

Imperialism and Class Struggle in Modern History: A Dialectical Critique

Aftab Ahmad Mir¹

¹ Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Sociology & Social Work, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar

* Corresponding Author:

Aftab Ahmad Mir

Email: aftabmir57@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received	07-07-2025
Revised	22-10-2025
Accepted	20-11-2025
Available Online	30-12-2025

ARTICLE ID

CLIO0302002

KEYWORDS

Marxism, historical materialism, class struggle, imperialism, revolution, capitalism, proletarian theory.



ABSTRACT

The study presents a thorough Marxist examination of historical transformation, emphasising the interconnected themes of imperialism, revolution, and class struggle. It follows the changes in Marxist history from its classical materialist roots to modern interpretations that have been influenced by global capitalism and the spread of other ideas. The book critically interacts with arguments on economic determinism, political agency, and revolutionary practice by exploring fundamental texts and theoretical contributions from Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Gramsci, and subsequent philosophers. It examines the profound impact of European historical events on early Marxist philosophy, often revealing Eurocentric biases, and reevaluates its relevance to non-Western nations such as India, Russia, and China. The study closely examines important events including the Paris Commune, the Russian Revolution, and imperialism's role in the growth of capitalism. It also talks on differences within Marxist thought, such as revisionist criticisms, the role of the proletariat party, and the idea of everlasting revolution. The paper employs a historical-analytical approach to contend that, while classical Marxism offers significant instruments for comprehending socio-economic revolutions, its inflexible paradigms need reassessment in the context of modern complications. The paper contends that historical materialism continues to be an essential but developing paradigm for analysing class dynamics and global historical processes.

CLIOQUEST: Journal of Historical Research

How to Cite This Article

Aftab Ahmad Mir, "Imperialism and Class Struggle in Modern History: A Dialectical Critique," *Clioquest: Journal of Historical Research*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2025, pp. 5–16.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19784148>

INTRODUCTION

The dialectical link between imperialism and class struggle is central to Marxist history and offers a crucial framework for comprehending historical change and socio-economic transformation. In the framework of contemporary history, characterised by the ascendance of global capitalism that has influenced and reorganised societies worldwide, the significance of Marxist theory persists not merely as a critique of capital but also as a methodological approach to decipher the complexities of revolution, oppression, resistance, and reform. The convergence of imperialist expansion and class-based antagonisms is not coincidental nor transient; instead, it constitutes a systematic and structural continuity that has been extensively examined by Marxists. From the theoretical foundations established by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in the 19th century to the practical revolutionary actions of leaders such as Lenin and Trotsky, as well as subsequent theorists like Gramsci, Althusser, and dependency theorists, Marxist thought has examined both the material and ideological aspects of imperialism and class struggle. This work re-examines these interactions by providing a dialectical criticism of the historical impact of imperialism on class relations and its transformative effects on modes of production, especially in non-Western settings.

This inquiry is grounded on Marx's theory of historical materialism, which asserts that the economic base—comprising productive forces and relations of production—shapes the political and ideological superstructure. From this perspective, history is a chronicle of class struggle characterised by tumultuous transitions between socio-economic systems, culminating in upheaval, revolution, and the ultimate replacement of obsolete institutions by emerging classes. Marx saw class conflict as the driving force of history. But this procedure wasn't straight or unavoidable. It was dependent, conflicting, and firmly rooted in certain historical contexts. Marx's technique was dialectical, which means that opposites might work together to create a greater synthesis. In this dialectic, imperialism and capitalism were not external factors; they were mutually constitutive forces. The first system helped the second system grow and become stronger in more places, and the problems that arose in both systems set the stage for revolutionary changes. Lenin's *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916) is the most well-known theory of imperialism. It says that imperialism is not only a foreign policy or a geopolitical technique; it is also an economic

necessity of mature capitalism. As monopolies established and wealth built up in the major industrial centres of Europe and North America, it became very important to locate new markets, get raw resources, and put extra money to work. Colonial territories and dependent economies were the edges that the capitalist core used to keep making money. This worldwide restructuring of industry, commerce, and labour created a system of exploitation based on hierarchy, with imperial powers taking both material riches and ideological control over cultures they had conquered. Lenin's contribution was essential in expanding Marxist thinking beyond Europe, highlighting the global aspects of class struggle and the uneven development of capitalist relations.

