

<sup>1\*</sup>Dr. Asghar Ali Dashti

<sup>2\*</sup>Afshan Iqbal

## Understanding the Karl Marx's Theory of Historical Materialism

### ABSTRACT

*In this article it is analyzed that Theory of Marx about historical materialism utilizes the development of creative powers and struggles of class for the olden times explanation. In the 20th century, with the communism's fall, numerous elements of historical materialism have been attacked. This article is cover of strength of historical materialism which will be presented and it will also conclude that few of the arguments in opposition of theory of Marx are still to be founded, and at the same time others are still holding the weight. What stays is a wide outlook of past that still holds the worth and value. Marxism believes in combination of ideology and action. This study has come to the wrapping up that historical materialism is till now pertinent and reasonable.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Dialectic, Political Economy, Asiatic, Realism, Class Struggle.*

### INTRODUCTION

Karl Marx is great philosopher in history and he is recognized all over the globe for his theory, innovatory writings and connection with the communism. The capitalist and communist states rivalry described the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Since Marx had the identification of being the most famous person in terms of development of this opposition, he had a deep consequence on the previous century. At the center of teachings of Marx is historical materialism and an explanation of it that communism is in a state to be predicted. So many people studied about Marx but few people could understand him and about his theory.

Historical materialism theory relies over the dominance of financial powers in societal transformation all the way through the history, and that these financial powers will carry on transformation of the globe unless it

---

<sup>1\*</sup> Assistant Prof., Department of International Relations, Federal Urdu  
University, Karachi Email: asghar.dashti@fuuast.edu.pk

<sup>2\*</sup> Research Scholar., Department of International Relations, Federal Urdu  
University, Karachi Email: afshaniqbal41@yahoo.com

---

achieves its conclusion in communism. Friedrich Engels, who was longtime companion and co-author of Marx defines that Marx revealed growth regulation of history of human in much the similar method discovered by Darwin regarding the rule of growth of organic environment. [1] This explanation of the history could change numerous grounds of thinking in much the similar approach findings of Darwin natural choice and development did.

Historical materialism, though, has been inspected in the precedent 3-4 decades. Marxian culture's each effort has been either unsuccessful (for example Soviet Union) or drifted far from the teachings of Marx in the direction of the capitalist standards of the world's greater part (such as China). Sensibly, capitalism has been winner of this contest. The evident collapse of communism has unlocked the door for analysis of historical materialism and Marx. A lot of sociologists and economists raise the question about the strength and application of historical materialism. Considering it, this research sets out to respond to the query of whether historical materialism is at a standstill appropriate subsequent to the termination of communism and socialism in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. The literature on the subject of this query is fairly baggy, but through this Marx study, Marxian opponents and he himself.

## **BASES FOR HISTORICAL MATERIALISM**

So as to in fact recognize the assessments of historical materialism, a methodical clarification of the personality building chunks, materialism and dialectics is needed. The detail about the historical materialism will be given when these both elements are completely explained. The old saying is that "You have to crawl before you can walk". Perceiving materialism and dialectics will build perceiving of historical materialism in easy form.

### **i) THE DIALECTIC**

Dialectic is based on the logic of change, evolution and growth. It starts from this thought that nothing is permanent. Hegel's Knowledge and its impact on Marx are essential to recognize the nearly Marx's entire theory. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel has been familiar philosopher from Germany. His era was between the years of 1770 to 1831. Hegel's one major role to philosophy was his dialectical technique. This procedure of thoughts is obvious all the way through writings of Marx and it is also the Marx's foundation. The fundamental thought of the dialectical procedure is that human is divided or estranged from Absolute; and the past procedure is man's steady progress in the direction of the Absolute, or, in

the mind of Hegel, God. In the light of Wolff's statement, estrangement is the thought that two items that fit in together fall apart. [2] Here, human and the Absolute fit in collectively they are estranged and the dialectical procedure will steadily carry them jointly over the route of history. The dialectical procedure helps progressive movement of man in the direction of the Absolute by easing human of his unawareness and raising his self-attentiveness by steadily substituting opinion of man about the realism with truer and newer shapes. [3] Each time opinion of man regarding realism is changed into a side that is relatively new; one step has been taken by man nearer to Absolute. Finally, realism, as man recognizes it, will develop to a position where the estrangement of man out of the Absolute will not exist any more. In the view of Hegel, the condition of realism where Absolute and man are brought back together is the history's ending. [4]

