

THE ANALYSIS OF CAPITALISM ACCORDING TO MARX AND WEBER

SUMMARY

The emergence of capitalism, the development and functioning process of it according to Marx and Weber constitute the purpose of the research. First of all, it has been mentioned about the history philosophy of Hegel and the materialism of Feuerbach. It has been explained the development of the understanding of dialectical materialist history by taking dialectics from Hegel and materialism from Feuerbach. And later, it has been focused on the ideas of Marx and Weber about capitalism. It has been understood that there is not a direct criticism of Weber to Marx. However; there is no connection between capitalism and profit and the ambition of making more money has been advocated by Weber in an indirect way. But, in Marx, it has been stated that the main ground on which the functioning of capitalism is not profits, it is surplus-value. It has been understand that the contradiction between capital and labor has betrayed itself clearly in surplus-value.

Key Words: Surplus-value, Dialectics, Philosophical History, Profit, Spirit

KAPİTALİZMİN MARX'A VE WEBER'E GÖRE ANALİZİ

Mustafa SOLMAZ¹

ÖZET

Kapitalizmin ortaya çıkışının, gelişiminin ve işleyişi sürecinin Marx'a ve Weber'e göre nasıl temellendirildiği, araştırmanın amacını oluşturmaktadır. Öncelikle Hegel'in tarih felsefesine ve Feuerbach'ın materyalizmine yer verilmiştir. Diyalektiğin Hegel'den, materyalizmin de Feuerbach'tan alınmasıyla, diyalektik materyalist tarih anlayışının nasıl geliştiği açıklanmıştır. Daha sonra sırasıyla Marx'ın ve Weber'in kapitalizm hakkındaki görüşleri üzerinde durulmuştur. Weber'in Marx'a yönelik doğrudan bir eleştirisinin olmadığı anlaşılmıştır. Ancak dolaylı yoldan, kapitalizm ile kâr amacı, daha çok kazanma hırsı arasında bir ilişkinin kurulamayacağı Weber tarafından savunulmuştur. Fakat Marx'ta kapitalizmin işleyişinin dayandığı temel zeminin kâr değil, artı-değer olduğu saptanmıştır. Artı-değerde, sermaye ile işçi arasındaki çelişkinin kendini açık bir şekilde ele verdiği anlaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kavramlar: Artı-değer, Diyalektik, Felsefi Tarih, Kâr, Tin

INTRODUCTION

There are two main approaches at the point of development and functioning of capitalism. They are based on the views of Marx and Weber. Researchers generally have tried to justify one of these two thesis. Some of them collect argument to validate the views of Marx and some of them collect argument to validate the views of Weber. However; there have been a few thesis comparing the views of both of them and revealing the differences between them. It has been needed to make that research to overcome that difficulty and to have more clear information about the capitalist organizational. Because of this, first of all, it has placed the theory of Marx and later, Weber's. Then the comparison has been made between them. It has been mentioned the circumstances preparing it as the theory of Marx has been more understandable. It has been mentioned about the philosophy of history of Hegel and the vulgar materialism of Feuerbach. It has been tried to explain how a social dialectic has developed from these two foundations. It has been tried to analyze how that new dialectic has defined the capitalism.

1. From the Dialectic of Spirit to Social Dialectic that Societies Have Replaced Each Other

Hegel agrees that there are three types of historiographies: Genetic History, Intellectual History and Philosophical History. In Genetic History, the writer has involved in the spirit of the event that he has told. The writer and the events that he told do not belong to a different time zone. The writer has internalized the events that he has met. However; there is a difference between the writer and the context that the events occurred in the Intellectual History. The writer does not involve in the events that he

belong to a different time zone. The writer has internalized the told. He beyonds of it.

