism to socialism, are no longer valid because they have been disproven by modern capitalism’s new structure.

Due to his lack of access to the *Grundrisse*, Weber based his opinions on Marx’s writing primarily on the *Communist Manifesto* and the introduction to *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. As a result, he saw Marx’s analysis of the course of history as a deterministic structure that developed in a linear fashion. Furthermore, he saw Marx’s analysis of “the tendency of the rate of profit to fall” as an obligation that must be met, yet failed to acknowledge, even though he knows Marx’s approach to addressing these challenges was a dispositional trait that capitalism might produce. However, it is not enough to examine Weber’s views on Marx to examine the similarities and differences between Weber’s and Marx’s analysis. For this, it is necessary to compare their analyses of the emergence and rise of capitalism and the methodology they used, which were examined separately for each above.

3.2. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN THE PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF ANALYSIS IN THE WRITINGS OF MARX AND WEBER

In truth, neither Marx nor Weber is foretellers, and their work does not foretell specific future occurrences. Both have constructed analyses to describe how they approached the political, social, and economic issues that they faced as well as to delineate them accurately, which also comprises examining the origins and growth of capitalism.

To examine the analyzes of Weber and Marx, the first thing to look at is how they approach social sciences: both reject giving the ultimate judgments as in the positive sciences. This rejection does not suggest that they oppose drawing causal inferences, but it does indicate that they believe it is crucial to understanding the problem with interpretative comprehension. It brings many results about their analysis of these approaches. Since humans, as moral beings, are a key factor in historical development, they both base their analyses on a combination of causal explanations and hermeneutics (Özel, 2018, p. 118). Marx sees the law of social sciences as tendencies: Accordingly, the explanation of human actions and phenomenons is characterized by the plurality of perspectives and theories, as it contains complex interpretations and transformations according to the changing aspects of time. Similarly, Weber's methodology is to analyze society in terms of typologies, which are the basis of his conceptualization of phenomena in society. Weber put this,

“We will only point out here that naturally, all specifically Marxian "laws" and developmental constructs - insofar as they are theoretically sound - are ideal types. The eminent, indeed unique, heuristic significance of these ideal types when they are used for the assessment of reality is known to everyone who has ever employed Marxian concepts and hypotheses. Similarly, their perniciousness, as soon as they are thought of as empirically valid or as real (ie, truly metaphysical) "effective forces," "tendencies", etc. is likewise known to those who have used them.” (Weber, 1949, p. 103)

Moreover, Weber acknowledges that the concepts of Marxist analysis are some kind of ideal type, as can be seen in the above passage. It shows the commonality of the two authors' forms of abstraction in their analysis.

The second issue is their comprehension of the individual as an essential component of understanding society. Marx's understanding of the individual depends on their self-creation and their action, and this creation finds itself in society with production as a part of individuals' emancipation; accordingly, production is not a technical action but rather a part of human emancipation. On the other hand, Weber sees man as the producer of collective actions that form society and history. Although these collective actions simultaneously give away the values and institutions of society, such as culture, religion, and production, this understanding of action, similar to Marx's analysis, depends on the emancipation of the individual. On the basis of Weber's views, which are interpreted as giving primary importance to ideas in the determination of history, lies the idea of an active subject in which the results of collective human action will shape society and

history. While both of them analyze society and history, they see the smallest part as the most complex structure of society, so the approach from the parts to the whole is inadequate for both of them. Moreover, in connection with the above, both thinkers refused to attach importance to a single element in their analysis. They envisaged a comprehensive analysis that includes many elements at the same time.

This reveals another issue: both reject the mechanistic evolutionary schema in which explanatory elements develop and necessarily form a new resultant. While this issue will be re-examined in the comparison of the rise of capitalism, the fact that both examine the stages of history does not mean that they see capitalism as a necessary historical phase to reach. While Marx evaluates capitalism as a new system with specific features such as free wage-workers, Weber defines capitalism as an economic existence that exists in every period. Modern capitalism is a new form of society in which this economic system is rationally organized and dominated. Therefore, to examine the problems of capitalism/modern capitalism as a new system, it is necessary to examine how it emerged, and examining this transition requires an examination of the whole of history.