The truer and shapes of realism that guide man to the history's ending are produced in the course of the interface between the theory and converse. These are phases that are present in disagreement to one another. Disagreement in dialectics is not an easy thought to clutch because of its divergence from the rational sense of disagreement. [5] By the rational meaning, the disagreement of anything is its reverse. For instance, the reverse of being is not-being and the opposite of A is not-A. [6] In dialectics, disagreement has a relational sense. Disagreements in dialectics are the opponents that are essential for and thus far caustic of one another. [7] Such as, a servant's opposite is the master and vice versa. Without a servant, no any individual can be a master and similarly without a master no individual can be servant. Both a servant and master can only be explained in relation to one another. [8] Marx used this perceptive of reversal to describe class efforts in the course of the rivalry of a class that rules and a class with low category as will be discussed later. It is the kind of opposing correlation that exists between the theory and reverse. The theory and reverse both are separate phases. According to explanation given by Marx is that the society's class that rules as the theory and the lower class as the reverse. The theory and reverse, though, can be valid to any logical procedure, not wholly as used by Marx. For instance, a room might be dazzlingly lit, but this can merely be realized in association with a shady room. It is the form of a dialectical association. An individual that expends his whole life in a solo room that is for all time lit the same will be without reason of darkness or brightness. According to this case, theory is the brightness and its reverse is darkness. They oppose and can only be explained with regard to one another. In this case, the interface of darkness and brightness does not direct to a truer shape of brightness. In its place,

the mixture of darkness and brightness shapes a point of brightness that is present anywhere next to the range between dark and bright. This mixture, or cooperation, is the mixture, another phase of dialectic by Hegel.

The theory, reverse and mixture are the performers of the dialectic. The theory and reverse battle with one another unless a tilting-spot is achieved and the present theory is defeated and mixture replaces it. In the dark-dark case, darkness and brightness act together and shape a view of brightness that is a mixture of the both. The mixture of the theory and reverse design the mixture with both the theory and reverse contributing. The mixture formed throughout this mixture then turns out to be the latest theory. [9] The designed theory that is new is on a superior level of growth or understanding in comparison with the past theory. This newly formed theory is a truer shape since the mixture unites the good of the theory and reverses both, permitting the theory to gain from the disagreement. Disagreement is an essential state for progression as "You never know what enough is until you know what is more than enough". [10]

The latest theory is another step in the direction of the Absolute. [11] The theory generated off late, though, is not only. One more reverse be presents. These two phases will once more interrelate and the procedure will begin once more unless another mixture is structured. Even if a theory nearer to the Absolute was created subsequent of each interface of the theory and reverse, a reverse will forever remain unless the Absolute is attained. Each substitution of the theory with the mixture is just a little step heading towards the stage of Absolute. This procedure will carry on until a theory is created where no reverse be present. With no any disagreement, the theory will stay since it has linked human with the Absolute and eradicated estrangement. As this position is accomplished, the argumentation procedure is ended. [12]

In outline, as per the dialectic of Hegel, human's opinion of realism is in a steady situation of fluctuation because of the uneven co-existence and consecutive resolution of the theory and reverse. [13] With each consecutive resolution, a fresh position of realism is shaped that is improved than the preceding shape. Human is continually on a course of development through the interface of reverses, slowly heading nearer and nearer to the point of Absolute unless no disagreement be present to compel transform in the current condition or theory. At the present, the Absolute is accomplished and, as defined by Hegel, so is the ending of history. [14] Commonly Marxism is called dialectical Materialism. Marxism is a Materialistic philosophy in which social and economic conditions determines different ideas in the world.