Consequently, the examination of class conflict must transcend national confines and Eurocentric frameworks. Marx's involvement with colonial countries, especially his publications on India and China, illuminated the constraints and developing character of his analysis. His early works, like his 1853 essay on British rule in India, showed that he thought colonialism, even though it was brutal, would create the conditions for capitalist and then socialist development. But his later works, especially the ethnological notebooks and his letters to Russian revolutionaries like Vera Zasulich, show a big change. Marx started to see that social structures that weren't European, like the Russian mir (communal hamlet), might be used as other strategies to bring about socialist change that didn't have to be based on the Western capitalist model. This change shows that Marx is starting to value historical specificity more and more, as well as the need to change theoretical frameworks to fit different social and economic situations. For Marx, the Paris Commune of 1871 was a turning point that showed the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat in action. Even though the Commune's decentralised and participatory government system didn't last long, it showed how working-class people might run things via democratic control and their own power. However, its collapse also showed how hard it is to have a spontaneous uprising without established political leadership. This understanding had a big impact on Lenin's idea of the vanguard party, which he wrote about most clearly in *What is to be Done?* (1902). Lenin contended that proletariat consciousness must be cultivated beyond the immediate economic struggle and that a disciplined, centralised party of professional revolutionaries was crucial for coordinating and maintaining a socialist revolution. Lenin's stance became a fundamental element of Bolshevik policy during the Russian

Revolution of 1917, whereby the vulnerabilities of the bourgeoisie and the pronounced contradictions of Russian capitalism enabled the working class, under Bolshevik leadership, to usurp state power.

Nonetheless, these advancements were met with opposition. The German Social Democrats Eduard Bernstein and Karl Kautsky contested both the revolutionary and deterministic elements of Marxist dogma. Bernstein's Evolutionary Socialism advocated for a tranquil, parliamentary approach to socialism, dismissing the need of violent revolution and the inevitability of capitalism failure. Kautsky, although adhering to Marxist concepts, also inclined towards a gradualist interpretation, proposing that capitalism's underlying conflicts might be addressed by democratic changes. Lenin and others strongly opposed these revisionist ideas, saying they watered down the revolutionary heart of Marxism and gave in to bourgeois legality. The ideological schism resulted in the disintegration of the Second International and exposed the strategic challenges confronting the socialist movement in the early 20th century.

The post-Leninist era significantly varied Marxist theory, especially due to the influences of Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser. Gramsci's theory of cultural hegemony broadened the examination of class conflict to include the ideological mechanisms that uphold capitalist supremacy. Gramsci posits that consent is produced by institutions like schools, media, and religion, which disseminate bourgeois ideals and normalise capitalist social relations. This idea gave us a better idea of how governing elites stay in power via both force and moral and intellectual leadership. Althusser, however, presented a structuralist interpretation of Marxism, contending that ideological state apparatuses serve to reproduce the conditions of production. He dismissed economic and humanist readings of Marx, instead highlighting the structural causes that limit individual agency and the overdetermination of social tensions.

In the Global South, Marxist theory saw further evolution as it confronted unique colonial and postcolonial contexts. Frantz Fanon, Samir Amin, and Andre Gunder Frank modified Marxism to confront the particular circumstances of racialised exploitation, dependence, and underdevelopment. Fanon, specifically, analysed the psychological and cultural aspects of colonialism, associating national liberation with the decolonisation of the mind. Dependency theorists, drawing from Marx but sceptical of conventional frameworks, emphasised

the unequal integration of periphery economies into the global capitalist system. They contended that advancement in the core relied on the underdevelopment of the periphery, necessitating a reevaluation of revolution not just in the context of class but also in connection to global economic dynamics. The revolutions in Cuba, Vietnam, and China further questioned traditional Marxist ideas by showing that peasant-led uprisings and societies that weren't industrialised may lead to socialist changes in certain situations.

These intricacies compel a reassessment of historical materialism in the present context. While the fundamental principles of class analysis, dialectical change, and critique of capital remain essential, the deterministic frameworks of base-superstructure relations, the inevitability of proletarian revolution, and the uniform stages of historical development have demonstrated their inadequacy in elucidating the diverse trajectories of contemporary history. The collapse of socialist initiatives in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the emergence of neoliberal globalisation, and the enduring presence of novel forms of imperialism and class exploitation necessitate that Marxists reassess fundamental principles and critically examine intersectional factors, including race, gender, ecology, and nationalism. Moreover, the imperialistic rationale of capitalism persists notwithstanding the official cessation of colonialism. Modern types of neo-imperialism, such as multinational businesses, debt regimes, military interventions, and ideological hegemony, are still changing the way classes interact across the world. The structural adjustment plans enforced by entities like the IMF and World Bank in the Global South exemplify a contemporary form of imperialist domination, eroding national sovereignty and intensifying class disparities. The extraction of surplus value increasingly occurs via global supply networks, financial speculation, and digital economies, making the places where people are exploited less clear and the people who fight less clear. However, the fundamental antagonism between capital and work endures, although in increasingly intricate and dispersed manifestations.