Intellectual History has divided into four groups: Universal History, Pragmatic History, Critical History and Philosophy World History. Universal History, in general, is the history of a nation, country or the whole world. It offers a holistic narration. Pragmatic History has been written with the concern of turning to the past. Benjamin's interpretation about Historical Materialism reminds the Pragmatic History of Hegel. "To articulate the past historically is not to know that past how it has been in fact. In contrast to that, it means to capture a memory in a time of danger. The important factor for historical materialism has been to protect a historical image in the case of danger with its original form."(Benjamin, 2009: 39-40) There is a tendency to the past for some reasons in both of them. While the reason of this tendency has been recovered the subject itself to be a tool of the ruling classes in Benjamin, the reason of the interest to the past is moral in Hegel. In case of disruption of a nation's spiritual atmosphere, Practical History has a great task to resurrect it again. Another form of Intellectual History is Critical History. Critical History is different from other data of history. The subject of it is not occurred events, it is history itself. It investigates that what kind of historical writing would be more suitable. The history of researches such as: Religion, Law and Art consist of the transition to Philosophical World History. The forth kind of history writing is about the conceptual development of various disciplines.

Philosophical World History, includes the rational category in history. Hegel makes a statement about that subject in three places. In the first, he has stated that "it is the simple Reason thought that reason has dominated to the world and for that reason the thing that has rational progresses in the world history."(Hegel, 2011a: 15) In the second, he says that "if we can not enter to the History of World with Reason and information, , then, at least

Arş. Gör. İnönü Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü.

we should believe that Reason is there.”(Hegel, 2011a: 16) In the third, he has said that “if so, World History has been a rational progress, the nature of the World History has always been and the same, but the Spirit has explained that only nature in a specific presence is a compulsory process and just that history itself should be examined.”(Hegel, 2011a: 17) The different views discussed in all three, can not be easily distinguished from each other. However; the attitude of Hegel is the direction of the second one.

For a better understanding of the subject, we have to be remembered everything that Socrates discovered in Anaxagoras. Socrates has said that he has first come across “the concept of Reason” in Anaxagoras. He gets carried the hope like he has found a teacher in the particular one that has shown the particular purpose of it and in the whole that has shown the universal purpose of it. But then, he has understood that the thing that Anaxagoras has understood from the Reason is not an abstract thing, it is like something such as: air, and ether. The thing Socrates has tried to find is an abstract mission from the movement of himself. But Anaxagoras has tried to find a more different thing like tangible assets. The purpose in the Philosophy of History is similar to the one that Socrates has researched the nature by means of Reason. However; the subject has changed here. The research site is not nature, it is historical narratives.

We understand with the rationality in History that it has a beginning, development and result. More importantly, we comprehend that the purpose of the events that have occurred. History is a way towards freedom. “The principle of Spirit, the last purpose of it, is that the thing we are called the nature of it has been just an abstract, universal thing.” (Hegel, 2011a: 29) It is that man is free with regard to Human, isn't One or some people. Man should not be free because of the qualifications that human being has. He has gained that right just as he is a human. This is the first principle of Spirit. The second principle is related to the fulfillment of the necessary things to reach that purpose. “A mode should be brought for actuality and that activation is functionalization and in general it is the activity of people.”(Hegel, 2011a: 29) Human beings have to act to fulfill their subjective needs. What pushes people into action is their needs, desires and passions. Because, “... nothing is achieved without the general interests of the participants to it, and in the extent of the ignorance of all other interests and ends that have been or to have been, the admission all of the nerve fibers to an only object and concentrate all of the needs of the individuality on that target, we have said that it is a passion and then in general we should say that we can say that nothing has been managed without passion in the world.”(Hegel, 2011a: 30) We both respond to our own needs and reach more things that we aim while we are trying to get our passion. Hegel has given an example about a “fire” event on that issue (Hegel, 2011a: 34-35). We can ask to anyone the account for that as a someone that has been aggrieved. The most effective and direct way of it is to hurt him. We think to burn his house even if we know that we have been criticized. We believe that our own revenge will come down by hurting him economically. For that reason, we have done the first movement. However; we can not think that if we burn that house, other houses will also burn. The harm that we will cause can not be only related to goods. We can cause the death of lots of people. “... they have implied that more things have appeared that in general, people aimed and reached and the things that know and want in an indirect way via of their actions; they have fulfilled their interests, however; in that way, the more important thing has been managed that it has

not been in their aims and consciousness whereas it has been in their actions as an inter thing.”(Hegel, 2011a: 34- 35)