As a result, the methodology employed by Weber and Marx in their analysis is similar in their approach to the social sciences, the significance they positioned the individual in accordance to their emancipation, their method for abstracting facts, and their disapproval of the study of history as an activity that advances in stages as a mechanical sense.

3.3. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MARX AND WEBER REGARDING THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM

Because Marx and Weber's analysis of the emergence and development of capitalism are seen as the antithesis of each other, on the one hand, Marx's analysis is assumed to be economic-reductionist and deterministic and puts the development of technology and trade as the driving force of history, and, on the other hand, Weber's analysis takes into account the elements of society, such as religion and culture, which are seen as superstructure and ignored by Marx, and this gives importance to the differentiation of economic and political fields and does not put one ahead of the other. Most of the analyses regarding their comparison make these kinds of statements.

In his analysis of the birth of modern capitalism, Weber stated external factors such as the development of technology or trade, changes in the population, and the flow of precious metals can only be factors in the birth of capitalism and cannot be its driving force. Weber's position stems from his view of Marx's analysis of the transition to capitalism as being the result of the development of technology, and he even cites Marx's famous quote about the steam mill and hand mill:

"The well-known Marxist 'statement that the hand-mill requires feudalism just as the steam-mill necessitates capitalism is at most correct in its second part, and then only partially. The steam-mill fits without any difficulty into a state-socialist economy. The first part of the statement, however, is entirely incorrect: The hand-mill has lived through all conceivable economic structures and political "superstructures." In general we can say about capitalism only that, since its opportunities for expansion are limited under feudalism and patrimonialism, its champions usually attempt to substitute bureaucratization or a plutocratic domination by honoratiorees. This too, however, is only true of production-oriented modern capitalism, based on the rational enterprise, the division of labor and fixed capital, whereas politically oriented capitalism, just as capitalist whole-sale trade, is very much compatible with patrimonialism." (Weber, 1922, p. 1091)

Weber further asserted that Marx framed his thoughts in this phrase because he did not see the significance of the growing political and other superstructure institutions in capitalism. This reference, where Marx seems to attach importance to technological development when evaluated in its entirety, indicates the importance of productive forces for the realization of production. Moreover, productive forces include both labor power and technical/technological development as a necessity of production. Neither the comments about Marx attributing productive forces as determinants of history, especially in his later writings, nor Weber's approach does not reckon that the main considerations of his views on production are related to the emancipation of people by realizing themselves. Thus, the importance Marx attaches to the productive forces finds itself in society with the creation of a new division of labor. This issue, similarly, constitutes one of Weber's main areas of interest as the reorganization of production through rationalization and gaining another dimension with bureaucratization. Moreover, according to Marx, the division of labor affects the distribution of the means of production and determines the property relations that separate urban and rural lifestyles. As mentioned earlier, in Weber's analysis, what determines life in the rural-urban is whether they are organized according to production or consumption, which is based on the relationship between debtors and creditors. Considering Weber's view of the economy as a space of peace consisting of trade and his relationship with the marginalists, this relationship does not seem to show property relations, but the organization of production-

consumption in the city and village is directly related to how production is organized. In conclusion, it can be said that both Weber's and Marx's approaches are concerned with how production is organized in the context of the importance of the division of labor and the differentiation of productive forces, which is non-mechanistically central to both their writings.