---

## ii) FEUERBACH'S MATERIALISM

Although Marx had strong belief in the Hegel's teaching, yet the philosophy of Hegel was not utterly accepted by him. Hegel was an optimist. Actually, he is reckoned one of the creators of idealism of Germany. Idealism is the idea that realism is stand upon thoughts or the mind. By Descartes: "I think so I am" is one of the mainly well-known quotations related with the idealism. Marx not liked idealism and described it the "my satisfactory face of the dialectic of Hegel". [15] For Hegel, the theory and reverse interrelate in the theoretical and human's progress on the way to the state of Absolute is not anything that happens in the material globe. Marx had idea that the interface happened in actual life. The acts of public, not opinions, shift human nearer to the state of Absolute. Marx tossed dialectic of Hegel "on its head" with the intention of discovering the sane core inside the spiritual case. [16] Marx had belief that dialectic of Hegel made logic, but that Hegel was not successful to produce the procedure in the right area, the area of human.

In discarding idealism, Marx produced his vision of the globe with the foundation on materialism. Materialism is said to be the idealism's reverse. Materialists think that matter is the single thing that can be established to survive. Matter heads the whole thing whereas the material globe arrives earlier than all realization. According to Marx it is not the realization of men that concludes their being, but in contrast, their societal being that concludes their realization". [17] The state of Absolute in mind of Marx is not God or any highest thought generated inside the consciousness of a man. According to Marx, the state of Absolute is reckoned to be the material form of liberty. Estrangement will be eradicated via the dialectical procedure not when human have re-unity with some divinity that might not even be present, but when man attains real autonomy. In this paper, the notion of the Marx regarding liberty will be discussed later.

According to Marx explicit shape of materialism relies upon the effort of a previous pupil of Hegel named Ludwig Feuerbach. Ludwig Feuerbach was Hegel's student in year 1823 at the University of Berlin. First work of Feuerbach was published namelessly that was "*Thoughts on Death and Immortality*". Feuerbach rejected the perpetuity of the spirit of the human and determined that globe possibly is the final place of rest for a man. [18] Thoughts of Feuerbach are of a clearly materialistic type as he is unwilling to confess that the being of anything that does not present materially. Human had birth on the World, his death will occur also on World and no next world expected for him.

Feuerbach carried on his materialistic viewpoint with one more work with the title of "*The Essence of Christianity*". Feuerbach; in this work, claimed that the cause human beings look like God is not for the reason that man was created by God in his likeness, but as God is created in the image of a man. [19] According to him all the good has taken by the man inside him and conferred it upon God, estranging himself from his supreme qualities. Only by breaching the sequences of religion can human spend the life he was truthfully destined to survive. [20] Marx settled with thoughts of Feuerbach about the religion as he declares in "*Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction*:"

## **HISTORICAL MATERIALISM: DEFINITION**

It is point in time to join the two building chunks into the theory of historical materialism. In order to keeping away from any bewilderment, when referring to historical materialism in this article, the theory of produced by Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx will be strictly spoken. Because Engels and Marx at first laid-out historical materialism, accumulations and dissimilar understandings have been prepared by men for example Leon Trotsky, Georgi Plekhanov, Karl Kautsky, Mao Zedong, Nikolai Bukharin, Vladimir Lenin, Eduard Bernstein and limitless others. These men have contributed in support of the saying of Marxist Louis Althusser that the scientific mainland of societal and past idea. [21] To uphold constancy, in this paper these accumulations and focusing on the actual foundation are chosen.

Post materialism declares that financial forces are the principal forces that push human throughout the past as societal classes perform interaction. Financial interactions are the way a man relates to the world of material. Man transforms the world of material, not with idea and conceptualization, but with spades, picks, diggers, ploughs, lathes and looms. [22]

Class efforts give the disagreement that reasons the dialectical procedure to work in the theory of Marx. Two classes, one that rules and other the lower class, struggle in opposition to each other unless one of both ultimately succeeds and turns out to be the fresh class that rules. Out of this fresh class to rule, one more class of lower level will progress, carrying on the procedure. Engels and Marx evidently state the significance of classes in past with the opening phrase of the *Communist policy that is the times gone by of all up till now present society is the history of struggles of class* . [23] Classes expand from the disagreement between the financial/creative forces, relations of creation and super-structure inside the society. The clearer depiction of Marx regarding the

interfaces between creative forces, prolific associations and super-structure is in the foreword to “*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*”.