If the person has run his passion, lots of things will happen that he has aimed. His particular interests, wishes and passion have been the essential condition of the universe. “The particular interest of the passion is not separated from the activation of universal, because, the one that has been universal has been born from the one that has been specific and particular. The ones that have argued with each other is particular and some parts of them could disappear.”(Hegel, 2011a: 40) The one that is general and universal consists of meeting their particular actions of the people who have tried to resolve their own desires and passions and their conflicts. In that process time is also important. “Time is the negative in sensual: thought is also the same disadvantage, however; it so infinite and interior that everything that has been existed solves with it.”(Hegel 2011a: 87) The certain shape of the Spirit does not pass only in natural way in time, unlike of that it is eliminated in the activity of self-conscious by itself. That elimination is also a storage and upgrade as it has been the activity of thought. In that way, Spirit both eliminates reality and durability of that thing and gains universality and thought of that thing (Hegel 2011a: 87). The progress of Spirit consists of three stages. First of all, represents the decadent of Spirit to the natural one. Spirit is not aware of here that it has been different from the natural and material one. When it is aware of that, second stage takes place. However; Spirit is not separated from the natural completely here. It is still affected from the natural one. The case that Spirit is get rid of the natural effects consists of the third stage of the progress of Spirit. Spirit is still completely free from the natural. It has reached the pure universality and self-consciousness of Spirit.

Indian thought consists of the decadent of the Spirit to natural one. Spirit can not pass the natural one in it. Spirit was embedded to it. It has not understood that it is different from the area of objects and natural assets. There is a single substance in Indian thought. And, it is not the product of thought. It is a powder that the nature has produced. That way of thinking the one that has been sensual does not serve the intellectual one. “So, everything, the sun, stars, Ganges, Indus, animals, flowers, are the God for it and in this divinity, the one that has an end loses its solidity and permanence, but the one that has been divine can change for own and as it is susceptible, it can be dirty from beginning to end.”(Hegel, 2011b: 38) However; the harm of the divine one does not occur in Indian thought. Anthropomorphic understanding of the God has been developed in Egypt and Greece. According to Herodotus, almost all the names of God have come from Egypt to Hellas. Poseidon, Dioskurlar, Hera, Hestia, Themis, Khariftler and the others have been known by Egyptians since the ancient times. However : they do not know the name of Poseidon. Pelasgs have been given that name to this God. No other communities apart from Libya have known the name of Poseidon (Herodotus, 2007: L).

The thought that Spirit is different from the natural has been in Persians. In Persians thought, Spirit has understood that it is different from the natural. The light that has been spreaded from Zoroaster has provided the development of that understanding. Primeval things showing Spiritual is different from natural have come from both Egypt and understanding of God of Jews. Isis and Osiris cultures have shown that the natural one has been compromised. There has been a speculative interfere towards the natural one. But, Yehova is a pure One. “... The light has been

Yehova anymore... The breaking between east and west has become true in that way, Spirit goes in the depths in its own and comprehends the fundamental, abstract principle as Spiritually.” (Hegel, 2011b: 95) Spiritual element here breaks itself from the sensual elements and Nature has reduced something external. That is the reality of the nature because, idea can reach to compromise to itself later. The first word of it will be opposed to nature. Because, firstly, it has gained a value here. (Hegel 2011b:95) It is important that the breaking of Spirit from natural. Because, “...Spirit should be with own. That is completely Freedom, because, when I am dependent on someone else, I am not myself, if I am with my own, then I am free. This is the own consciousness.”(Hegel, 2011a: 24)