Weber shared the criticisms directed at Marx for viewing history through the framework of economics. Accordingly, the relations established between the relations and forces of production, which determine each mode of production, give away Marx's approach to history from the perspective of economics. However, Marx argued that, although the productive forces and relations of production combine to establish the mode of production, the antagonism between them results in class struggles and alters the mode of production or way for people to earn their living. Therefore, the transition from feudalism to capitalism would also mean the emergence of a class conflict from the internal dynamics of feudalism and would lead to bourgeois revolutions that would radically change all class and social relations. Thus, expansion of trade, a change in population, or an expansion of merchants' capital would remain factors that could influence but not drive this process. On the other hand, Weber's view of the transition to modern capitalism lies in his evaluation of capitalism, in which he says that it is characterized by features such as profit motive, trade, and the existence of wage workers. According to this, capitalism does not have an emergence because it exists with these features in every period, but modern capitalism was born when these features of capitalism became organized in society through rationalization. Weber's interpretation of capitalism is clearly based on economic relations, but since he considers the emergence of rationalization to be dependent on the momentum of the Protestant ethic of the Western European example, it is inadequate to consider his analysis as a stand-alone economic interpretation. Because Weber's analysis distinguishes between the economic and the political spheres, according to this, the economic sphere is peaceful as a manifestation of the field of exchange, whereas the political is the field of power struggle. However, the economic field can be in the field of struggle as long as it coexists with the political field.

Moreover, Marx's analysis of primitive accumulation is assumed as economically deterministic in that the method of extraction of surplus from the producer is an economic issue. However, the surplus extraction method has more features to have to be

interested. Although the way in which the surplus was taken was realized, in feudalism, through extra-economic coercion, which included the political pressure tools of the state and violence, it started to be taken through economic coercion in capitalism. The characteristics of the transition period, on the other hand, contain both economic and extra-economic coercions, as capitalism arises from the internal dynamics of feudalism and exists as a new specific mode of production. Thus, the basis of Weber's critique of Marx, in which he offered an alternative with such a definition of the economy and separation of the political and economic, depends on the fact that Weber did not recognize Marx's theory of separating economic and extra-economic power during primitive accumulation and taking surplus value. Through this method, extra-economic power could play an important role in the development of societies (Wood, 1995, p. 176–177). And this distinction is not a result of expressing the superiority of the economic area over the political, but rather, the relationship of both areas shown in the examination of the specific results of the accumulation.

Weber's critiques are based on the claim that Marx's theory falls short in evaluating the role of superstructure institutions like religion, ideologies, and political power in the examination of society and history. Weber's assessment of the development of capitalism in Western Europe can be traced to this criticism. Accordingly, the ascetic discipline of rational organization, which is already inherent in all religions but not prevalent in society, was made public by Protestantism. The emergence of this Protestant ethic meant the acquisition of a new discipline in accordance with the new division of labor in the form of calling. Moreover, it required the reorganization of the whole society in accordance with this discipline. Although there are criticisms that Weber's analysis here is an analysis of religion and that he deals with history from an idealist perspective, it is clear that his analysis is based on the examination of rationalization and, thus, the newly formed division of labor and other aspects of society. Weber's relationship with the superstructure institutions such as the Protestant ethic and ideology only aims at explaining the dominance of rationalization because only rationalization can create the efficiency that can provide competitive power in the newly developed modern capitalism. Thus, it can be said Weber's interest in both superstructure and infrastructure formations is related to their involvement in power struggles. Here, including the division of labor in his analysis to examine the conflicts, collectiveness, and stratification of society indicates it has a dialectical character (Mann, 2012, p. 7).. On the other hand, one of the most common criticisms of Marx is that Marx

attributes secondary importance to the superstructure and interprets it as a phenomenon that can only be a follower of the base with a passive existence. However, Marx's statements that the superstructure cannot have a history on its own are not because he sees the elements of the superstructure as secondary; he uses it as an explanatory element that does not have the power to be decisive on its own, as it determines the direction and form of the change of history and society together with the foundation. Moreover, the importance Marx attaches to superstructure institutions can be observed in his dividing capitalism into periods. The first period is the manufacturing stage, in which a new "methodological calculation" changes the social relations as the factor of the wage worker's dominance in the organization of production, and the direction of the change in property relations is determined by legal regulations such as "enclosure acts." The second period is the modern industrial stage, in which the rational organization of the developments in technology and science provided the increase in productivity and the formation of social relations in the form of "real subordination of labor to capital." This does not imply that Marx, like Weber, views rationalization as a distinctive feature of contemporary capitalism. According to Marx, the specific feature of capitalism is the dominance of the wage worker in society, but while explaining this change and the new conditions, Marx did not ignore the importance of rationalization and other superstructure institutions.

