

## Hey Marx! Can't live... Without You<sup>1</sup>

¡Hey Marx! No se puede vivir... sin ti

Sevgi Doğan  
Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy  
Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa

### Abstract

The purpose of this article is to *re*-discover and *re*-announce the importance and significance of Marxism through the critiques of Gregory Elliot to Marxists Eric Hobsbawm, Perry Anderson, and to a neo-conservative Francis Fukuyama in his book, namely, the *Ends in Sight* (2008). This book brings these thinkers close together concerning their different past and future perspectives of capitalism and socialism respecting the statement of 'end of history'.

*Keywords:* 'the end of history', Marxism, Eric Hobsbawm, Perry Anderson, Francis Fukuyama, anti-globalization movements, the *Manifiesto*, intra-capitalism, inter-/intra-system.

### Resumen

El objetivo de este artículo es re-descubrir y re-anunciar la importancia y el significado del Marxismo a través de las críticas propuestas por Gregory Elliott en su libro *Ends in Sight* (2008) a los marxistas Eric Hobsbawm, Perry Anderson y al neo-conservador Francis Fukuyama. El libro recoge, por medio de estos pensadores, las diferentes perspectivas, pasadas y futuras, del capitalismo y el socialismo a través de la declaración el "fin de la historia".

*Palabras claves:* "el fin de la historia", Marxismo, Eric Hobsbawm, Perry Anderson, Francis Fukuyama, movimientos antiglobalización, el *Manifiesto*, intra-capitalismo, inter/intra sistema.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is a Latin tag employed by Domenico Losurdo, *Nec tecum possum vivere nec sine te!*, in the introduction of the *Communist Manifesto* in an Italian edition.

History continues to flow regardless of the debate proclaiming that history has come to an end. After the collapse of communism, the irrepressible rise of liberal capitalism and the appearance of fascism, the belief regarding world changes as regards socialist ideology has been damaged and correspondingly a great belief that history has attained its end has become pervasive among intellectuals. This discussion began, in effect, with Marx who in the *Communist Manifesto* declared that 'pre-history' would come to an end within communism. However, according to him, this termination is an inception for a new human history. In this context, Gregory Elliott in his short book *Ends in Sight*<sup>2</sup>, discusses and, in a certain sense, criticizes three contemporary thinkers such as Eric Hobsbawm, Perry Anderson, and Francis Fukuyama, concerning their views on the past and the prospects for the future of capitalism and socialism through their interrelations and their relation with Marxism regarding the statement of 'end of history'. In this context, this paper shall focus on the current, fresh theme of the death and revival of Marxism in terms of the arguments raised in *Ends in Sight*. Therefore this study shall be especially concentrated on the analysis of Elliott's basic assertions.

The discourse of the 'end of history' is determined by the slow deletion of communism in the Second World War and the continuous growth -the boom, even- of capitalism with its neo-liberal political formulation. Thus the idea that capital has been irrepressibly globalized begins to predominate not only economical field but also in intellectual ambient. For this reason Elliott pays attention to so-called Marxists Eric Hobsbawm and Perry Anderson and to a neo-conservative Francis Fukuyama by virtue of their differing perspectives upon capitalism and socialism in the last century. Each chapter, Elliott says, has its separate composition but he adds that "they are scored here as an unwitting quartet"<sup>3</sup>.

Elliott puts forth the first hypothesis that notwithstanding the fact that Hobsbawm and Anderson appear to criticize Fukuyama's historical perspective in the light of Marxism, they

---

<sup>2</sup> Gregory Elliott, *Ends in Sight: Marx, Fukuyama, Hobsbawm, Anderson* (London: Pluto, 2008).

<sup>3</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, viii.

are unfortunately still in the same league with him. Secondly, Elliott emphasizes the recession or hesitation of the working class or proletariat movement in contrast to the appearance of anti-globalization movements all around the world which he sees as precluding the working class movements.

Within the framework of these two hypotheses the *Communist Manifesto* is envisaged as a fundamental resource of historical materialism for the basic argument of the prospect of capitalism and 'scientific socialism'. Elliott applies to the present Merleau-Ponty's<sup>4</sup> claim from 1960 -that Marxism in the sense of scientific socialism is not true- a statement which Elliott believes sums up the current condition of today Marxism or MarxismS<sup>5</sup>. Furthermore, he especially stresses that true Marxism or scientific socialism has never existed. Marxism today refers to socialism as a political ideal, not something which is currently embodied or enacted by a real mass movement. The real mass movement in the twentieth century was, in effect, a real movement. Therefore he claims that in "the future socialism must engage a kind of thinking about the goal of socialism, about the shape of desirable, achievable, and available socialism"<sup>6</sup> (sometimes it is called concrete utopism in contrast with the abstract utopism embodied in the Soviet Union). It can be conceived that *concrete utopism* substitutes for 'scientific socialism' from Elliott's point of view. Here I would like to ask if still it is not a kind of utopism which Marx and Engels attempted to negate. What differentiates it from scientific socialism? That is to say, still it is not clear why concrete

<sup>4</sup> Maurice Merleau-Ponty, in the preface to *Signs*, 1960, "Marxism has definitely entered a new phase of its history, in which it can inspire and orient analyses and retain a certain heuristic value, but is certainly no longer true in the sense it was believed to be true.", trans and introd. Richard C. McCleary, *Signs* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964), 9, quoted from *Ends in Sight*.

<sup>5</sup> For Elliott, today not only one Marxism exists more than one Marxism which he calls "MarxismS". He prefers not to call them "interpretations" of Marx or Marxism because every interpretation for him constructs or reconstructs, forms or reforms, and even deforms Marxism. In this sense, they are all different from each other; they have different perspectives and prospects of society depending upon Marxism. They occurred as a new theory of practice, that is to say, as a state theory, for instance Maoism, Trotskyism.

<sup>6</sup> Gregory Elliott, "Marxism Yesterday and Today", from the seminar in Università di Urbino: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Uomo, May 9<sup>th</sup> 2011.

utopianism has superseded scientific socialism. What is the deficiency of scientific socialism?

In this regard, after the Russian Revolution which according to Elliott, remained in utopian socialism instead of founding a scientific socialism, there were two errors which made the Soviets utopian socialists: the first is the treatment of the state and law; the second is the notion of complete abolishment of economic markets. To this point it should be said that Elliott believes that socialism has to know how to separate between the negative and the positive aspects of capitalism. In so doing, it must take the positive things from capitalism and abolish the negative things. Therefore due to these two errors, utopian socialists found themselves in the dark after the 1970s<sup>7</sup>.

Elliot describes the crisis of Marxism in four phases or periods. The first crisis broke out after Engels' death in 1895, which was called "the revisionist controversy" in the Second International (Second International Workingmen's Association founded in 1889). This first crisis was much more related to Eduard Bernstein as a founder of evolutionary socialism and revisionism. Before Engels' death, the close relationship of Bernstein and Engels became a friendship and Bernstein shared the most of political ideas of Engels. This first crisis was a debate between the orthodox Marxism<sup>8</sup> and Bernstein's utopist perspective defending revisionism contra an orthodox version of Marxism leading to a dispute in his party (the German Social Democratic Party). In this context, Bernstein's main point was that the realization of socialism could be achieved not through the destruction of capitalism but through the capitalism itself, for instance, simply through the parliamentary reform. Shortly, with this crisis, seemingly the dissolution of orthodox Marxism had risen both with Bernstein's refutation of Marxist belief on impending annihilation of capitalism and his discussion on Marx's

---

<sup>7</sup> Elliott, "Marxism Yesterday and Today".