In this environment, the examination of imperialism and class conflict has additional importance. This study aims to elucidate the continuities and discontinuities in capitalist growth, the developing dynamics of class alliances and antagonisms, and the potential for emancipatory politics in the 21st century via a reexamination of the dialectical approach. It utilises a comprehensive

repository of Marxist theory and practice, including the foundational texts of Marx and Engels, the critical contributions of Gramsci, Althusser, Lenin, and modern postcolonial thinkers. It examines the theoretical consistency and practical relevance of historical materialism in various temporal and geographical situations. Consequently, the purpose of this introduction is not only to provide a historical overview of Marxist theory but also to emphasise the conceptual and methodological implications inherent in the analysis of imperialism and class conflict. It asserts the primacy of class as an analytical framework while staying cognisant of the particularities of cultural, geopolitical, and ideological constructs. It recognises the essential nature of Marxist concepts—surplus value, alienation, commodity fetishism, base-superstructure—while simultaneously emphasising the need of their reinvention in response to changing historical contexts. This dialectical criticism is both an homage to and a change to the Marxist heritage. It is based on the belief that critical thought must develop as history does, and that the search for justice requires both resistance and deep intellectual engagement. It examines the historical development of Marxist historiography and contextualises it within the larger context of anti-imperialist and anti-class oppression movements. It adds to the expanding corpus of research that aims to reclaim and rejuvenate Marxism as a dynamic, flexible, and revolutionary framework. In a time characterised by economic disparity, political volatility, environmental catastrophe, and ideological disunity, the significance of Marxist analysis persists—contingent upon its readiness to acknowledge its constraints, accept its inherent contradictions, and dedicate itself to the practice of social change.

Marx's theoretical framework shaped his study of historical events by closely entwining active political participation. Not limited to abstract theory, his involvement in creating the Communist League in 1847 and authoring *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) sought to impact revolutionary movements. His dedication to proletariat organisation was shown even more by his membership in the International Working Men's Association (First International) in 1864. Marx's theories found a key testing ground in the European scene of the 19th century, shaped by capitalism transition. He evaluated the power and constraints of national bourgeoisies, noting circumstances wherein working-class support for revolutions may propel social change. He did, however, also find cases when bourgeois supremacy

had faded but the proletariat lacked the will to grab power, resulting in reactionary losses.¹

Examining the 1851 French coup, his study of *The Eighteenth Brumaire* of Louis Bonaparte revealed the interaction of class dynamics allowing Louis Bonaparte to build the Second Empire. Marx saw the complexity of class struggle and political contingency although he did not see history as a straight line process. Likewise, his analyses of the Paris Commune (1871) revealed his sophisticated attitude to historical materialism. Emphasising dispersed and democratic systems, the Commune embodied an embryonic form of proletariat government, but not quite matched with his theoretical model of historical transformation. Marx's opinions on non-European civilizations—especially India and China—were mostly informed by Eurocentric accounts of historical evolution. Though its exploitative character, he saw British colonial control in India as a disruptive factor that unintentionally set the stage for capitalist development. His understanding of the "Asiatic mode of production" mirrored the impact of British colonial ideologues who saw India as a backward, authoritarian civilisation.²

Though only in tandem with proletarian revolution in the colonising countries, Marx thought that the forced introduction of capitalism in India may finally result in socialist change. Though this viewpoint lacked direct interaction with local socio-economic systems, he regarded Western interference in China as a possible catalyst for historical advancement. Marx's view of the American Civil War (1861–1865) saw it as a struggle between two economic systems—slavery and free labour. His larger resistance to feudal and semi-feudal production relations influenced his constant backing of the North. But his study mostly ignored the role small-scale southern farmers who opposed both slave-based exploitation and capitalism played. Marx's support of the Union cause was strengthened by the ideological posture of the British ruling elite, which backed the Confederacy. Marx aimed to expand his historical materialist perspective beyond the European experience during his last 10 years of life. His ethnological notes point to a changing view of non-Western civilisations and the potential of other routes to social change. Although his previous works were firmly anchored in a Eurocentric view of historical development, his subsequent research shows an attempt to include more intricate, region-specific paths of historical change. This changing participation reveals the dialectical link between

theory and historical actuality, therefore highlighting Marx's flexibility of approach.³

Review of Literature

The theoretical foundations of Marxist thought on imperialism and class struggle have been developed, debated, and refined over the course of more than a century. As the global capitalist system evolved through colonial expansion, wars, revolutions, and neoliberal restructuring, so too did the interpretations of historical materialism and the role of class conflict in shaping history. The scholarship surrounding these themes reflects the rich, complex, and often contradictory trajectories of Marxist theory and praxis. This literature review synthesizes key contributions from classical theorists such as Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Trotsky; mid-20th-century scholars like Baran, Sweezy, and Gramsci; and contemporary critical theorists who have engaged with issues of imperialism, global inequality, and class consciousness in both Western and non-Western contexts.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels laid the groundwork for analyzing history as a process driven by material forces and class antagonisms. In works like *The Communist Manifesto* and *Capital*, Marx posited that societal development moves through dialectical stages marked by contradictions between the forces and relations of production. The historical trajectory from feudalism to capitalism, and eventually to socialism, was theorized as a necessary unfolding conditioned by the accumulation of internal contradictions within each mode of production. In *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marx refined his views by acknowledging the role of political contingencies, ideology, and individual agency within the broader materialist framework (Marx, 1852). This work in particular challenged overly deterministic readings of historical materialism and introduced complexity into the understanding of revolutionary periods and class alliances.