Another important point of comparison is Marx's and Weber's approaches to modernity. According to both, the organization of modern life in capitalism is based on work and the new values it creates. The differences between the understanding of modern work and the understanding of work belonging to ancient times attract the attention of both Weber and Marx. According to Weber, work, which was seen as an unavoidable necessity in the medieval period, became a social and cultural value as a result of the strengthening of the middle class in the 18th century (Just, 2017, p. 436, 437). Moreover, it expresses work in the 19th century, with the bourgeoisie becoming the powerful class, as well as the expansion of secularization due to the disenchantment of the world. According to Marx, although there are comments that he varied in his early writings because he saw work as a requirement of human emancipation and in later writings as an obligation that caused emancipation to be unfulfilled. Marx's perspective is based on showing the conflict between the alienation and socialization of production in both his early and later writings. According to the position of Marx and Weber, work is meant to examine how

modern society is reorganized within the framework of increased productivity, division of labor, and the new principles of modernity (Just, 2017, p. 425).

Marx and Weber continued their approach to modern capitalism, which saw society and history as a field of conflicts: The conflicts that Weber saw between charisma and bureaucracy and that Marx saw between the appropriation of the individual and the social organization of production herald the collapse of capitalism. Weber contended that, as formal rationalization advances, there will be an increase in bureaucratization, which will cause capitalism to lose its capacity for charismatic renewal and result in the professionalization of political and economic administration. This means that capitalism loses its original qualities that offer freedom and is condemned to dehumanization and the iron cage. According to Marx, the accumulation process, crises, and the fact that the organization of production brings with it the capitalist organization in all areas of society will prevent the self-realization of the individual and cause the collapse of capitalism. Although Marx predicts that this collapse could not happen spontaneously and thus entails a class war, and Weber finds it unlikely that a class war would lead to the collapse of capitalism, they both have in common to have manifestations of the collapse of capitalism. Moreover, Marx's concept of alienation and Weber's concept of dehumanization showed the negative impact of capitalism on human nature and its potential for self-realization.

Another issue is Weber and Marx's approaches to societies outside Europe, where capitalism had not fully developed yet, and their studies on India provide important insights. The first is Weber's association of Indian functioning with traditionalism: accordingly, it lacks the charismatic features of capitalism in terms of its commitment to fixed payments. Weber acknowledged that Marx was right about traditionalism in India:

"K. Marx has characterized the peculiar position of the artisan in the Indian village—his dependence upon fixed payment in kind instead of upon production for the market—as the reason for the specific 'stability of the Asiatic peoples.' In this, Marx was correct." (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 111, 112).

According to Weber, the obstacles to India's being capitalist exist because of the 'spirit' inherent in each system differently. Even if capitalism was "imported from Europe," says Weber, it was not possible for India to have a capitalist structure before these obstacles were removed, but it was possible to exist with the exploitation:

“The core of the obstacle did not lie in such particular difficulties, which every one of the great religious systems in its way has placed, or has seemed to place, in the way of the modern economy. The core of the obstruction was rather imbedded in the 'spirit' of the whole system.