<sup>8</sup> Orthodox Marxism was a version of Marxism based on the fundamental Marxian theories. Orthodox Marxism appeared after the death of Marx with the significant contribution of Engels' later works elaborating and systemizing Marx's works. Furthermore, with the works of some Marxists thinkers such as George Plekhanov and Karl Kautsky who had great influence on Lenin as being supporter of orthodoxy, orthodox Marxism was developed during the Second International until the First World War.

labour theory of value. The second crisis appeared in 1914, after the collapse of the Second International which began to dissolve during the First World War. This second crisis comprised two important events; the collapse of the Second International and the advent of the Social Revolution in Russia in 1917. Orthodoxy, according to Elliott, was completely discredited. Or, as Elliot quoted, in Gramsci's words, it was a "revolution against *Capital*". What does it mean? It means a revolution against Marxist orthodoxy, against the way of interpretation of Marx's *Capital* by the Second International and therefore this interpretation or the way of interpretation was identified as remaining "in the mechanistic fashion"<sup>9</sup>. With the advent of the Russian Revolution in 1917, Lenin's and Third International's (Comintern, 1919) theory and praxis of revolution transformed its path from the west to the east in the name of civilization, that is, from the "developed" to "undeveloped" countries in the process of the Eurocentrism referring to the civilization and enlightenment. Eurocentrism was a characteristic of the Third International used to be called extremely European. In this regard, 'developed' countries aimed to civilize their colonies in Asia and Africa<sup>10</sup>.

The third crisis is defined by Elliott as "the crisis of communism", or "crisis of Marxism in its communist form". This crisis is determined with the denunciation of Stalin by Khrushchev at the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It was "the dissolution of international communist movement as any kind of unified world movement". This dissolution resulted from two factors: first, the dissolution of the bond between the Russian and China in the 1960s and, second, the appearance of the Eurocommunism<sup>11</sup>, particularly in the 1970s. In short, while the first and second crises correspond with the

---

<sup>9</sup> Ellen Meiksins Wood, in her article "Marxism and the Course of History", lightens to what Marx's mechanical view of history (unilinear) refers and in doing so, she exposes mis-interpretation and mis-reading of this mechanic fashion of *Capital*, *New Left Review* I: 147 September-October (1984).

<sup>10</sup> Elliott, "Marxism Yesterday and Today".

<sup>11</sup> In the 1970s and in the 1980s in particular among the European countries there appeared a new theoretical and practical transformation of society within Western European democracy which was less relevant to the influence of Soviet Union socialism. Eurocommunism questioned the Soviet Union, and supported new social movements such as feminism and gay liberation.

problem and debate on the *content* of Marxian theory, the third one is much more related to the *form* of Marxism in its communist realization. In other saying, they are the crises in theory and praxis of Marxism.

The fourth, and most important, crisis began in the mid-1980s with Gorbachev's political and economic strategies called *perestroika* and *glasnost* in the Soviet Union. The fourth crisis according to Elliott was not only a drama but also a trauma. However the most of socialists believed that at least since the death of Lenin in 1924, the Soviet Union's real relation with socialism in its true form was given up but still this crisis came like a bombshell or, like a trauma. In other words, after Lenin, the Soviet system was no longer based on communism, but rather upon the state capitalism. For this reason for the majority of socialists, the collapse of communism was a kind of trauma because the second world that they used to call a communist world was a representation of a real -and unique- attempt to create a socialist society in the last century. After the First World War, says Elliott, the social democratic tradition in Marxism, that is, the Second International tradition had been abandoned. Thus Elliott calls the fourth crisis of Marxism as an announcement of the death of Marxism. However there are two significant political and economic developments giving rise to comeback of Marxism or MarxismS: (1) the rise of alter-globalization movement; (2) the economic crisis of capitalism, specifically, the global economic recession in 2008.

*End in Sight* is an analysis of two different Marxists' aspects on the future expectation of socialism. Elliott points out that the irresistible growth of capitalism all around the world generates the new claims in regard to communism and socialism. He summarizes as follows:

“With the deletion of communism in the Second World, sanitization of social democracy in the First and exhaustion of nationalism in the Third-in sum, with the remorseless capitalist standardization of political culture across the globe-Fukuyama proclaimed the end of history, Hobsbawm feared a descent into darkness, and Anderson announced an utterly unprecedented neo-liberal ascendancy”<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 116.

The paragraph above gives a general schema of the world historical and political conjuncture articulated by contemporary interpreters. From the whole this historical panorama and departing from diagnoses of history of Marxism, *Ends in Sight* is a radical critique of these Marxists who lose, roughly speaking, their confidence in the Left and who theoretically, as a result, relatively approach the right-wing. Basically, *Ends in Sight* makes reference to the crisis of the Left -the crisis of Marxism or MarxismS- which has been turning around the statement of 'end of history' based particularly on Fukuyama's argument as a trigger. In the Marxian sense, the end of pre-history is the end of past society which "has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs"<sup>13</sup>. *Ends in Sight* explains the defection of communism or pessimism of the future prospect of communism within historical and political world affairs after modernization, that is, after the development of neo-liberal capitalism or the hypertrophy of industrialism. Accordingly, Elliott elaborates these three thinkers' views through the framework of their approaches to history in the light of their periodisation of current world conjuncture throughout their political perspectives.

*Ends in Sight* is divided in four chapters. The first chapter begins with the *Communist Manifesto* in which Marx and Engels demonstrate the ideal society as an end of pre-history of mankind within communism. In this context, the *Communist Manifesto* is the central text under discussion throughout Elliott's work. This first section reminds us of what Marx attempted to delineate and distill in the *Manifesto*. The second chapter takes up Fukuyama's *The End of History and the Last Man* [1992] in which he argues that liberal democracy is the final form of human government. According to Fukuyama, with the end of the Cold War and the collapse of communism came the triumph of Western liberal democracy and the end of history since -as he sees it- democracy is the climax of human social-cultural evolution. In other words, it is the end of ideological evolution of mankind. The reaction of Hobsbawm to Fukuyama leads, in the third part, to a fuller discussion of

---

<sup>13</sup> Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party", in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker (New York-London: Princeton University, W.W. Norton & Company, , 1978), 489.

Hobsbawm's work, particularly his *Age of Extremes* [1994] and his more recent *Globalization, Democracy and Terrorism*. Finally, in chapter four, Perry Anderson's article "Renewals" [2000] which represents the new perspective of *New Left Review* as regards its political, cultural analysis of the nineties, is examined. In the conclusion, Elliott turns back to the first chapter to indicate the anti-capitalist movements which, according to him, justify Marx and disprove the negative approaches of Fukuyama, Hobsbawm and Anderson. According to Elliott, these alter-globalization movements are a sort of comeback for Marxism. However still there is a significant question that he has to ask: what sort of comeback is it?