In the societal construction of their existence, men go into unambiguous relations that are crucial and sovereign of their self-control; these relations of manufacture communicate to an unambiguous phase of growth of their forces of material creation. Sum of these associations of manufacture comprises the financial arrangement of civilization — the actual base, on which increases a lawful and political super-structure and to which communicate exact structures of societal realization. The form of production of material life decides the societal, political and scholarly life procedure in common. It is not the realization of men that concludes their existence, but, in contrast, their societal existence that concludes their realization. At a definite period of their growth, the society's material creative forces stand in clash with the present production relations, or what is but a lawful phrase for the same thing, with the assets relations inside which they are at job previously. Out of the types of growth of the forces that are productive these relations become their ties, and then begin an era of societal revolution. Along with the change in the financial basis the whole enormous super-structure is relatively quickly changed. [24]

Along with the improvement in the forces of production, , the production relations (as saying of Marx states that these are for the major fraction belongings human rights) turns out to be a load (a fetter, according to Marx) on the improving forces of production, not letting the forces of production to carry on their course of development. The super-structure is the lawful, theoretical, political and religious setting in which discussed forces of production and productive associations interrelate. The super-structure lives to assist the productive relations.

Classes expand because of the clash between the forces of production and productive relations. These forces of production and productive associations do not have an dialectical opposition. The opposition merely exists between the class that rules and the class of lower level. Between the forces of production and relations of production presents just a clash and the existence of disagreement does not signify the existence of opposition by the dialectical meaning. [25] The disagreement among the forces of production and the associations of production give only the foundation by which the development of classes occurs.

The forces of production are for all time varying and doing the improvement. In the world, as man works, the separation of labor raises and man discovers latest and improved methods to master his surroundings. This development will advantage the class of lower level

since with superior control of the surroundings comes a better ability of attaining resources of benefits. The class comprising rulers, though, is in a beneficial situation and would like the status quo to sustain. The present relations of production and super-structure of the civilization survive to supply the will of the class of rulers. The class comprising rulers decides the allocation of supplies inside the society and they are with no any wish to transform the relations of production.

The class of lower category, conversely, is not satisfied with the present circumstances and would like to take benefit of the always-improving forces of production. The class of rulers stops this to occur. This incongruity of classes concludes in societal revolution. The classes of lower level defeats the ruling class and shapes new relations of production that are suitable in better to work with the forces of production. The super-structure modifies with the relations of production and the fresh relations of production and super-structure serve up the concerns of the latest class of rulers. The latest theory will exist unless the productive relations and forces of production are once more no longer well-matched. The inappropriateness will reason an additional lower class to shape in disagreement to the class of upper level, starting the rivalry all over again. Inside each form of production lies its own collapse.

## COMPLEXITIES OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

### i) COMMUNISM

There have been numerous opponents of historical materialism. The main criticism inside the previous few decades is the effect of the drop of communism and socialism. Since a number of editions of historical materialism forecasted communism and socialism would track capitalism, numerous have understood the drop of such regimes as proof sufficient that historical materialism is fake.