The journey of Spirit consists of the essence of philosophy history of Hegel. However; Marx thinks in a more different way: “My dialectic method is not only different from Hegel but also, it is completely the opposite of it. The living process of human brain for Hegel is the creator and architect of the real world and real world is an external phenomenal form of the idea. For me, on the contrary, the idea is not anything different from the reflection of the material world to the human mind.”(Marx, 2003a: 26- 27) History like information can not complete the process of it by reaching an imaginary state of perception. A perfect society and a perfect state are the things that have only been in our thoughts. On the contrary, all cases which have followed one another in History consist of the temporary stages of development of human society. Each stage is necessary and therefore legitimate in the period, but, it becomes invalid when it meets new superior conditions. It has to give its place to another one. How the Bourgeoisie scattered all of the old-fashioned and durable institutions due to the competition and world marketing, in the same way that dialectical philosophy has scattered all of the concepts of absolute and ultimate truth with the concepts of the ultimate states of the people corresponding to them (Engels, 2009: 17-18). Dialectical development showing itself in the History and nature, the chain of reasons moving towards the lower level to upper level, according to Hegel is in a place that is unknown since eternity. It is necessary to destroy that reverse posture. We should take the opinions in our brain as a reflection of ideas and reconceive those with a materialistic point of view instead of seeing real objects as a reflection of absolute level of this or that idea. In that way, dialectic has transformed into both external world and human thought. But the dialectic of the idea becomes just a conscious reflection of the real world and in that way, the dialectic of Hegel is converted head-up, he has been put over his feet (Engels, 2009: 55-56).

The thought of two philosophers has an important place in the essence of scientific socialism Marx and Engels have tried to develop. The first of these is Hegel and his dialectical method. Second one is Feuerbach and his strict, hard materialism. According to Feuerbach, “Nature exists as independent each kind of philosophy, there is nothing apart from nature and people and superior beings that have been created by our religious power is not anything apart from a reflection.”(Engels, 2009: 25).

Although it is seen like Feuerbach’s naturalistic has a shocking effect on German idealism, it still has a very rude quality. The most important deficiency is that he does not see the nature as the developing asset in historical process. A dialectic nature concept is missing in it. There have been three important and big discoveries which will change that belief so far. The discovery of development law of cell, energy and types has caused the idea that natural thing has a tough structure and tough always

changes. These were the discoveries which had been done in the age in which Feuerbach lived. But Engel broached two important reasons why Feuerbach had not got a nature idea suitable to these new discoveries. One of them was that discoveries in those periods have been in the crawl stage yet. Also even scientists who were directly interested in that area were complicated in that point. Second one was Germany conditions which caused Feuerbach to be far away from his society and to box in only one small village. These two important factors caused not to the formation of dialectic nature understanding.

If a dialectic is taken from Hegel and if nature is taken from Feuerbach; a dialectic understanding which got free of its mystic shell will be developed. It is not enough. The area in which new developed dialectic will be applied will be communal world not natural world. We should adapt dialectic especially on communal area. That discrimination should be hold in front of especially eyes. Because Marx and Engels criticise Feuerbach because Feuerbach insisted on natural area and he paid attention to communal ones. According to Marx and Engels, a person is a sensitive on one side and on the other side a person is a communal being. Person and society are not discriminated from each other. Then the last shape of dialectic will turn into this: “.... Dialectic sees the every communal type which has developed as historically in a liquid movement...”(Marx, 2003a: 27)

2. The Capitalism Analysis of Marx

The society types which have developed in historical process and will develop are qualified as “ With rough lines, asian type, antique, feudal and modern production types, advanced periods of economic society institute.” (Marx, 2009: 93) Marx’s explanations focus on modern production types and capitalist production. We need a general assessment to understand the Marx’s analysis related to capitalist organising. There are four main elements of methodology which we have to apply:

- a) How is capital acquired which is needed for Industrial Revolution;
- b) How do workers and unpropertied proletariat who have come together in the factory system appear;
- c) What are the powers who offer many people to work all together at the same time and in the same place;
- d) What is the core of that capitalist organising operation mechanism and all that process

a) At the beginning of ninth century, Islam Empire took all world trade under its hegemony. It took hold of all the beaches of Spain, Africa, Mediterranean, Egypt and Syrian. Mediterranean harbours such as Carthage, Tunis, Alexandria and Antios belonged to Muslims (Pirenne, dateless: 267). Thus West Europe started to creep into its own skin. It started to be far away from trade and cultural interaction and it leaned towards feudal organising. Byzantine Empire which is another part of Rome Empire was luckier. Because Istanbul and Anatolian beaches had not been taken under domination yet. Byzantine had the key of Europe in its own hand. But later, in fifteenth century, with the help of wartime which had been done by Ottoman Emperor Sultan Mehmet, there was a not wanted event. Byzantine started to lose not only its own trade centers also lose its asset and power.