## The Eternity of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*

Before beginning to concentrate on detail of the *Manifesto* itself from Elliott's perspective, let's take a glance at Engels' summary of the *Manifesto*;

"The *Manifesto* being our joint production, I consider myself bound to state that the fundamental proposition, which forms its nucleus, belongs to Marx. That proposition is that in every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organization necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploited and oppressed class -the proletariat- cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions, and class struggles"<sup>14</sup>

With Engels' exposition above, the *Manifesto* emphasizes the *particularity* of every epoch which is equipped with its particular – distinct- mode of economic production and the ways of exchange,

---

<sup>14</sup> Friedrich Engels, "the Manifesto of the Communist Party", Preface to the English edition of 1888, in *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*, edited by Lewis S. Feuer (London-Glasgow: Collins, 1969), 46.



the social relations and organizations. And every epoch owns its particular struggles for freedom or emancipation from being oppressed and its particular classes with its particular relationships in political and social life. In this sense, the *Manifesto* attempts to exclaim that the history of mankind is the history of class struggle -the struggle between the ruling class or, exploiter and oppressed.

Terrell Carver describes the *Communist Manifesto* as being “perhaps the most successful political pamphlet of all time... the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848 is frankly the easiest and best point of entry [to Marx’s ideas and revolutionary ideology], as it is unmistakably political, deeply in earnest, sweepingly historical, and superbly written”<sup>15</sup>.

In the *Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* [1859], Marx wrote that

“(...) the bourgeois mode of production is the last antagonistic form of the social process of production -antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism but of an antagonism that emanates from the individuals’ social conditions of existence- but with the productive forces developing within bourgeois society create also the material conditions for a solution of this antagonism. The prehistory of human society accordingly closes with this social formation”<sup>16</sup>

A capitalist mode of production would create the solution for the abolishment of exploitation by private property. Marx defines this kind of society, that is, capitalist society, as a prehistory of human society which will be replaced (*ended*) by the solution arising from the antagonistic form of the social process of production. Here history shows a progressive, directional and materialistic process.

In the first chapter of Elliott’s treatment, *the Communist Manifesto* is handled from the standpoint of its historical importance and its detections of present philosophical and

---

<sup>15</sup> Terrell Carver, ‘Reading Marx: Life and Works’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Marx*, edited by Terrell Carver (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 12-14.

<sup>16</sup> Karl Marx, “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy”, in *Early Writings: Marx*, introduced by Lucio Colletti, translated by Rodney Livingstone and Gregory Benton (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, New Left Review, 1975), 426.

political situation and future prospect. Hobsbawm, in his 1998 introduction to the *Manifesto*, described it as a characterization of late-twentieth-century capitalism. Meanwhile Gareth Stedman Jones, in 2002, made the same claim that it is “a brief but still unsurpassed depiction of modern capitalism”<sup>17</sup>. The aim of this first part is to speak of the significant core and key points of *Manifesto* in order to elaborate the following chapters.

In this context, the main focusing point is the idea and materialization of communism, or socialism which was evaluated as a step or passage to arrive at communism through its scientific perspective. Engels and Marx insisted that socialism developed from utopia to science which was therefore used to be called “scientific socialism.” According to Engels, with the discovery of capitalist mode of production in its historical condition and surplus value, socialism was comprehended as a science. In other words, socialism was transformed from the utopian understanding into a scientific conception of the world, society and human conditions based on the materialist and historical results. The process in which communism progresses is not a kind of mechanical process; it requires human agency to carry out the revolutionary movement. Here capitalism creates not only the material condition but also the social condition, in other words, it creates proletariat or working class emerging in order to realize communist revolution.

That is to say, with the Elliott’s statement; communism, therefore, is not an unrealizable aristocratic utopian idea that has to be materialized by humanity but rather communism itself is immanent or inherent to capitalism that human agency, so to speak, proletariat will annihilate. It is properly the description of the scientific socialism based on the understanding of historical and dialectical materialism. Marx defines capitalism as a creator of its enemy who would destroy and eradicate its core, namely, class-antagonism. Briefly, it can be said that “capitalism creates communism”<sup>18</sup>. Marx and Engels point out the proletariat as the *dramatis personae* -only they are the really revolutionary class which Marx calls the ‘modern working class’-, the seed of the hypertrophy of capitalism creating its own destruction by its

---

<sup>17</sup> Quoted from *Ends in Sight*.

<sup>18</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 10.

hand. Therefore Marx declares the modern working class as essential being to capitalist industry. In this context, the chapter briefly deals with each part of the *Manifesto*.

While, in the *Manifesto*, Marx concentrated on socialism and its scientific character as differentiated from utopian socialism, in the *Anti-Dühring* (1878) Engels speaks of Marx's two important discoveries: (1) the materialistic conception of history; (2) the discovery of surplus value. However this interpretation of Engels is not espoused by some Marxist historians. Marx's most important discovery (as Engels claimed) is the notion of surplus value with the determination of "the differentiation of labour and labour power" that yet had not propounded in 1848 because the theory of surplus value was elaborated only twenty years later in the first volume of *Capital*. Elliott points out that the *Manifesto* concerning capitalist exploitation is communist in the Ricordian sense, that is, not in the Marxian sense since the *Manifesto* involves a "subsistence theory of wages" which, according to Ricardo, signifies that just as every fundamental commodity has a price so the labour possesses also a price or wage. The main character determined this wage is the average price of wage labour enabling the workers to survive or earn him/her keep. In this sense, the wage labour is defined by the price of basic necessities and sustenance. However, of course, it is criticized by socialists to drive the people into poverty and famine. But the materialist conception of history had been described in the mid-1840s, in the *German Ideology*. Thus the depiction of historical perspective of Marx's theory appears in the *Manifesto*. It exhibits the development of new class antagonism which already existed in earlier epochs of history as a demonstration of a complicated arrangement of society. *The Manifesto* is a presentation of the immiseration of working class or proletarian pauperization due to diminution of the wages.

However Elliott believes that there are two different aspects in the *Manifesto* and in *Capital*. In *Capital* two tendencies are distinguished from the *Manifesto*: (1) periodic absolute impoverishment of working class because of unemployment; (2) relative impoverishment of the whole working class in virtue of increased exploitation and lack of satisfaction of human needs in question. The pauperization of working class through the diminution of wages as Marx states in the *Manifesto* results in the

organization of proletariat and therefore Marx professed that the capitalist gave birth to the proletarianization of the lower strata of the middle class and growth of working class. Inevitably the working class would organize in a political party. Therefore the bourgeoisie, so to speak, the capitalist mode of production evoked its grave-diggers: proletariat. It is the aim of history to dispose of proletariat.

According to Lenin, the *Manifesto* represents crucial and historical role of proletariat as the builder of new socialist society. Here Elliott puts emphasis on the proletariat movement as an international one with reference to Lenin and Trotsky, talking about, unlike Stalin and Mao, the possibility of revolution in the West signalled by the evolution in the East.