... In modern times it has not always been easy, but eventually it has been possible to employ Indian caste labor in modern factories. And even earlier it was possible to exploit the labor of Indian artisans capitalistically in the forms usual elsewhere in colonial areas, after the finished mechanism of modern capitalism once could be imported from Europe. Even if all this has come about, it must still be considered extremely unlikely that the modern organization of industrial capitalism would ever have originated on the basis of the caste system. A ritual law in which every change of occupation, every change in work technique, could result in ritual degradation is certainly not capable of giving birth to economic and technical revolutions from within itself, or even of facilitating the first germination of capitalism in its midst.” (Gerth & Mills, 1958, p. 111, 112)

There is an important point to note: Weber's argument is fully consistent with Marx's views, which are widely criticized for defining India as passive existence and is even said to have a racist overtones. Because Weber also predicted modern capitalism, at least in its current form, could only be imported from Europe and could exist in India only as a form of exploitation. Accordingly, explaining why capitalist development did not develop, while Marx's approach is based on the development of productive forces and relations of production in the country, pointing to the internal contradictions, it is found in the relationship between the spirit of the given system and the necessity of innovation to be rationally organized in Weber's approach. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that both of them notice the roots of capitalist development in the system's internal dynamics in the country.

3.4. IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION

To sum up, Marx's and Weber's analyses of the origins and development of capitalism do not show as many divergent features as has been discussed, although there are clearly consequential differences between both. When comparing the analyzes of Weber and Marx, the views that place them in opposition to each other are either based on a crude version of Marxism and historical materialism that attaches importance to economic reductionism and the development of technology or commerce and does not see his acknowledgment of the importance of the internal dynamics of society, including superstructure elements, or it is formed by perceiving Weber's analysis as giving priority to ideology, religion, and political institutions rather than seeing society as cognition of many factors including material factors such as division of labor and production. It is

possible to collect the analyzes of Weber and Marx on the development and origins of capitalism in a table as follows:

Table 1. Comparison of their analysis on the development and origins of capitalism

	MARX	WEBER
Methodology	A combination of hermeneutics and causal reasoning	A combination of hermeneutics and causal reasoning
Role of Individual and Division of labor	Individual as active subjects Production and division of labor as a part of self realisation of individual and as a building block of society	Individuals are placed as an active subject that reveals the importance of collective human action, which leads the change in society, although the concept of classes built upon economics
Driving Force of Change	The conflict between relations of production and forces of production which results in the class struggle	Irrational charisma creates innovations, which shows itself in the transformation from feudalism to capitalism as the Protestant ethic
Fundamentals of Capitalism	The dominance of labor power as a commodity in society	Rationalization spreading the society
Collapse of Capitalism	Conflicts between appropriation of individuals and spreading social organization of production	Increasing formal rationality which causing disenchantment and iron cage

The views of Marx and Weber, whose analyses of the origins and development of capitalism are seen as rivals to each other, are collected as shown in the table. Their analyzes are quite consistent with each other in terms of examining the different elements of society, their examination methods, and their dialectical perception of society.

Weber differs from Marx in terms of his relationship with the marginalists and his essentially being a bourgeois economist, with different results. A considerable example of this is that he states that the conflict in society can achieve results not from the class struggle but from the relationship it establishes between debtors and creditors. However, even here, Weber's analysis finds itself on the ground of explaining the internal conflicts