Europe was facing with an important deadlock economically. Ways which would save it from that situation were being searched. Geographical Discoveries was the lead of those ways. Both new trade ways were being found and richness belonged to those regions were being used with the help of geographical discoveries. "Big revolutions which were seen in trade and provided the development of merchant capital were important elements which made transition from feudal production type to capitalist production type easy with geographical discoveries in 16th and 17th centuries. Immediate expansion in world market, the accession of goods in circulation, the ambition and rival business which have been showed by European nations to have Asia's products and America's treasures, the system of commercial factory gave corporeal assistance for the breaking up feudal chain on production." (Marx, 2004: 293) Manufacture and the production movement itself showed an enormous development as a result of the discovery of America and the ways of East India Sea with expansion fact of trade. The silver and gold crews which had been brought from India changed the situations of communal classes totally. It put down a big and tough beat on feudal land ownership and its proletarians (Marx, 1968: 62). Silver and gold which had a movement in Europe increased after finding of mines which were richer and of which processing was easier in America in 16th century. So the value of silver and gold decreased if they were compared with other mines. Employees continued to get silver as money depending their workpower. Worker's financial price was at the same rate but their wages decreased. Because they had less goods in the consideration of same quantity silver. That situation made it possible that capital got big and communist bourgeoisie carried forward its ascension (Marx, 2003b: 33).

b) The finding of the ways of Geographical discoveries and new trade were the ones which generally formed the trade capital. The presence of usurer capital was needing some of the products to turn into goods and also it needed some of these products to develop near the goods trade in the various functions of money (Marx, 2004: 526). In that meaning, the awaken of trade again caused the awaken of usury again. Though usury was not in repose. Because money was service for arresting others labor by buying land, money and slave, money can be spent as capital and it can get interest. There were two characteristics which showed the presence of usury in the periods which prevented capitalist (Marx, 2004: 527). The first borrowed money was given to super class and landowner and the other was given to artisans who had their own labor vehicles. Artisans started not to pay the debt which they had borrowed in the length of time. They lost their own means of production. Because the debts which had been given lavish landowners spent freely were not taken, their lands were confiscated. There were many unemployed and idle people everywhere. Those people were not only the landowners. Those people were also artisans who had lost means of production and properties to live. "Independent" proletarian which had been created via accommodation of people with land by force and resolving links of feudal dependents was not assimilated by manufactures with the same speed. Additionally, those people who had been detached suddenly from their conventional life styles did not get used to live in that discipline which was needed by that new situation in the same speed. They become beggar, bribour and adrift with the effect of some aptitudes or many times with compulsion of conditions (Marx, 2003a: 630). "There were similar periods especially in 13th century but generally being adrift always developed at the end of 15th century and at the beginning 16th century. There were so

many adrifts that the England King Henri VIII as the many other kings had 72.000 of them hanged out and there must be a very big destitution to carry off finding them job and then at last they got over all the difficulties and they were successful in that goal. The quick improvement of manufacture was giving gradually an end to those idles especially in England." (Marx, 1968: 62)

The production styles were generally guild, manufacture and Huge Industry in the historical process. Guild is a middle ages production style. An artisan who work in guild had the authority to have a number of employees. S/he had the chance to have some limited number of workers who would obey his or her rules.