Like according to many, also for Elliott, the *Manifesto* is implicitly or explicitly a manifestation of the scientific conception of socialism rested on several pillars. Elliott points out that Kautsky and Labriola, Lenin and Luxemburg, Trotsky and Togliatti drew off the essence of scientific conception of socialism from the *Manifesto*.

Elliott drew out the *Manifesto* as follows:

- (1) In the *Manifesto*, there is a description of human history and its periodization from primitive communism, via different forms of class society to advanced communism in which pre-history of human being is coming to an end. It is clearly not the same with Fukuyama's claim of 'end of history'. Briefly, the *Manifesto* attempts to an exposition of existed and existing classes in terms of their historical development by means of historical context.
- (2) The manifestation of the capitalist mode of production and its dynamics lead to creation of the conditions for abolition of capitalism and replacement of communism.
- (3) Third pillar is social agency. The laborers who have been created by capitalist mode of production, that is, by modern industrial capitalism are the means of transformation of the system of capitalism. This working class overthrows this system, the existing order and builds up a new order, called communism. In other words, the working class produces a new history, namely, it is an introduction, an outset of history.
- (4) The forth pillar is based on this new order leading to a direct democracy.

(5) Finally, the Marxist conception of socialism has been despised as being a moralist. Scientific socialism produces a way for overcoming the suppression of capitalism and causes a conviction for a new civilization and culture beyond capitalism.

The 1980s is defined as the period in which the positive future expectations have decreased because of its neo-liberal offensive. In this respect, there are negative aspects of the communist ideal thought yelling that the materialization of communist idea is quasi impossible for the twentieth century. In this point, Elliott observes the liberal discourses increasing in society. For instance, Hobsbawm, in his essay published in 1971, has described the class of 68, the period in which the working class lost its hope and concrete model of alternative society, like socialism. After the great October Revolution and the Soviet Union, nothing replaced this hope and instead of socialist perspective the negative view point of existing society and the public hatred of socialism settled in.

### *The End of the History, Fukuyama*

In the second part of the book Elliott focuses on Fukuyama who has been discussed not only by the left side but also the right side. Elliott delineates Fukuyama's work, namely, "The End of History?" as predating earthquake in the East. His main thesis is that liberal democracy is the last form of the world, the last form of government for all existing states, which implies the end of history. Elliott formulates Fukuyama's thesis as; 'the end of communism=the end of socialism=the end of history'<sup>19</sup>.

According to Fukuyama, since the French Revolution, democracy in ethical, political and economic areas has been a better system than any other alternatives. Fukuyama was bombarded with many critiques by many thinkers such as Jacques Derrida criticizing him in *Specter of Marx* in 1993, Perry Anderson as so-called Marxist directing his fiercest criticisms to Fukuyama and George Will ironically writing that history has 'returned from vocation'.

---

<sup>19</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 35.

Elliott incisively exposes the resource of Fukuyama's argument composed of Hegel with one of the most important Hegelian commentators, namely, Kojève and finally Nietzsche. In this respect, Fukuyama's idealist idea of history was arising from Kojève's understanding of history. His interpretation of the *Philosophy of Spirit* concerning the master-slave dialectics elaborating the 'struggle for recognition' is one of the fundamental points to understand the development of history in Fukuyama's view according to whom 'the desire of recognition' is the motor of history. Fukuyama expresses the meaning of history according to 'the desire of recognition' as follows;

“Writing in the twentieth century, Hegel's great interpreter, Alexandre Kojève, asserted intransigently that history had ended because what he called the 'universal and homogeneous state' -what we can understand as liberal democracy- definitely solved the question of recognition by replacing the relationship of lordship and bondage with universal and equal recognition. What man had been seeking throughout the course of history -what had driven the prior 'stages of history'- was recognition. In the modern world, he finally found it, and was 'completely satisfied'”<sup>20</sup>

Fukuyama absolutely concurs with the idea of desire of recognition. Therefore it is possible to comprehend political struggles as an effort on behalf of recognition. “Recognition is the central problem of politics because it is the origin of tyranny, imperialism, and the desire to dominate”<sup>21</sup>.

According to Fukuyama, Nietzsche talks about liberal democracy representing “the unconditioned victory of the slave and a kind of slavish morality”<sup>22</sup>. Now therefore from this perspective, the last man is a citizen of liberal democracy while, in contrary, Marx stresses that last man is a free man emancipated from the liberal capitalistic society.

“The typical citizen of a liberal democracy was a 'last man' who, schooled by the founders of modern liberalism, gave up prideful belief in his or her own superior worth in favour of comfortable self-

---

<sup>20</sup> Francis Fukuyama, “By way of an Introduction”, in *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York-Toronto: Free Press-Macmillan, 1992).

<sup>21</sup> Fukuyama, “By way of an Introduction”.

<sup>22</sup> Fukuyama, “By way of an Introduction”.

preservation. Liberal democracy produced 'men without chests', composed of desire and reason but lacking *thymos*, clever at finding new ways to satisfy a host of petty wants through the calculation of long-term self-interest. The last man had no desire to be recognized as greater than others, and without such desire no excellence or achievement was possible"<sup>23</sup>

The destination of world history, which was the relevant tribunal for Hegel, as well for Kojève, "Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht", was switched from "the differentiated freedom of the liberal-constituted state to the universal and homogenous state"<sup>24</sup>. Kojève evaluated classless USA as an instance of the homogeneity which was the aim of history.

"Communism is being superseded by liberal democracy in our time because of the realization that the former provides a gravely defective form of recognition"<sup>25</sup>. In this point, Elliott underlined how Fukuyama's article frequently is negative. While adversely Marx characterized the history in which communism was ultimate form of society, Fukuyama defined the capitalism as the final result of history. Fukuyama describes that "liberal democracy replaces the irrational desire to be recognized as greater than others with a rational desire to be recognized as equal."<sup>26</sup> Here the definition of Fukuyama's history was presented by Italian philosopher Norberto Bobbio as follows;

"(...) argues Fukuyama, the principal motor of historical progress is inequality, not only because it is functional for the capitalist market, but also because it is in itself 'right'...Fukuyama develops his argument in two registers, a philosophy of history and an ontology: (i) history does not progress through an equalization of inequalities, but through individual or collective struggles for supremacy; (ii) human beings, realistically rather than idealistically understood, aspire not to equality but to superiority over their fellows, through competition and victory over opponents (...) humanity has by no means reached the 'end of the history'. Perhaps it is only at the beginning"<sup>27</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Fukuyama, "By way of an Introduction".

<sup>24</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 40.

<sup>25</sup> Fukuyama, "By way of an Introduction".

<sup>26</sup> Fukuyama, "By way of an Introduction".

<sup>27</sup> Norberto Bobbio, "At the Beginning of History", *New Left Review* I: 231 September-October (1998).

According to Fukuyama, there are two spheres including capitalism as 'satisfaction of material needs' and liberal democracy as 'satisfaction of the desire for recognition'. Here 'desire of recognition' entails a link between liberal economics and liberal politics. In this respect, for him, the motor of history was the struggle for recognition, not economic drive while for Marx, it was the class struggle. He declared that history is in progress through the coherent direction by rational desire and rational recognition. Therefore liberal democracy is the best solution of the human problems.