of society. Moreover, his emphasis on the development of industry also differs from that given by Marx; Weber sees the development of the industry as a necessity in the context of the power relations of the nation-state and sees the emerging working class as the unintended consequences of the development of the industry, while also taking into account the difficulties they experience. For Marx, it is a development that should be examined in the context of the nature of the bourgeois revolutions so the internal characteristics of the newly formed society can be better comprehended since only the new internal dynamics show the qualities that can lead to the collapse of capitalism. However, as has been said before, their approach to examining the origins and development of capitalism are perfectly compatible since both analyses examine the new system in the form of examining its internal dynamics, including the elements of economic and political or ideological and material or base and superstructure, etc.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (2005). *For Marx* (Vol. 2). Verso.
- Barbalet, J. (2008). *Weber, Passion and Profits: 'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism' in Context*. U.K: Cambridge University Press
- Blackledge, P. (2006), *Reflections on the Marxist theory of history*, Manchester University Press, UK and US
- Brenner, R. (1976), *Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe*; Aston, T. H., & Philpin, C. H. (Eds.). (1987). *The Brenner debate: agrarian class structure and economic development in pre-industrial Europe*. Cambridge University Press pp:10-64; orig. publ. in *Past & Present*, 70(1), 30-75.
- Brenner, R. (1977). *The origins of capitalist development: a critique of neo-Smithian Marxism*. *New left review*, (104).
- Brenner, R. (1978), *Dobb on the transition from feudalism to capitalism*, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (June 1978), pp. 121-140
- Brenner, R. (1989). *Bourgeois revolution and transition to capitalism. The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone*, 271-304.
- Brenner, R. (2007). *Property and Progress: Where Adam Smith Went Wrong*, In Wickham (ed.), *Marxist History-Writing for the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 49-111.
- Callinicos, A.T. (2007), *Social Theory - A Historical Introduction*. Polity Press Ltd. Cambridge
- Çiğdem, A. (2021). *Aydınlanma Düşüncesi*. Ankara, Vulgus Yayınları
- Davidson, N. (2012). *How revolutionary were the bourgeois revolutions?* Haymarket Books. Chicago, IL, US.
- Davis, W. M. (1978). " *Anticritical Last Word on The Spirit of Capitalism*," by Max Weber. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(5), 1105-1131.

- Denemark, R.A. & Thomas, K.P. (1988). 'The Brenner-Wallerstein Debate.' *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Mar., 1988), pp. 47-65
- Dobb, M. (1950), 'Studies in The Development Of Capitalism', Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. London, UK
- Engels, (1894), Preface to Capital vol 3, in Capital vol 3 (p: 4-15) International Publishers, NY
- Frank, A.G. (1975). Development and Underdevelopment in the New World: Smith and Marx vs. the Weberians, *Theory and Society*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Winter, 1975), pp. 431-466
- Gerth, H. H. & Mills C. W. (1958), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Oxford University Press, UK
- Giddens, A. (1995a). Politics and Sociology in the Thought of Max Weber, In Giddens, 'Politics, Sociology and Social Theory' (pp. 15-56), Stanford University Press, Stanford, California
- Giddens, A. (1995b). Marx, Weber, and the Development of Capitalism. In Giddens, 'Politics, Sociology and Social Theory' (pp. 57-77), Stanford University Press, Stanford, California
- Hill, C. (1979). *The English Revolution, 1640: Three Essays*. Lawrence & Wishart. London
- Hilton, R. (1963) 'A Comment', in Hilton (ed.), *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism* pp: 65-72; orig. publ. in *Science and Society*, 17(4), 340-351, Fall 1953
- Hilton, R. (1976). Feudalism and the Origins of Capitalism. *History Workshop*, 1, 9–25.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1965) *Introduction to Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, International publishers, NewYork, US
- Hobsbawm, E. (1998), *On History*, The New Press, New York, US
- Hunt, E. K. (1984). The relation between theory and history in the writings of Karl Marx. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 12(4), 1-8
- Hunt, E. K. (1997). Philosophy and economics in the Writings of Karl Marx. *FRONTIER ISSUES IN ECONOMIC THOUGHT*, 3, 67-69.

- Just, D. (2017). The Invention of Work in Modernity: Hegel, Marx, and Weber. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 30(2), 435-456
- Kaymak, M. (2018). Kapital'in Rusça Serüveni: Rusya Aynasında Tarihsel Maddecilik ve Politik Ekonomi Kuramı' *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 42 (1), 3-45.
- Kaymak, M. (2020). Adam Smith'in Dört Aşamalı Tarih Kuramı Üzerine. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 44 (2), 177-218.
- Löwy, M. (1989), Weber against Marx? The Polemic with Historical Materialism in the Protestant Ethic, *Science & Society*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (Spring, 1989), pp. 71-83
- Mandel, E. (1971), *The Formation of Economic Thought of Karl Marx'* Monthly Review Press, New York
- Mann, M. (2012). *The sources of social power: volume 1, a history of power from the beginning to AD 1760 (Vol. 1)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Marx, K. (1955), *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Marx, K. (1965), *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, International Publishers, New York
- Marx, K. (1972), *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Marx, K. (1974) *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Marx, K. (1993), *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Penguin Classics, England
- Marx, K. (1995a), *Capital: Volume 1*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Marx, K. (1995b), *Capital: Volume 3*, International Publishers, NY,
- Marx, K. (2008), *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Econom*, Book Jungle,
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1968), *German Ideology*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1977). *Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol 08: Marx and Engels: 1845-*