This, though, is an unproven declaration. In the light of writing of Engels and Marx in “*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy: Preface*”: No societal order ever vanishes previous to all the forces of production for which there is space in it have been expanded; and latest, production’s higher relations by no means emerge earlier than the material circumstances of their subsistence have developed in the womb of the older civilization itself. So, mankind forever sets itself merely such jobs as it can resolve; since having a look at the substance more narrowly, we will for all time discover that the job itself occurs only when the material states



essential for its resolution previously exist or are as a minimum in the procedure of structuring. [26]

Capitalism was not even near to being completely progressed prior to the formation of communist countries for example the Soviet Union. Russia was fundamentally still a feudal civilization at the time of their uprising. Actually, Laibman had belief that capitalism is at present in the third of his four phase form of capitalist growth where the class of lower category is not entirely developed and capitalist buildup is not entire, two preconditions for the changeover to communism or socialism. [27] A factual assessment of historical materialism is not even observed by the globe. 20<sup>th</sup> century was a case of over passionate on the component of revolutionaries. To point to the evident collapse of historical materialism actually throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century gives small proof of the shortage of strength of the theory. In actual fact, it only reinforces it.

#### ii) VIABILITY OF COMMUNISM OR SOCIALISM

One more matter beginning from the hypothetical predictability of communism is an additional financial question. The viability of a socialist financial system has long been discussed. From a past materialist viewpoint, in order for communism or socialism to go after the capitalism, the prolific relations inside communism or socialism would have to utilize the forces of production further competently than the prolific relations of capitalism. [28] In other case, the communism or socialism prolific relations would delay the forces of production and not serve up their idea of progress of the mankind. Keeping it in the mind, it is hard to disagree not in favor of the competence of capitalism and the marketplaces. Attaining the circumstances of Pareto effectiveness with no prices usage, personal property and the marketplace is almost not possible. [29] It looks like as though the effectiveness essential for communism or socialism to substitute the capitalism is not achievable.

The predictability of communism or socialism is a deficiency of the theory of historical materialism. Marx tackles this inadequacy by declaring that each form of production has its own financial system and monetary base. [30] Experts of Economy usually calculate financial effectiveness with the Pareto circumstances, but it is viable to declare that the arrival of communism or socialism could carry about a diverse, non-neoclassical method of calculating the effectiveness. But from a neo-classical point of view, a socialist financial system that does not in someway integrate a marketplace to assign resources looks unfeasible. Socialists for example Oscar Lange have tackled this problem with the growth of marketplace of

socialism, but Marx considered the exercise of any kind of marketplace would be not capable to utterly get rid of estrangement. [31]

This difficulty does not disprove historical materialism. It is absolutely suitable to have the same opinion with the standards of historical materialism exclusive of acceptance of utopian visualization of a prospect communist society. [32] Whether Marx is correct or incorrect about the ultimate course of past is not relevant. Marx might have gone somewhat too distant. He had the viewpoint based on the revolution, as it is evident from the *Communist Manifesto*. He declared to observe the requirements for communism or socialism in capitalism in the declining ratio of earnings and capital centralizing. Conversely, perhaps he just had the wish to communism or socialism to pursue the capitalism as capitalism was rough on Marx. In numerous letters to his associate Friedrich Engels, Marx inquires for economic support and Marx, seemingly, existed in relative scarcity his entire life. [33] In any case, a form is calculated upon its skill to clarify and forecast. Historical materialism can be employed to give details about the past. It can also be utilized to forecast, just possibly not to the level utilized by the Marx. Historical materialism can foresee that capitalism is supposed to be substituted but what precisely will substitute the present form of production cannot be forecasted with any level of assurance.

### iii) THE MATTER OF ECONOMIC DOMINANCE

As philosophy's degree was held by Marx, it did not carry on him from investigating into numerous fields of idea. He is recognized in philosophy, finance and has been one of the leading powerful sociological theorists. Sociologists in modern years, though, have turned out to be to a greater extent displeased with financial reductionism of Marx. Marx had belief that finance related forces progressed through history and political, military and ideological forces (i.e. the super-structure) expanded minor to finance related forces. More than a few sociologists now have belief that there are numerous forces performing at the same time and with changing levels of force. Michael Mann acknowledged four resources of power: ideological, political, military and economic. [34] Ernest Gellner said that for the development of forces of economies, the ideological and political poise of authority must vary in an approach that permits the forces of economic to expand, fundamentally allowing the dominance to forces of ideology and politics. [35] These thoughts have some rational sagacity.