Therefore Elliott arrives at four possible outcomes from Fukuyama's doctrines:

- (1) US capitalistic development and its democratic capitalism is the symbol of the end of history.
- (2) Asian authoritarian-paternalistic capitalism developing more economically than politically is the end of history.
- (3) European liberal democratic capitalism demonstrates the end of history.
- (4) "History has not been concluded, as a result of the presence of contradictions in liberalism that continues to drive the historical process"<sup>28</sup>.

Elliott detected that Fukuyama began with 'the mystical shell' referring to the Hegelian-Kojévian dialectic. He makes another clear evaluation that Fukuyama's understanding of history is a kind of historical teleology that history proceeds by a provided goal. In other words, his historical teleology is proceeding towards theodicy:

"History is a process with a subject (humanity) and a goal (the universal-homogeneous state), whose developments are to be explained and evaluated, in a retrospective benefaction, by their contribution to the realization of that goal. It is only a short step, if any, from teleology to theodicy"<sup>29</sup>

Althusser refused the central principle of Hegelo-Marxism resulting from Kojève's anthropological reading of *The*

<sup>28</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 50.

<sup>29</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 52.



*Phenomenology* as regards the statement of the end of history. In this respect, by recalling Marx's 1859 *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Althusser depicted that Marx considered "communism as the end of human 'pre-history' -historically determinate exploitation and alienation- and the beginning of an authentically human universal history; not as the end of history"<sup>30</sup>. The mystical shell of Fukuyama is what Althusser called the mystical kernel of Hegelio-Marxism. In this point, *End in Sight* indicates Fukuyama's understanding of history as a kind of the inversion of Marx's inversion of Hegel, that is, named 'Fukuyama's inversion of inversion'. It is the first aspect of mystical shell of Fukuyama. The second aspect of Fukuyama is his understanding of 'contradictions'.

For Fukuyama, contradictions are not endogenous to systems but they are exogenous to systems. Put differently, the contradictions are inter-systemic, that is, between for example, fascism and liberalism, and thus inter-systemic as opposed to intra-systemic which would be directly related to the system itself within which the contradiction must be found, like properly inside the capitalism. By this way, the formulation of the antagonism between capitalism and socialism leads to be conceived as if there would not exist the significant contradictions or antagonisms intra-capitalism. In this regard, Elliott obviously proclaims that the exclusion of intra-contradiction of capitalism dissimulates "the reality that fascism was in fact a general tendency of pre-war capitalism"<sup>31</sup>.

*Ends in Sight* lays stress on Fukuyama's terms such as 'liberalism', 'capitalism', 'liberal democracy', 'liberal society', 'Western societies', 'democracy', and 'capitalist liberal democracy' which are used interchangeably as if they are synonymous when in fact they are not. In his sense, Elliott points out that Fukuyama does not consider the link between capitalism and modern representative democracy as necessary and unitary but as contingent and complex. While Fukuyama claims that the liberal capitalist democracy was the ultimate form of society by refuting possible non-capitalist alternatives contra the growing

<sup>30</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 53.

<sup>31</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 54.

inequalities, environmental perils, serial wars, he ignored the contemporary nationalism and religious fundamentalism as well.

Elliott states that in the 90s the intellectual field was pretty dark for the situation of the world. He gives an example from an ex-Communist Jorge Semprun, in Spain, in 1991, in *Le Monde*, he wrote that the current reality of society was an 'untranscendable horizon'. In this point, Fukuyama with his description of current human history is another reference having gloomy approach to the present world situation. Fukuyama believed that liberal democracies like in United States whose mission brings peace which damaged by so-called "terror" or, carries democracy to under-developed countries have the revolutionary character.

### Hobsbawm: *The Age of Extremes*

Hobsbawm between 1962 and 1987 published his important three researches about the history of 19<sup>th</sup> century: *The Age of Revolution, 1789-1848*; *The Age of Capital, 1848-1875*; *The Age of Empire, 1875-1914* and his last book, called *Age of Extremes 1914-1991*, a kind of continuation of these three books. The theme for *Age of Extremes* is, as he subtitled it, the short history of twentieth century. This history which has been written by Hobsbawm is from the First World War in 1914 until the dissolution and collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. This period separates into three parts: 'the age of catastrophe' (1914-1945); 'the golden age' (1945-1973); and (1945-the present) 'landslide'.

In effect, all of these four books can be elaborated as a representation of his own lifetime. Each of these books, in a manner of speaking, periodically, demonstrates the changes in historical, political aspects of his society. In *New Left Review*, through his review of Hobsbawm's last book, *How to Change the World*, Elliott indicates how his confidence not only in historical materialism but also in 'scientific socialism' gradually enters a recession. In this context, it is conceived that Hobsbawm's confidence of the manifestation of *the Manifesto* proclaiming the existence of proletariat as gravedigger of the capitalism is "deepening into scepticism".

"Greeting the revival of anti-capitalism in the new millennium, and the 'implosion' of neo-liberalism in 2008, Hobsbawm doubts that what he

solecistically dubs 'a systematic alternative system' has reappeared in the horizon. The disillusion of a socialist future has not been dispelled. Consequently, the 'somewhat unexpected return of Marx' in the twenty-first century is staged by him not in the guise of prophet of international communism, which failed conclusively in the twentieth, but as critic of the globalizing capitalism that has just posted its own *memento mori*"<sup>32</sup>

In the twenty-first century, anti-globalization movements, namely, alternative movements against capitalism and globalization of capital according to Hobsbawm still is deprived of movement in the sense of real mass movement based on Marx's description in the *Manifesto*.

Hobsbawm characterizes the idea of Fukuyama as 'the Doctor Pangloss of the 1990s'. Pangloss is a character in the work of Voltaire, namely, *Candide*, who is a teacher of Candide in the castle and who believes that nothing exists without a reason. In other words, there is not any result without reason. According to him there is always a good reason for everything. In this respect, Pangloss teaches Candide to be an optimist. Hobsbawm's own point of view for the present world is different from the Panglossian outlook. According to Elliott, regarding the character of Pangloss, Hobsbawm misrelated this character to Fukuyama who is a pessimist anti-communist person about past and future human history. Hobsbawm is not an optimist of the present.

In this chapter Elliott is particularly interested in *Age of Extremes, 1914-1991*, published in 1994. Elliott intelligently and justly puts forth the aim of Hobsbawm for not adding the definite article "the" (not 'the Age of extremes', but 'age of extremes') for the title of book presumably because 'age' is not yet ended or it will continue to exist with its extremes. Another interpretation might be that Hobsbawm may attempt to avoid any definitive determination. The most important reason is coming from Elliott according to whom it is because *Age of Extremes* in some senses is not based on Marxist elements. Elliott considers Hobsbawm's trilogy -*The Age of Revolution, The Age of Capital, and The Age of Empire*- as being Marxist in contrast to *Age of Extremes* interpreted to embrace the categories derived from liberal perspectives, or

---

<sup>32</sup> Gregory Elliott, "The Old Mole's Path", *New Left Review* 67 January-February (2011).

liberalism. However, Elliott adds that it does not mean that Hobsbawm has adopted liberalism.