1848. International Publishers. New York.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1979). Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol 12: Marx and Engels 1853-54. International Publishers. New York.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1989). Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol 24: Marx and Engels: 1874-1883. International Publishers. New York.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1998), Communist Manifesto, Verso, London, UK

Meek, R. L. (1967), Economics and Ideology and Other Essays. London: Chapman and Hall,

Meek, R. L. (1977), Smith, Marx, & After: Ten Essays in the Development of Economic Thought. Springer: Boston, MA

Mommsen, W. (1992), The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber: Collected Essays, University Of Chicago Press, US

Mueller, G.H. & Weber, M. (1982), Socialism and Capitalism in the Work of Max Weber, The British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Jun., 1982), pp. 151-171

Nisbet, R. (1979). The idea of progress. *Literature of Liberty*, 7-37.

Ollman, B. (2012). Yabancılaşma: Marx'ın kapitalist toplumdaki insan anlayışı. Yordam Kitap.

Özel, H. (2018), Four Horsemen Of The Apocalypse: Marx, Weber, Schumpeter, and Polanyi' Yıldız Social Science Review vol. 4 no. 2

Parsons, T. (1930). 'Translator's Preface'. pp. 9–11 in Max Weber: The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Routledge, London, 2005, UK

Perelman, M. (2000), The Invention of Capitalism: Classical Political Economy and the Secret History of Primitive Accumulation; Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2000

Polanyi, K. (2021), Büyük Dönüşüm: Çağımızın Siyasal ve Ekonomik Kökenleri, Bugra(Çv.), İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul

Sayer, D., & Corrigan, P. (1983). Late Marx: continuity, contradiction and learning. In T. Shanin

(Ed.), *Late Marx and the Russian Road: Marx and the Peripheries of Capitalism* (Vol. 26, pp. 77–94). NYU Press.

Sayer, D. (2005) *Capitalism and modernity: an excursus on Marx and Weber*, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, London, UK

Sayer, D. (1987). *The violence of abstraction: The analytic foundations of historical materialism*. Basil Blackwell. UK

Sezgin, Ö. (2008). *Marx, Kapital ve Diyalektik Materyalizm*, Phoenix, Ankara

Shanin, T. (1983). *Late Marx: gods and craftsmen*. In T. Shanin (Ed.), *Late Marx and the Russian Road: Marx and the Peripheries of Capitalism* (Vol. 26, pp. 3–39). NYU Press.

Sherman, H. (1981), *Marx and Determinism*, *Journal of Economic Issues*, Vol. 15, No.1, (Mar.1981), pp 61-71

Sweezy, P. M. (1963), *A Critique*, in Hilton (ed.), *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism* pp:1-20; orig. publ. in *Science & Society*, 14(2), Spring, pp. 134-167

Swingewood, A. (1984). *A short history of sociological thought*. Macmillan Education. UK

Thompson, E. P. (1995). *The Poverty of Theory: or an Orrery of Errors*, Merlin Press, London

Üşür, İ. (1990). *Burjuva Devrimleri Bağlamında Onyedinci Yüzyıl İngiliz Devrimi*. Onbirinci Tez Kitap Dizisi. 1990/1. pp158-178.