"Men have to be in a situation to exist so as to be capable to create history". [36] Marx had belief that this will be the initial basis of existence of human. [37] For men to build up system of politics, ideology and

military, first the circumstance of economic must be developed. Hierarchy of needs by Maslow exhibits this noticeably. Attaining a state where the class can stay alive, do the reproduction and maintenance of itself is the objective of each class on the earth. Endurance is and forever will be the upmost requirement. To articulate that men shape their indicates of endurance around less important forces for example political and ideological creates sense very little. Mann and Gellner highlight the specific cases inside the history that they suppose illustrate a shortage of financial dominance. They are wrong in what they observe. Even when it emerges as though a fresh philosophy or political faction reasons a modification in the form of creation, this could merely happen as a consequence of the creative forces expanding further than the creative relations. [38] The super-structure can influence the way the creative forces build up as the earliest and feudal forms show, but the super-structure only modifies subordinate to the creative forces. According to Engels and Marx: "h o w irrational is the outset of history held up till now, which abandons the actual relationships and imprisons itself to high-sound plays of princes and countries". [39]

#### iv) CLASS STRUGGLE: SPEED OF HISTORY?

The dialectic association connecting the classes of rulers and class of the lower category inside the historical materialism build up beyond personal belongings and the occurrence of an excess. A class of rulers ruling builds up in the course of its usage of personal belongings to attain the excess. Communism is believed to eliminate all estrangement by eliminating the class rivalry. For this, personal belongings must be got rid so a class of rulers cannot expand to manage the excess. The past leading up to socialism is created of the dissimilar forms of production where changing structures of personal belongings and compulsion generate the class rivalry. The forms of creation and their following collapses and substitutes are all predicated on great effort and revolution of class.

It is believed by several opponents of historical materialism that struggles of class have not had a standardized outcome all through the past, with the large role by a class throughout the some eras and a lesser role in others. [40] In the light of arguments given by Michael Mann the capitalism is an unusually class-separated civilization and that previous forms of creation did not exhibit this similar characteristic. [41] Mann and a number of his colleague sociologists highlighted the past instances that emerge to illustrate struggles of class having a miniscule result. Engels and Marx claimed that all past struggles, whether they are warfare, murders, political reformations, revolution d'états etc. are all signs of struggles of

class. [42] Whether this is factual or not is not possible to establish. For instance, in order to decrease the Punic Wars between Carthage and Rome downward to struggle of class is not possible.

The explicit past instances, though, can be clarified if historical materialism is employed in the manner intended by the Engels and Marx. Historical materialism was created by Marx as a common rule for history interpretation. He had awareness that he had modest past facts to support his theory. But considering the history, he was capable to observe a basic sketch or stream that looked to recur itself in the mode of consecutive forms of production. The changes perhaps downy, but the stream was visible. While historical materialism might not clarify each past incidence clearly, the four forms of production and their changes illustrate the growth through classes and financial dominance. Doing the interpretation of historical materialism in this method is observed as protecting it in a "blindly rigid method" or exploring theory of Marx as "discovered creed rather than pragmatic theory".[43] Even though this might be factual, it does not reverse the reality that historical materialism can clarify the history, just not each case.

#### v) THE ASIATIC FORM OF PRODUCTION AND ITS FAULTS

The Asiatic form of production has a dual-sense. Actually, several have produced two alike but separate forms of production from the Asiatic form. In the place of using ancient socialism and the Asiatic form closely, a difference presents amid the both that has guided a few to consider of them as totally dissimilar forms. Marx recognized this dissimilarity but discontinued short of distributing the two. The dissimilarity between ancient socialism and the Asiatic form of production is, as shown by its name, that the Asiatic form submits to what Marx reckoned unique conditions in the region of Asia. In the view of the Marx, Asia was dissimilar from the region of the Europe and the other world. In the region of Asia, common belongings and the comparatively lesser developed forces of production had continued to be principal while the other headed through other production's forms. This happened, in the viewpoint of Marx, as the citizens within the Asiatic form of production were further unwilling to develop into sovereign of the community. In order for the Asiatic form to be substituted, the obstruction that limits the sovereignty of persons regarding the desires of the community should be postponed to let the production forces to be more developed. [44] In the Asiatic form, this obstruction was stronger than in ancient socialism. In *Grundrisse*; Marx defined this dissimilarity in the two forms:

The Asiatic mode essentially suspends on most stubbornly and for the highest time. This is owing to its assumption that the person does not turn out to be sovereign *in comparison with* the community; that there is a self-sufficient circle of production, harmony of cultivation and productions, etc. [45]

Few have utilized this difference created by Marx to hit historical materialism. In the book titled "*A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*" the author Giddens calls the historical materialism "Europocentric". [46] The author claims that Marx, like several other authors of his day, observed downward on the region of Asia as barbarous. [47] Therefore, the stagnation that was attributed to Asia by Marx, Giddens declares, does not be a sign of the accurate Asian circumstance, but as a substitute is merely a likeness of European partiality of Marx. [48]

It is a fact that Marx only briefly argued civilizations outside of the region of Europe. His main center was United Kingdom, France and Germany. Actually, Marx did not contribute with adequate pages *Grundrisse, The Ideology of Germany and Capital* to the conversation of civilizations that don't belong to Europe. Keeping in mind that these books are approximately a joint twenty-five hundred pages, the ratio of discussion of Marx does not agree with the ratio of the globe that is not non-Europe. Giddens claims that imperfect look of Marx at Asian civilizations is a fault inside historical materialism as if the globe is continually varying and rising through disagreements, why is Asia sluggish?

It is not possible to deny that Marx wrote very small regarding the Oriental civilizations. This might be owing to either to be short of knowledge or a shortage of thoughtfulness. The quotation from *Grundrisse*, though, could be utilized to show why the Oriental civilizations are an exemption. For the Asiatic form of production to dispel, a disagreement has to exist. In this position of less developed forces of production, no disagreement exists. In the Asiatic form of production, as with ancient socialism, no classes remain existed; the only method for hostile classes to produce is if the forces of production develop and an excess is generated. The existence of an excess gives inspiration for persons to crack from the community so as to achieve power of this excess. These persons take hold of the excess and materialize into fresh societal stratum for instance soldier classes, nobles, commoners and priesthoods. [49] The appearance of classes indicates a conclusion to ancient socialism. In the Asiatic form of production no excess is there. So, there is no inspiration for persons to smash from the community. There is a self-supporting surround of

production, harmony of cultivation and production, etc. inside the Oriental communities that stop class structure. [50]

Still, Giddens and numerous of others sense that the forces of production do not motivate the main periodic changes all the way through the past.. [51]

## CONCLUSION

Philosophy of Marx is rising in different ways in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Historical materialism could be utilized on order to clarify the history by distributing the time into four forms of production those are Primeval, Asiatic, capitalist and feudal. There is a rational stream amid these four forms. Forces of production have slowly enhanced and with this improvement a move in the universal sketch of civilization has happened with the objective of improved suit the forces of production. Whether this stream will conclude in socialism or whether class rivalries lie beneath all past struggles is unrelated. The existence of a stream relied on rising forces of production is what makes the difference and what provides historical materialism its legitimacy. Karl Marx's all basic principles still stand on this ways.

Although historical materialism has made its efforts, it still stays a concrete theory because of its capability to clarify the largely stream and sketch of the history. The changes from one form of production to another form are obvious. Every form has constructed upon the preceding and human has gradually floated in the direction of an improved approach of generating a living. In current article, some particular past examples are given to support the historical materialism. The belief is here that this is not necessary and somewhat only utilized in an effort to refute the theory with no knowledge of its real intention Historical materialism could not be reckoned factually. It cannot clarify entire the time that has now become the past. It can merely clarify the universal sketch. If it shifts historical materialism towards the area of creed as a number have claimed, then so be it. This will not remove the potencies of the discussed theory when measured as a common rule for learning the history.