Elliott introduces two critical observations of Hobsbawm's approach to history. The first critique contends that his book does not contain Marxist elements. In other words, it is far from the Marxist orientation. Another observation is that he is no longer a communist. By means of these two critiques, some paradoxes of *Age of Extremes* are analyzed as regards the key points which construct its argument concerning 'the results of historical communism' and 'the prospects for contemporary capitalism'. In light of the critiques, it is not difficult to decide that his conception of history is neither Marxist nor orthodox communist. Furthermore, he is not so much anti-Fukuyama, even if he declares that he is against the contentions of Fukuyama.

In the *Age of Empire* (1987) Hobsbawm exhibited three governing principles:

- (1) He wrote that the modern world originally is based on the dual revolutions in the late eighteenth century: the English industrial revolution and the French political revolution. These two revolutions supported a great transformation in society, that is: the birth of capitalism.
- (2) Globalization and colonization: this capitalist mode of production expanded from Northern Europe to conquer much of the globe in the nineteenth century.
- (3) "Modern world history was basically the history of the process of combined and uneven development triggered by a mode of production which...was global"<sup>33</sup>.

Hobsbawm believed that capitalism had potentially an alternative: socialism which was superior to capitalism. *The Age of Revolution*, published in 1962, is described as being more Marxian than others. However, *Age of Extremes* is determined the ages as being in darkness in three parts. (1) The age of catastrophe from 1914 to 1945, the birth of bolshevism and fascism after the catastrophic destruction of economic and political liberalism. (2) The golden age from 1945 to circa 1973, the decolonization and the end of European empires. (3) The landslide of 1973-91, faced

<sup>33</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 71.

setback of “global capitalist society into a chronic crisis of regulation”<sup>34</sup>. The core issue is his treatment of liberal capitalism itself. While Hobsbawm depicts the contrast between the ‘Golden Age’ and the ‘Landslide’, he does not examine this contrast through the economic crisis which is not analyzed specifically by means of Marxist view. In this regard Elliott rightly comments that Hobsbawm, instead of Marx’s *Capital*, is concentrated on Polanyi’s *The Great Transformation*<sup>35</sup> which refused the material reality of the economic process and approached to the economy from a culture perspective, and also Schumpeter’s *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* in order to clarify the economic crisis.

Now, Hobsbawm reacted to the optimist aspect of Marx for the nineteenth century proclaiming that the creation and solution of problems always results from mankind. In this respect, Hobsbawm in the conclusion of *the Age of Empire* says that “there is less reason to feel hopeful about the future than in the middle 1980s”<sup>36</sup>. *Age of Extremes* is not presented by the internal dynamics of global capitalism but rather he explains the short history of the twentieth century regarding the external dynamics.

<sup>34</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 76.

<sup>35</sup> *The Great Transformation* was first published in 1944 which was about the upheavals that occurred in England during the rise of the market economy. For Polanyi the modern market economy and modern nation-state was associated, that is to say, they were not completely different separated elements. Put differently, the development of the modern state depended on the development of the modern market economies, which was called the market society. R. M. Maciver who had written a foreword for *The Great Transformation* explains Polanyi’s relation with Marx and Marxism as following; “Mr. Polanyi leaves far behind alike the dogmatics of Karl Marx (...) He is concerned with the economic process in modern civilization but he offers no doctrine of economic determinism. He gives instead a penetrating analysis of a particular historical transformation in which the supersession of one economic system by another played the decisive role. This happened not because the economic relation is always primary but because in this instance, and in this instance alone, the “ideal system” of the new economics demanded a ruthless abnegation of the social status of the human being... For Mr. Polanyi the last word is society. The major tragedy attendant on the Industrial Revolution was brought about not by the callousness and greed of profit-seeking capitalists - though there was inhumanity enough in the record - but by the social devastation of an uncontrolled system, the market economy. Men failed to realize what the cohesion of society meant.”

<sup>36</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 135.

The most important critique of Elliott is associated with Hobsbawm's combination of communism and liberal democracy like Browder according to whom communism and capitalism could peacefully appear together. It seems that the evaluations and conclusions of Hobsbawm and Fukuyama are different, but still there is something common with the 1989 essay of the anti-Marxist Fukuyama. Elliott explains these common points as follows: "denial of any intrinsic contradictory logic to the capitalist mode of production -one of whose tendencies for Marx, as Hobsbawm had so rightly argued in *the Age of Revolution*, was the creation of a force internal to it, with the potential to challenge and redirect its logic: the 'collective labourer'"<sup>37</sup>. More clearly, the contradiction of capitalism is logically not external to it, but these contradictions are intrinsic to capitalism itself. Therefore capitalism creates its internal force that is equipped with the potential role to overcome this capitalist system or contradictory logic. However, here by these thinkers socialism is considered to be enacted by "a force external to capitalism".

## The Pessimistic diagnosis of Perry Anderson

Anderson can be characterized on the one hand as a leading spokesman of the Western Marxism after 1956 under *the New Left Review* -which by Gilbert Achcar was thought to be equal with *Die Neue Zeit*, the theoretical organ of Social Democratic Party of Germany (SDP), i.e., the journal of orthodox Marxism- in Europe and on the other hand as a person against the post-modernist movements. The *New Left Review* (NLR) is defined by Anderson as a political journal which since 1960s has discussed "social and moral sciences"<sup>38</sup>.

Anderson attacked the structuralist and post-structuralist understanding of Marxism by remarking the essential problem of this theory, in his work, called *In the Tracks of Historical Materialism* (1983) composed of some lectures, one of which was on the French structuralism and post-structuralism. In this context, in the

---

<sup>37</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 85.

<sup>38</sup> Perry Anderson, "Renewals", *New Left Review* 1 January-February (2000).

second lecture on the French philosophy, Anderson talked about the problem of the structuralist theory by focusing on “the nature of the relationships between structure and subject in human history and society”<sup>39</sup> which according to him were in ‘marginal’ and ‘uncertainty’. In this context, Anderson compared this theory with the Marxian theory concerning relationships between these two -structure and subject- and stressed that Marxian theory formulates the problem in the context of historical materialism “as an account of the development of human civilization”<sup>40</sup>.

According to Anderson, in *Arguments within English Marxism* (1980), the Russian Revolution initiated a new kind of history which launched the foundation of a new form of agency. October 1917 was an outset for “alteration of the potential of historical action, in the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century”<sup>41</sup>. In his context, the conclusion Anderson arrived at, says that communism was wiped out altogether in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union and the observation on the ‘dènouement of historical socialism’<sup>42</sup> signify that the detection of the *Communist Manifesto* ‘had been undermined’<sup>43</sup>. Anderson does not believe anymore the primary role of the working class in the revolution movement contra capitalism as a gravedigger. In this point, Anderson was disappointed for the proletariat movements which currently do not exist but he emphasizes that “within the metabolism of capitalism” the change will be materialized through the “human energies”. Pay attention to the definition: not “proletariat” as “collective agency” but the “human energies”. It seems as an empty -hollow-, incomprehensive conception. Elliott points that

“(…) with its ongoing profound decomposition, the working class was not primed to play the part of capitalist gravedigger allocated it in the classical scripts and stoutly defended by Anderson in *In the Tracks of Historical Materialism* (as well as by colleagues in *New Left Review*), during the revisionist controversy of the early 1980s triggered by Eric

<sup>39</sup> Perry Anderson, *In the Tracks of Historical Materialism* (London: Verso Edition, 1984), 33.