Marx's writings on non-Western societies, especially India and China, were marked by an ambivalent Eurocentrism. In his early essays, Marx viewed British colonialism as a destructive yet potentially progressive force that could introduce capitalist relations into "backward" Asiatic societies. However, his later *Ethnological Notebooks* (1880–82) and correspondence with Russian revolutionaries like Vera Zasulich revealed a more nuanced engagement with non-capitalist social formations and the possibility of alternative revolutionary pathways, particularly through the Russian *mir* or

village commune. Scholars such as Lawrence Krader (1974) have noted this late shift in Marx's thinking as an important departure from the universalist assumptions embedded in earlier Marxist texts.

Friedrich Engels' writings complemented Marx's analysis, especially through works like *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, where he linked the subjugation of women and the institutionalisation of the family to the rise of private property and class society. Engels' contributions to Marxist historiography were essential in understanding the institutionalisation of class rule and the state apparatus as tools of bourgeois domination.

Building on the classical foundation, Vladimir Lenin extended Marxist theory in the early 20th century to address the specificities of imperialism and its role in global capitalism. In *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916), Lenin argued that capitalist competition had given way to monopoly capitalism and finance capital, leading to the export of capital to less developed regions and the political partitioning of the world. Imperialism, in Lenin's view, was not an anomaly but an inevitable outcome of advanced capitalism's internal contradictions. This reorientation of Marxist thought away from purely intra-national class conflict toward a global framework marked a key development in Marxist historiography.

Lenin also introduced the idea of the vanguard party and the necessity of a tightly organised revolutionary apparatus to direct proletarian struggles—particularly in societies where the working class was fragmented or politically immature. This was exemplified in the Russian Revolution of 1917, where Bolshevik leadership succeeded in seizing state power, demonstrating the practical applicability of revolutionary Marxism in a semi-feudal, semi-capitalist society. His work would heavily influence revolutionary movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America throughout the 20th century.

Another towering figure in Marxist thought is Leon Trotsky, who developed the theory of "permanent revolution" to account for the peculiarities of uneven and combined development. According to Trotsky, in societies where the bourgeoisie was too weak or compromised to lead a democratic revolution, the working class could and should assume leadership, combining bourgeois and socialist tasks into a single revolutionary process. His analysis of the Russian context, and later the Chinese and German revolutions, emphasized the

international dimension of socialism and critiqued the Stalinist doctrine of “socialism in one country.”

Moving beyond the revolutionary praxis of the early 20th century, the interwar and post-war periods witnessed a proliferation of Marxist scholarship that analyzed the changing nature of capitalism and class structure. Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy’s *Monopoly Capital* (1966) argued that the modern capitalist economy had moved beyond competitive markets to oligopolistic structures that suppressed innovation and created economic stagnation. They emphasized the role of state intervention, advertising, and imperialist exploitation of the periphery in maintaining capitalist profitability. Baran and Sweezy’s contributions were foundational to the development of dependency theory and world-systems theory.

Nikolai Bukharin and Harry Magdoff also contributed significantly to Marxist understandings of imperialism. Bukharin, in *Imperialism and the World Economy* (1915), focused on the integration of national economies into a global capitalist system, arguing that inter-imperialist rivalries would inevitably lead to global conflict. Magdoff, writing in the context of Cold War geopolitics, emphasized the economic necessity of imperialism for capitalist accumulation and the ways in which military and economic domination reinforced each other.

Antonio Gramsci offered a powerful critique of economic determinism within Marxism by theorising the concept of “hegemony.” In his *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci emphasized the cultural and ideological dimensions of class rule, arguing that the ruling class maintains dominance not only through coercion but also through consent—achieved by shaping civil society, educational institutions, media, and religious structures. Gramsci’s ideas were instrumental in rethinking the nature of class struggle, especially in liberal democracies where overt repression was less pronounced.

Louis Althusser brought a structuralist interpretation to Marxism, arguing that the state operates through both repressive and ideological apparatuses to reproduce the conditions of production. In his seminal essay “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses” (1970), Althusser stressed that ideology is not simply false consciousness but a material practice embedded in everyday rituals and institutions. His work highlighted the indirect, often invisible ways in which capitalist relations are naturalised and perpetuated.

More recent contributions to Marxist theory have come from scholars engaged in postcolonial, feminist, and environmental critiques. Writers like Frantz Fanon, Samir Amin, and Andre Gunder Frank challenged the Eurocentrism of classical Marxism by focusing on the colonial and postcolonial experiences of the Global South. Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth* emphasized the psychological and cultural dimensions of colonial domination, while Amin and Frank explored how dependency and unequal exchange reinforced global inequality. These thinkers helped to localise Marxist theory within specific historical and cultural contexts, demonstrating its flexibility and continued relevance.

Feminist scholars such as Silvia Federici and Angela Davis have interrogated the gendered dimensions of class exploitation, particularly the unpaid reproductive labour performed by women and the racialised structures of state violence. Federici’s *Caliban and the Witch* (2004) traces the origins of capitalism to the violent subjugation of women during the transition from feudalism to capitalism, arguing that primitive accumulation involved not just the enclosure of land but also the control of bodies and social reproduction. Marxist historiography has been enriched by dialogue with the Annales School and other forms of social history that emphasize *longue durée* processes and everyday experiences. E.P. Thompson’s *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963) exemplifies this approach by reconstructing working-class consciousness through cultural and lived experience rather than abstract economic categories.