Üşür, İ. (1992). *Kapitalizmin Gelişmesi Üzerine İncelemeler ve Geçiş Tartışmaları: Bir Takdim*. In Dobb (ed), *Studies in The Development Of Capitalism*, Ankara: Belge Yayınları, 355-452.

Wada, H. (1983). *Marx and Revolutionary Russia*. In T. Shanin. *Late Marx and the Russian Road*.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The rise and future demise of the world capitalist system: Concepts for comparative analysis*. *Comparative studies in society and history*, 16(4), 387-415.

Weber, M. (1922), *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, University of California Press, 1978, US

Weber, M. (1923), *General Economic History*, The Free Press, 1950, US

Weber, M. (1930), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Routledge, London, 2005,
UK

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. The Free Press. Glencoe,
Illinois

Weber, M. (1949), *The Methodology of Social Science*, The Free Press, 1949, US

Weber, M. (2010), *Political Writings*, Cambridge University Press, 2010, UK


Weber, M. (2013), *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations*, tr.R.I. Frank. Verso, London,
New York

Wood, E. M. (1995), *Democracy Against Capitalism – Reviewing Historical materialism*.
Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK


Wood, E. M. (2002), *The Origin of Capitalism: A Longer View*, Verso Press, London

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1. ETHICS COMMISSION FORM

	<p>HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES ETHICS COMMISSION FORM FOR THESIS</p>
<p>HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT</p>	
<p>Thesis Title: A COMPARISON of MARX and WEBER'S ANALYSES ON THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM</p> <p>My thesis work related to the title above:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not perform experimentation on animals or people. 2. Does not necessitate the use of biological material (blood, urine, biological fluids and samples, etc.). 3. Does not involve any interference of the body's integrity. 4. Is not based on observational and descriptive research (survey, interview, measures/scales, data scanning, system-model development). <p>I declare, I have carefully read Hacettepe University's Ethics Regulations and the Commission's Guidelines, and in order to proceed with my thesis according to these regulations I do not have to get permission from the Ethics Board/Commission for anything; in any infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility and I declare that all the information I have provided is true.</p> <p>I respectfully submit this for approval</p> <p style="text-align: right;">10.09.2020 Signature</p> <p>Name Surname:KARDELEN KILINÇOĞLU</p> <p>Student No:N19137710</p> <p>Department:ECONOMICS</p> <p>Program:ECONOMICS MASTER PROGRAM WITH THESIS (ENG.)</p> <p>Status:<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D. <input type="checkbox"/> Combined MA/ Ph.D.</p>	
<p><u>ADVISER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL</u></p>	
<p><u>APPROVED</u></p>	
<p>Doç. Dr. MUAMMER KAYMAK</p>	

APPENDIX 2. ORIGINALITY REPORT

 <p>HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES MASTER'S THESIS ORIGINALITY REPORT</p>
<p>HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Date: 15/05/2023</p> <p>Thesis Title : A Comparison of Marx and Weber's Analyses on the Origins and Development of Capitalism</p> <p>According to the originality report obtained by my thesis advisor by using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software and by applying the filtering options checked below on 15/05/2023 for the total of 105 pages including the a) Title Page, b) Introduction, c) Main Chapters, and d) Conclusion sections of my thesis entitled as above, the similarity index of my thesis is 9 %.</p> <p>Filtering options applied:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval and Declaration sections excluded 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bibliography/Works Cited excluded 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quotes excluded 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quotes included 5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Match size up to 5 words excluded <p>I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>I respectfully submit this for approval.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Date and Signature</p> <p>Name Surname: Kardelen KILINÇOĞLU _____</p> <p>Student No: N19137710 _____</p> <p>Department: ECONOMICS _____</p> <p>Program: ECONOMICS MASTER PROGRAM WITH THESIS (ENG.) _____</p>
<p><u>ADVISOR APPROVAL</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">APPROVED.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muammer KAYMAK</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ (Title, Name Surname, Signature)</p>