<sup>40</sup> Anderson, *In the Tracks*, 34.

<sup>41</sup> Perry Anderson, *Arguments within English Marxism* (London: New Left Books, 1980), 20-1.

<sup>42</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 95.

<sup>43</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 95.

Hobsbawm's 1978 Marx Memorial Lecture, 'The Forward March of Labour Halted?'<sup>44</sup>

Therefore Anderson's reorientation and the course of *NLR* to the historical communism can be observed in 2000 with his article, namely, 'Renewals'. Elliott summarizes the description of 'Renewals' as proceeding "from economic ('deep economic crisis'), via the political ('the correlation of political forces'), to the ideological ('the balance of intellectual advantages')"<sup>45</sup>.

Anderson divides the period of *NLR* in two moments: the founding moment of *Review* "in the post-1956 conjuncture in the world politics" and the "refounding moment", that is, "the new global conjuncture...ushered in by the seismic events of 1989-91"<sup>46</sup>. Anderson examines these two periods in terms of the political, intellectual and cultural outlooks. Accordingly, Anderson organizes the 'founding moment' geopolitically, in three worlds: "the First World of advanced capitalism, then booming; the Second World of backward socialism, finally reforming; and a Third World including nations that had wrested independence from their colonial masters or were struggling for it"<sup>47</sup>. In other words, it might be summarized as such: First World=Capitalism; Second World=Socialism; Third World=Decolonization. Anderson designates political position of first period of *NLR* as supporter of anti-imperialist movement in the Third World.

Anderson analyzes the intellectual environment as a "discovery of alternative Marxism" in terms of political practice related to Trotskyism, Luxemburgism, Maoism, Council communism so on and so forth. He thought that the existence of various theoretical traditions of Western Marxism in different European countries was even similar but still productive, like Sartre and Althusser in French, Adorno and Marcuse in Germany, and Della Volpe and Colletti in Italia. The appearance of rock music and auteur cinema was identified as a cultural movement against the conformism of the 1950s.

<sup>44</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 95.

<sup>45</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 104.

<sup>46</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 96.

<sup>47</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 96.



Elliott summarizes Anderson's "defining characteristic of the refounding moment"<sup>48</sup> such as: after forty years, this intellectual, political and cultural panorama had changed because the Second World came to an end and the Third World was taken under the control through different ways. Socialist idea did not anymore take place in the political debates and in the intellectual field Marxism fell into a decline as a result of corruption of socialism. The collapse of Soviet bloc gave a rapid growth and "universal diffusion" to neo-liberalism. In this sense, Elliott introduces Anderson's analysis of six interrelated developments leading the rise of neo-liberalism.

- (1) The emergence of US in the economy, politics, culture and military as great power.
- (2) The neo-liberal policy within the assistance of social democratic governments put into effect in the Europe in the late 1990s.
- (3) The decline of Japanese's economy and therefore China and India almost take a mission as "the (de) regulatory bodies of the Washington consensus"<sup>49</sup>.
- (4) Under the rapid economic liberalization, that is, under the 'shock therapy', which aims to block or withdraw government intervention in economy and in the large scale to privatize the public resources, the Russian economy reduced and therefore it began much more to depend on Western.
- (5) The ideological and political development based on the neo-liberal policy of the 'Third Way' of the Clinton-Blair regimes claiming to be the best alternative as reconciling the left-wing social policies with the right-wing economic aspects. Anderson points out that "the 'Third Way' is the best ideological shell of neo-liberalism today" by making an analogy with Lenin's maxim saying that "the democratic republic is the ideal political shell of capitalism"<sup>50</sup>.
- (6) The last one was related to military and diplomatic developments claiming of carrying the "peace" by the 'humanitarian' intervention through NATO and UN.

---

<sup>48</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 98.

<sup>49</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 98.

<sup>50</sup> Elliott, *Ends in Sight*, 99.

Anderson utters that there were two reactions of socialist or, as he named, traditional Left to “the new conjuncture predominant”: (1) ‘accommodation’; it was exposed that capitalism persuaded many -formerly had believed the impending annihilation of capitalism- that it was irresistible or, necessary and natural for social order. In this point, Anderson presents the Third Way as an example to this attitude. In short, accommodation referred to the omnipotence of capitalism with which we must make peace. (2) The second reaction is ‘consolation’. It is not more than reaffirmation of accommodation. Against to these two Anderson suggests “an uncompromising realism” on behalf of *NLR*.

“Uncompromising in both senses: refusing any accommodation with the ruling system, and rejecting every piety and euphemism that would understate its power... The journal should always be in sympathy with strivings for a better life, no matter how modest their scope. But it can support any local movements or limited reforms, without pretending that they alter the nature of the system”<sup>51</sup>

Seemingly Anderson’s political and intellectual attitude shifted from rigid form into more flexible shape. In other saying Anderson refrains to be radical contra capitalism but nowadays what we need is radicalism as necessary way to challenge so-called unlimited power of capitalism and subdue whole radical discourses around Marxist theory.

In this respect, Gilbert Achcar criticizes Anderson’s comment on neo-liberalism which claimed that it was the most successful political and economical alternative existed in the world history. “What is particularly striking is that Perry Anderson seems more convinced of the omnipotence of neo-liberalism than most of its supporters!”<sup>52</sup>.

Anderson was charged with ‘defeatism’ and ‘pessimism’ about Marxism, socialism or, communism. In this context when Gilbert Achcar talks about his pessimism, he says that “over time Perry Anderson has become more and more a practitioner of the

<sup>51</sup> Anderson, “Renewals”.

<sup>52</sup> Gilbert Achcar, “The Historical Pessimism of Perry Anderson”, *International Socialism Journal* 88 Autumn (2000).

'pessimism of the intellect' championed by Gramsci"<sup>53</sup>. Elliott, like Gilbert Achcar, declares that Anderson admits the viewpoint of Fukuyama's thesis on 'end of history'. Elliott, broadly, deals with the outlooks of Anderson in *Perry Anderson: The Merciless Laboratory of History* (1998) discussing that NLR separates in two different ideological camps between Maoist -Althusserian and Trotskyist-Deutscherian which current gains the upper position within *Review* in the 1970s.