Research Objectives

The study aims to examine the evolution of Marxist historical analysis, tracing its shift from classical materialism to contemporary interpretations. It explores the Marxist engagement with imperialism, revolution, and capitalism, critically assessing the ideological variations within Marxist thought. It also evaluates the applicability of Marxist theory to non-Western contexts and its relevance in understanding modern socio-economic transformations.

Methodology

The study employs a qualitative, historical-analytical methodology, drawing from primary Marxist texts and secondary scholarly interpretations. It utilizes comparative analysis to examine ideological shifts within Marxism, critically engaging with debates on imperialism, revolution, and class struggle. Contextualizing Marxist theory

within global historical developments, the research assesses its applicability to contemporary socio-economic structures.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Classical Marxism and its Tradition

We ought to have a basic understanding of Marx's ideas at this point. It must be acknowledged that the presentation was a synopsis that omitted some of the complexity of Marxist theory and practice, which have pervaded history for over 200 years. For our purposes, traditional Marxism is based on concepts taken straight from Marx and Engels' texts. For the time being, any differences between Marx and Engels are put aside. It is commonly known that Marx and Engels collaborated closely for a long time and often wrote significant works together, including *The Communist Manifesto*. Let's review the main ideas of traditional Marxism point by point. Marx used the logic of Hegelian dialectics as a framework to comprehend historical social change and development. He did not subscribe to Hegel's idealism. According to Marx, being is the subject and thinking is the predicate in the interaction between the two.⁴

Hegel reversed this relationship by making thinking the predicate and the subject. Nonetheless, Marx's materialist philosophy differed significantly from the mechanical materialism of the Enlightenment and other prior schools. It did not see human behaviour as a passive result of material conditions, instead emphasising the actuality of mind and awareness. In order to comprehend economic structure and activity, one must consider its circumstances, productive forces, and production linkages. Geographical location, climate, and demographic characteristics, such as population number and composition, all influence the circumstances of production in a society.

Productive forces include equipment, technology, talents, and tools. The nature of property in a given society and the ways in which labourers interact to determine what, how, and for whom to produce determine the items and quantities of production, the technology used, and the distribution of the finished product. These factors are referred to as production relations. All of this contributes to a society's economic structure and production method. Marx believed that the economic structure of society was the foundation for the legal, religious, artistic, philosophical, and other ideological components. This also applies to a society's political climate and condition.⁵

Marx saw class strife as a constant element of all social phases in European history, with the exception of the early communist formations. These periods include capitalism, the feudal system, and ancient slavery in Greece and Rome. The social split between those who possess the means of production and those who do not leads to class tensions and struggles. The secret lies in the inconsistencies that exist inside a mode of production, as well as the motivation for switching between modes. As long as a mode of production's relations of production are compatible with the advancement of matching productive forces, it may be perpetuated. A mode of production may eventually reach a point where it is no longer feasible to develop the productive forces further within the constraints of the current production relations. As a result, property systems that are linked to a certain pattern of production relations and that have the legal approval of the ruling state impede the expansion of productive forces.⁶

According to Marx, this is the start of a period of social revolution in which a new class gains political power and social hegemony by acting as the leader of a newer productive force. "No order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed, and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured, in the womb of the old society itself," Marx said, firmly emphasising the importance of material conditions for the transformation of a socio-economic order. This is in contrast to any utopian leap or shoddy conformism. Marx believed that a classless society free from inter-personal alienation will emerge as a result of the proletariat's revolutionary victory.

When the proletariat, or propertyless class, abolishes capitalism, society is left without any kind of private property. The underlying source of estrangement is eliminated. All men and women are emancipated from alienation and the lack of true freedom when the proletarian revolution is successful. As previously said, the theories, concepts, and remarks contained in Marx and Engels' writings have been included into this study as classical Marxism. It deviates from the conventional meaning of the term "Marxist," which refers to ideas and methods purportedly inspired from Marx's theories. The concepts that are directly found in Marx and Engels' writings are thus designated as "Marxian." Even during Marx's lifetime, this divergence was apparent.⁷

There are reasons why we currently only consider the body of ideas developed by Marx and Engels as classical Marxism. For example, Engels wrote to Bernstein, a prominent member of the German Social Democratic Party, in a letter dated November 3, 1892, "The self-styled "Marxism" in France is certainly a quite special product to such an extent that Marx said to Laforgue "This much is certain, I am not a Marxist." It should make it easier for us to identify the latter effects of a tradition established by classical Marxism, which combined historical materialism with the fight for the eradication of capitalism by the proletariat. It could never support complete adherence to the set of all its initial claims because of the very practices of classical Marxism. Although the phenomena of class struggle, capitalist contradiction, and the necessity of a united oppositional movement towards socialism remain highly relevant in both situations, we must be prepared to face the harsh reality that a sound conclusion and direction that is valid for one historical context may lose its validity in another.⁸