## REFERENCES

1. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Portable Karl Marx*. Ed. Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books. 1983, P. 69
2. Wolff, Jonathan. *Why Read Marx Today?*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 29
3. Freedman, Robert. *The Marxist System: Economic, Political, and Social Perspectives*. New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990, p. 12
4. Ibid, p. 13
5. Heilbroner, Robert. *Marxism: For and Against*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981, p. 41
6. Ibid, p. 42
7. Ibid, p. 39
8. Ibid, p. 36
9. Freedman, Robert. *The Marxist System: Economic, Political, and Social Perspectives*. New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990, p. 12
10. Elster, John. *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986, p.34
11. Freedman, Robert. *The Marxist System: Economic, Political, and Social Perspectives*. New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990, p. 12
12. Ibid, p. 13
13. Heilbroner, Robert. *Marxism: For and Against*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981, p. 35
14. Freedman, Robert. *The Marxist System: Economic, Political, and Social Perspectives*. New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1990, p. 12
15. Giddens, Anthony. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995, pp. 84-85
16. Ibid, p. 103
17. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Portable Karl Marx*. Ed. Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books. 1983, P. 160
18. Kedourie, Elie. *Hegel & Marx: Introductory Lectures*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1995, pp. 153-154
19. Wolff, Jonathan. *Why Read Marx Today?*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 17
20. Kedourie, Elie. *Hegel & Marx: Introductory Lectures*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1995, p. 157
21. Baltas, Aristides. On the Stake's of Marxism's Future: Philosophy, Science, and Politics Again. *European Planning Studies* 7, no. 1: 51-63., 1999, p. 52
22. Wolff, Jonathan. *Why Read Marx Today?*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 28
23. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto and Other Writings*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 2005, p. 7
24. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Portable Karl Marx*. Ed. Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books, 1983, pp. 59-60
25. Heilbroner, Robert. *Marxism: For and Against*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981, pp. 39-40

26. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Portable Karl Marx*. Ed. Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books, 1983, pp. 160-161
27. Laibman, David. Theory and Necessity: The Stadial Foundations of the Present. *Science & Society* 69, no. 3 (July): 2005, pp. 285-315.
28. Howard, M.C. and J.E. King. Is Socialism Economically Feasible? An Analysis in Terms of Historical Materialism. *Review of Political Economy*, 6.2: 1994, pp. 133-152.
29. Ibid, p. 139
30. Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*. Trans. Martin Nicolaus. London: Penguin Books, 1993, p. 489
31. Howard, M.C. and J.E. King. Is Socialism Economically Feasible? An Analysis in Terms of Historical Materialism. *Review of Political Economy*, 6.2: 1994, pp. 140-141
32. Runciman, W.G. *A Treatise on Social Theory Volume One: The Methodology of Social Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983
33. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Portable Karl Marx*. Ed. Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books, 1983, pp. 27-52
34. Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power Volume I: A History of Power From the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986, p. 11
35. Gellner, Ernest. *Plough, Sword and Book*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, pp. 131-132
36. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Portable Karl Marx*. Ed. Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books, 1983, p. 171
37. Ibid, p. 172
38. Ibid, p. 175
39. Ibid, p. 179
40. Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power Volume I: A History of Power From the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 528-529
41. Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power Volume II: The Rise of Classes and Nation-states, 1760-1914*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993, pp. 26-27
42. Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Portable Karl Marx*. Ed. Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books. 1983, p. 177
43. Giddens, Anthony. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995, p. 105
44. Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*. Trans. Martin Nicolaus. London: Penguin Books, 1993, p. 487
45. Ibid, p. 486
46. Giddens, Anthony. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995, p. 85
47. Ibid, p. 87



48. Ibid, pp. 84-88
49. Laibman, David. The End of History? The Problem of Agency and Change in Historical Materialist Theory. *Science & Society*, no. 2 (April): 2006, pp. 180-204.
50. Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*. Trans. Martin Nicolaus. London: Penguin Books, 1993, p. 486
51. Giddens, Anthony. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995, pp. 84-85