## Epilogue

In the conclusion, Elliott smoothly and strictly presents the solution to the capitalistic system according to Anderson's suggestion and determination of anti-globalization movements one of which took place in 1999 in Seattle where major governments met at a WTO ministerial meeting to discuss various trading rules. In this sense, the political struggle against rising capitalism is, according to New Left Reviewists, neo-anarchism versus neo-liberalism. According to them, the alternative gets involved in anti-corporate globalization and interaction which is opposed to the negative effects of economic globalization, which is described by French supporters as *alter-mondialistes*, so to speak, known as alternative globalization or the global justice movement. It seeks an alternative anti-corporate globalization. These alternative movements might be diagnosed as the resistance to the New World Order. In this context, anarchism is the dominant ideological aspect in the alter-globalization which is identified by Lucio Magri as "neo-anarchism versus neo-liberalism". According to Lucio Magri, *Empire* which is the work of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri is the theorization of alter-globalization. This work was defined as rewriting of *the Communist Manifesto*. In other word, it is a manifesto of our time. In this regard, with the rise of alter-globalization movements and with the crisis of capitalism, Marxism or MarxismS turn(s) back. However according to Elliott, this Marxism/ these MarxismS is/are not true in the sense of scientific socialism as mentioned in the *Manifesto*.

---

<sup>53</sup> Achcar, "The Historical Pessimism".

History continues its course with the uprisings in Arabic countries. Nevertheless as Anderson and Elliott many times claim, these movements still are not the mass movement of proletariat against the present despotic governments which must be based on Marxism. However Engels gave a description of capitalism in the Preface to the German Edition of 1883 of the *Communist Manifesto* which might be a response to numerous advocates of the standpoint of the end of history:

“(...) that consequently (ever since the dissolution of the primeval communal ownership of land) all history has been a history of class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social development; that this struggle, however, has now reached a stage where the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie), without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression and class struggles—this basis thought belongs solely and exclusively to Marx”<sup>54</sup>

148

Before ending the paper, I would like to concentrate on the utopian idea in the light of Marx's fundamental critics, which Elliott suggests as a path for the emancipation from the capitalistic mode of production. In the *Manifesto*, Marx under the subtitle called 'Critical Utopian Socialism and Communism' historically differentiates the first socialist idea concerning utopian perspectives from the scientific idea. The reason for these utopian ideas, Marx claims, was that these socialists and communist systems of, for instance, St-Simon, Fourier, Robert Owen, etc., had emerged in undeveloped period of struggles between proletariat and the bourgeoisie. They realized the class antagonism as a discomposing element but they did not consider the historical significance of the proletariat as a political power. With the development of industry within new economic situations, a new class antagonism occurred with its material conditions. Therefore still these material conditions did not exist in their time. That's why they

“(...) search after a new social science, after new social laws, that are to create these conditions. Historical action is to yield to their personal

---

<sup>54</sup> Marx and Engels, “Manifesto”, 472.

inventive action, historically created conditions of emancipation to fantastic ones, and the gradual, spontaneous class organization of the proletariat to the organization of society specially contrived by these inventors. Future history resolves itself, in their eyes, into the propaganda and the practical carrying out of their social plans”<sup>55</sup>

Thus they created unreal conditions for emancipation of society from existing unequal situations. Instead of existing social conditions they produced a new social laws and social science which were just fantasia. Of course Marx says they could image proletariat as a suffering class but not a class leading a revolutionary movement, that is to say, as a revolutionary class. Hence due to the undeveloped state of the class struggle their aspects of changing world remained into utopian characters. However, now the whole material conditions and class struggles have reached at the peak. For this reason,

“(…) the significant of Critical-Utopian Socialism and Communism bears an inverse relation to historical development. In proportion as the modern class struggle develops and takes definite shape, this fantastic standing apart from the contest, these fantastic attacks on it, lose all practical value and all theoretical justification. Therefore, although the originators of these systems were, in many respects, revolutionary, their disciples have, in every case, formed mere reactionary sects”<sup>56</sup>

If this part of the *Manifesto* is clearly re-read and attentively contemplated, Marx’s foresight about utopian fantasia -even abstract or contract utopian- would be indispensably realized in the twenty-first century with Marx’s own words saying that “[the founders of utopian system] they, therefore, endeavour, and that consistently, to deaden the class struggle and to reconcile the class antagonism”<sup>57</sup>. That is to say, utopists propose to ignore the class struggle by declaring its death knell which is actually much more real than their -abstract or concrete- utopian ideas. Anti-globalization movement, namely, *alter-mondialistes*, may have its practices but what makes it weak is its deprivation from a theory which must be based on Marx’s dialectical historical materialism. The anti-globalization movement, like utopian idea, is condemned

---

<sup>55</sup> Marx and Engels, “Manifesto”, 497-98.

<sup>56</sup> Marx and Engels, “Manifesto”, 497-98.

<sup>57</sup> Marx and Engels, “Manifesto”, 499.

to fail and to remain a kind of bourgeois movement because of its dream to the realization of ideal world without appealing and belonging to a strong theory.

In conclusion, the great mistake of Elliott regarding the definition of society after the annihilation of capitalism is that this society, as he called, non-capitalist society is described not as a communist but as a post-capitalist society in the sense that post-capitalism is superior to capitalism. It must/should be asked why he refrained from defining this *fresh-society* as communist but post-capitalist society! It is just because capitalism possesses some positive elements! However Marx never disavowed the positive developments in the name of humanity. But unfortunately we have to warn you that capitalism does not possess any positive elements for humanity. If we could say “yes”, capitalism has something positive, it would certainly not for humanity but for majority of habitants in the planet; it has positive developments for accumulation of capital.

## Bibliography

Achcar, Gilbert. “The Historical Pessimism of Perry Anderson”. *International Socialism* 88 (2000).

Anderson, Perry. *Arguments within English Marxism*. London: New Left Books, 1980.

\_\_\_\_. *In the Tracks of Historical Materialism*. London: Verso Edition, 1984.

\_\_\_\_. “On the Concatenation in the Arab World”. *New Left Review* 68 March-April (2011).

\_\_\_\_. “Renewals”. *New Left Review* 1 January-February (2000).

\_\_\_\_. “The Affinities of Norberto Bobbio”. *New Left Review* I: 170 July-August (1988).

Bobbio, Norberto. “At the Beginning of History”. *New Left Review* I: 231 September-October (1998).

Carver, Terrell. “Reading Marx: Life and Works”. In *The Cambridge Companion to Marx*, edited by Terrell Carver. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Elliott, Gregory. *Ends in Sight: Marx, Fukuyama, Hobsbawm, Anderson*. London: Pluto, 2008.

\_\_\_\_. "The Old Mole's Path". *New Left Review* 67 January-February (2011).

Engels, Friedrich. "Manifesto of the Communist Party", Preface to the English edition of 1888. In *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*, edited by Lewis S. Feuer. London-Glasgow: Collins, 1969.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York-Toronto: Free Press-Maxwell Macmillan, 1992.

\_\_\_\_. "The End of History?". *The National Interest* summer (1989).

Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Empire, 1817-1914*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1987.

Marx, Karl. "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy". In *Early Writings: Marx*, introduced by Lucio Colletti, translated by Rodney Livingstone and Gregor Benton. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, New Left Review, 1975.

\_\_\_\_. and Friedrich Engels. "Manifesto of the Communist Party". In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York-London: Princeton University, W.W. Norton & Company, 1978.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. "Marxism and the Course of History". *New Left Review* I: 147 September-October (1984).

Recibido: 7 de octubre, 2011

Aceptado: 6 de noviembre, 2011

Correo electrónico: sevgidogan79@googlemail.com