Let us now examine some of the stances taken by classical Marxism and the issues that arose in the late 19th and early 20th centuries regarding the policies and practices of the socialist movement (such as the strategy and tactics of a socialist revolution, the maturity of conditions for a socialist revolution, the type of party required for the proletariat's movement, and the nature and working of imperialism). Following the defeat of the Paris communards in 1871, the European workers' movement was beset by conflicting pushes and pulls from various anarchists and ultra-left sects. This served as the backdrop for the decision to relocate the International's headquarters to New York. In 1876, it was finally disbanded. "Let us give our fellow workers in Europe a little time to strengthen their national affairs, and they will surely be in a position to remove the barriers between themselves and the workingmen of other parts of the world," was one of the remarks made in the statement regarding the dissolution. The years 1848 to 1876 saw many changes in European history. All things considered, the primary characteristic of this complex process emerged in a number of cases where capitalist authority was consolidated, sometimes even by forming alliances with feudal elements, in opposition to the forces of the workers' revolution with the aim of advancing towards socialism. In 1883, Marx passed away. The Second International debuted in Paris in July 1889, six years later. At the time, it was the biggest international assembly in the history of the global labour movement, with 391

representatives from 20 nations. Another international labour conference was held in Paris at the same time, almost as a rival event.⁹

This was an assembly of legal Marxists and trade unionists who thought that some modification of the bourgeois legal system would bring about socialism. Although there were suggestions for such a unification in both conferences, Engels opposed any convergence of such forces. In any event, the union was formalised at the Brussels summit in 1891. Following the historical vexations we have just discussed, the expansion of capitalism led to a growing number of wage workers in an increasing number of European nations. By the end of the century, Japan had followed similar patterns in North America. Accordingly, the labour union movement saw significant growth throughout all of the capitalist nations. Furthermore, in the more developed capitalist nations, particularly Britain, the increase in productivity and the profits taken from imperialist exploitation led to a new strategy by the bourgeoisie to set one group of workers apart from the rest of the proletariat by offering them higher wages and other concessions. "The English proletariat is becoming more and more bourgeois.....for a nation which exploits the whole world, this is of course to a certain extent justifiable," Engels wrote in a letter to Marx dated October 7, 1858, reflecting on this tendency.¹⁰

The Communist Manifesto stated that the path to achieving its goal was the forcible overthrow of the entire outmoded social order. Forcible overthrow may not always involve armed conflict. Marx believed that the achievement of universal adult suffrage might offer a sufficient measure for having political power to achieve socialism in nations like Britain and Holland, where the working class made up the majority of the population and capitalist transformation was linked to the beginning of democracy. Engels said in the Principles of Communism that it is very desirable to abolish private property using nonviolent means. Conspiracy tactics are usually avoided by communists. Communists, on the other hand, will jump to the aid of the downtrodden proletariat if they are provoked into a revolution. Engels noted in the introduction to the 1895 edition of Marx's *Class Struggles in France* that the new military tactics posed greater challenges to the barricade combat methods used in the conventional form of people's revolutionary activity.

This was not a call to always refrain from violent insurrection, but rather a warning against adventurist behaviour. However, a portion of the leadership of the Social Democratic Party of

Germany often used Engels' concept to defend legislative, nonviolent, and slow methods of accomplishing socialist goals. Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932) was a prominent advocate of nonviolent means. He disagreed with the traditional Marxist views on the dictatorship of the proletariat and military revolution. In addition, Bernstein disagreed with traditional Marxist theories on industrial concentration, the certainty of economic crises, and the growing suffering of the working class. For ethical reasons, he was inclined to support socialism. He argued for a peace solution and voted against war credits during World War I as a social democratic member of the Reichstag. Karl Kautsky (1854–1938) was a prominent member of the Second International and another significant leader of the German Social Democratic Party. His conception of historical materialism was based on a natural evolutionary scheme of things that was comparable to Darwin's theories of biological evolution and natural selection. As a result, he thought capitalism will fail due to its inherent incapacity to effectively use the expanding productive forces. Because no dictatorship of the proletariat could override the objective economic rules by its decrees and brutality, the logic and viability of a proletarian revolution were therefore ruled out. Despite their disagreements, Bernstein and Kautsky were labelled "revisionists," suggesting that they departed from the traditional Marxist stance of class conflict and revolution. According to Kautsky, the 1917 Bolshevik revolution in Russia was an event that was inconsistent with traditional Marxism.¹¹

This was related to the preconditions of Russia's inadequate capitalist growth. In reference to the development of economic circumstances necessary for the collapse of a mode of production, Kautsky brought up the fact that historical materialism emphasises: "No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed." In his well-documented study, Vladimir Ilych Lenin (1870–1924) examined the evolution of capitalism in Russia (*Development of Capitalism in Russia*, 1899). Its backwardness was acknowledged by him. In reality, one of the elements ultimately enabling the Bolshevik takeover of state power was the fragility of the Russian bourgeoisie. To put it simply—and maybe a bit strangely—the bourgeoisie was unable to defend their own position against Tsarist tyranny, therefore the proletariat's leadership was forced to push for socialist control of the state.¹²

As Lenin said, "Russia has evidently witnessed, and most painfully experienced, one of

the most abrupt twists of history as it turns from imperialism towards the Communist revolution." We overthrew one of the most ancient, strong, savage, and cruel regimes in a matter of days. We went through many phases in a matter of months, including removing petty-bourgeois illusions and reaching a settlement with the bourgeoisie, which took decades in other nations (V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works Vol. II*, Moscow, 1947, p. 308). In the passage above, Lenin makes reference to Russian imperialism. In *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916), Lenin examined a crucial aspect of capitalism. Marx predicted the unavoidable trend of competitive capitalism towards increasing capital centralisation and monopoly formation in the first volume of *Capital*. Marx contended that this was the process that would increase the number of proletarian members and spell the end of capitalism. Lenin expanded this traditional Marxist stance to include the identification of connections between monopoly capitalism and imperialism aimed at global dominance and division. In order to use inexpensive labour and raw resources, capital exports are directed towards the subordinate areas.

Among these struggles and objectives, the first global war was an imperialist fight. In fact, the weakest link in this imperialist nexus was Tsarist Russia and its underdeveloped capitalism. Lenin pointed to this element as one of the causes of the 1917 Russian Revolution's acceleration towards the socialist supersession of capitalism. In the face of a global revolution, it was probably going to help capitalism fall apart on a global scale. Kautsky had a distinct stance on imperialism. He contends that there were no disputes between the developed capitalist nations throughout the imperialist period. Only between the world's developed and developing nations would there be strife. Capital exports from the imperial wealthy to the colonial poor and excess appropriation in an economic environment with cheaper labour and raw resources were not the only ways that the undeveloped nations were exploited. The rates of exchange between the commodities of the more or less capital-intensive manufacturing might also be the cause. In fact, the elements of Kautsky's analysis have somewhat impacted the development of the dependency theory since the Second World War, which focusses on imperialist hegemony over developing nations and the historical setting in which the United States was the dominant capitalist nation in the world. There are no historical laws in classical Marxism or its later development that prevent the coexistence of profits from both production and circulation on an international scale,

and the scope of such supremacy has been further strengthened since the fall of the Soviet Union in the last decade of the 20th century. Marx and Engels emphasised that "the working class cannot act as a class" until a political party is established. They primarily presented and clarified the Marxist view of history, class conflict, and the eradication of capitalism throughout the Communist League and First International's existence. During the Second International, national Social Democratic Parties began to function in Europe's various capitalist nations. It should be mentioned that the Paris Commune, although its brief existence, was a significant event that took place during the First International era before delving into the specifics of the principles in issue with regard to the Second International period.¹³

Marx believed the Paris Commune offered a good example of the methods and means of the dictatorship of the proletariat with its measures of decentred, democratic treatment. The issue of the proletarian party mediating the revolution's outcome and subsequent revolutionary government is at the heart of this. Lenin and Kautsky agreed that the proletariat needed to be exposed to political awareness from outside, notwithstanding their many important disagreements. It would not logically flow from their struggles and economic misery, which were restricted to the realm of trade union awareness. Marx and Engels had already discussed the function of bourgeois ideologists who had attained a theoretical comprehension of the historical process as a whole in the Communist Manifesto. Their job would be to instill revolutionary awareness in the working class. Such a process of increasing awareness undoubtedly makes mediation more difficult, as does the kind of person that might satisfy the commitment. Lenin believed it was appropriate to form a small, hierarchically structured party of professional revolutionaries in light of the illegality and authoritarianism that were then prevalent in many European nations, particularly in Russia (What is to be done?, 1902). He supported the organization's expansion into a mass party during the Russian Revolution of 1905, but with stringent guidelines for democratic centralism. The question of centralism was the first cause of the split between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in Russia. The 1879–1940 Leon Trotsky was not a supporter of centralism. The German Social Democratic Party's Rosa Luxemburg (1871–1919) opposed Lenin's notion of a highly centralised vanguard party. She had great trust in the working class's ability to learn from its own experience and worked to support their

initiative and self-activity. Questions about the proper organisational principles for the party of the proletariat must be raised by the experience of the communist movement throughout the twentieth century, including its successes and setbacks, Lenin's own concerns about bureaucratic excesses within the party on his deathbed, and the fall of Soviet Communism in the final decade of the century.¹⁴

As noted in "The Two Marxisms," in Alvin Gouldner, *For Sociology*, Pelican Books, 1975, p. 419, the historical role that classical Marxism ascribed to the proletariat "was assigned by an invisible intelligentsia, by an intelligentsia that never made an appearance in its own theory, and whose existence and nature are therefore, never systematically, known even to itself." In actual history, pre-capitalist systems are affected differently by the conquering of capital and its universal function. Numerous combinations of capitalism and pre-capitalist systems of production show the distinctions. The prior power structures and production processes are essentially unaltered, yet such arrangements allow for the extraction of capitalist profit. In similar situations, the traditional Marxist view of the phases must take into account more recent prospects for historical change. Transitioning from feudalism to capitalism is no longer sufficient. Since capitalism and precapitalism have historically intertwined their methods of exploitation and power, no such movement can really represent anything in terms of advancement.

Marx and Engels did a good job of explaining historical moments that were marked by the emergence of complexes of power and exploitation that combined the old and the new. In nations outside of Western Europe and North America, this circumstance has often surfaced. It's possible that a timid and feeble bourgeoisie won't be able to advance the bourgeois democratic revolution. The onus thus shifts to the working class, who must move swiftly from the dismantling of the feudal system to a campaign to eradicate the bourgeoisie. Trotsky introduced the concept of "permanent revolution," which refers to such a revolutionary actuality. Marx and Engels used the phrase for the first time in their 1850 General Council Address to the Communist League. What happened to the anticipated unity of the global (universal?) working class revolt against capitalism is still unknown. Since 1917, no historical shift of essential importance for the shift to socialism has ever expressed this crucial action parameter of Marx's theoretical framework of history. The October revolution in Russia, according

to the Bolshevik leaders, would usher in a period of global proletariat revolution.¹⁵

After losing the four-year global war, Germany was predicted to be the first developed capitalist nation to implement a socialist revolution. The historical facts were different. The task of establishing socialism in a single nation fell to Bolshevik Russia, and the classical Marxist tradition was unable to assist in this endeavour. China had another significant socialist transition in the 20th century, with the peasants serving as the main catalyst for the uprising. There are several problems about its growth after the communist takeover of power that the standard Marxist tradition cannot directly address. Regarding the historical perspective of sociopolitical revolution, the cases of Cuba, Chile, and Vietnam are likewise considered outliers to the traditional Marxist viewpoints. Importantly, Marx engaged in some critical research on Russia's pre-capitalist rural communes during the latter ten years of his life. Despite the lack of maturity in the country's capitalist development and proletariat growth, he responded to enquiries from Russian Narodnik leaders such as Vera Zasulich, Danielson, and others about the potential of those communes to serve as mass agencies for socialist transformation.¹⁶

Marx explicitly said in *Capital* that his theoretical stance was exclusively applicable to the experience of western Europe, particularly the capitalist growth of Britain, and that it would be completely incorrect to use those concepts to comprehend circumstances in a different setting. Marx stressed the need of abolishing the Tsarist monarchy and the likelihood of being linked to socialist revolutions in west European nations in order to realise the socialist potential of Russian communes. Marx saw two innate historical tendencies in the communes, namely. The communal

concept gives the commune vitality and qualifies it for socialist transformation, whereas the private ownership principle undermines the communes. Marx sent three versions of a letter to Vera Zasulich in which he expounded on these concepts. Marx began reading extensively on pre-capitalist collective land ownership in the years 1880–1882. According to Lawrence Krader's *Introduction to The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx* (ed.), Amsterdam, 1974, p. 4, Marx seems to have read in them "an index that modern man was not without an archaic communal component, which includes a democratic and equalitarian formation, in his social being."

CONCLUSION

The evolution of Marxism from its inception to the late twentieth century has been marked by theoretical complexity, reinterpretation, and adaptation to diverse historical conditions. While classical Marxism provided a structured analytical framework, its application has varied significantly, reflecting the changing dynamics of capitalism and social movements. Marx himself acknowledged the complexities of historical transformation, evident in his broad range of studies, from European class struggles to non-European social formations. Despite divergences between Marxist predictions and historical developments, the dialectical method remains a crucial tool in historiography, emphasizing the interplay of economic, social, and cultural forces. The Annales school, with its focus on micro-histories and long-term structures, echoes Marxist concerns, demonstrating its enduring influence. Rather than being a rigid doctrine, classical Marxism continues to offer valuable insights into historical change, reaffirming its relevance as an evolving framework for understanding past and present social realities.

REFERENCES

1. Isaac Deutscher, "Marxism in Our Time," *Marxism, Wars & Revolutions*, Verso, 1984, pp. 243–255.
2. Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution, 1789-1848*, The World Publishing Company, 1962.
3. Ibid., p. 50.
4. Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914-1991*, Pantheon Books, 1994.
5. Ibid., p. 200.
6. Giovanni Arrighi, *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-first Century*, Verso, 2007.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. François Furet, *Le Passé d'une illusion. Essai sur l'idée de communisme au XXe siècle*, Laffont/Calmann-Lévy, 1995, p. 18.
10. Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt: Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, C. H. Beck, 2009, pp. 758, 777.
11. Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, chap. 1.

-
12. Penelope J. Corfield, "The State of History," *Journal of Contemporary History*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2001, p. 156.
 13. Paul Blackledge, *Reflections on the Marxist Theory of History*, Manchester UP, 2006.
 14. Ibid., p. 45.
 15. E. P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory*, Merlin Press, 1995, p. 63.
 16. Georg G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*, Wesleyan UP, 1997.