Manufacture is a production style which was active between years of 15th and 16th centuries and XVIII th and XIX th centuries. Manufacture is a planning which is as a home industry. The pieces of goods which had been produced was coming from different places and at the end of that process they were being installed in a place. The whole production process of a goods was not being done there. It was a production style which was more barbaric in Huge Industries and more developed in guild.

c) Different pieces were being functioned in only one place in other words it was functioned in factory organization and that situation was preparing the birth of Huge Industry Business Huge not in different places. There were two important invention which prepared the development of Huge Industry Business. Those were the invention of winder machine and the other is using of steam power in the production process. The first invention was the spinner machine, winder which had been invented by James Hargreaves in 1764. That machine was the beginning of bobin which was invented later and it was being moved by hand. That winder had sixteen or eighteen spindles while a normal winder had only one spindle also one employee was enough to do all work. That invention needed more yarns than the previous amount (Engels, 2007: 32). Winder was being developed regularly so that it would go with the change or else it would be thrown away. In reality, because capitalists used water power, they had the chance to prevent that situation by the help of old machines but it was impossible for the one by one spinners. That was the beginning of the factory but later it showed a new development with turning yarn machine which had been invented by Richard Arkwright in 1767. It was the most important invention of 18th century after steam engine. From the beginning it had been thought for Mechanical movement and it had been totally depended on new principles. Samuel Crompton who had put the features of yarn machines and winder together invented spool in 1785. The system of factory became the first in producing cotton yarn by the help of development of winder machine which belonged to Arkwright and its first step setup (a slight twist and roving twist). Those machines was applied to linen yarn gradually with small changings and it took place the hand working in that area, too. Nevertheless end had not come in that time yet. Dr. Cartwright invented engined weaving loom at the end of 18th century and he developed it well in 1804 thus it started to compete with hand weaving looms in a successful way. All of those machines were invented by James Watt in 1764 and that steam engine which provided driving energy became more important since 1785 (Engels, 2007: 34-35)

While putting many machines together in a large manufacture caused to usage of steam power, the competition between steam and human muscle made it quickly to gather machines and people in big factories (Marx, 2003a: 407). While revolution wind was sweeping country, there was a top and bottom situation

which was quiet and not less powerful in England. Steam and new machinery turned manufacture into modern big industry situation and thus it destroyed all the basic of bourgeois society. The slow development of manufacture period turned into a overwhelming lively period of production (Engels, 2003: 299)

d) Lastly, it was important to understand the process style of capitalist production style and modern production style. The goods which has been produced has double sides. One of them is to meet the need of people themselves and above this to not have a process. That side forms the usage value of goods. But if that goods exceeds its value and it changes with an other goods, it is called as changing value. While usage value is really important in terms of surviving of an employee and continuation of life, it is important to change with an other goods and make profit from it for the owner of capital. The usage value of a goods is important for the owner of capital, too. But that usage value is necessary which is produced by the owner if it subserves to person who will buy it. It means changing value for capitalists and it means usage value for the others.

G(goods) – M(Money) – G(goods) which is the most easy circulation style of goods is the turning of goods into money and turning of money into again goods also it is selling for buying. But there is one extra circulation way which is totally different from it. It is M-G-M1. It means turning of money into goods and then again turning of goods into money also it means buying to sell. It is indispensable condition for a capitalist to buy a goods, to handle it and to make profit it (Marx, 2003a: 139). The development of value which is objective or main source of M-G-M1 circulation is important for a capitalist because it is his or her subjective purpose. Step by step the capitalist become big by having a different character and s/he will function by having a conscious and willpower (Marx, 2003a: 143). M1 has been more than first M. M1 has started to have more value than the first money which was driven in the markets before. "I call that rise which is above its first value as "surplus-value". First driven value increases its first level and it puts a plus on its normal level. That movement turns it into capital." (Marx, 2003a: 142)

The capital of a capitalist consists of fixed capital, changing capital and surplus-value: $C(\text{Capital}) = f(\text{fixed capital}) + c(\text{changing capital}) + s(\text{surplus-value})$. The capitalist puts his or her money in a wholesale means of production. The money which is needed to buy means of production has been taken by him or her in one time. That means of production lives for a long time. The capital which has been put by the capitalist runs out by depending on the presence of that means of production. For example the money which is taken from a capitalist pocket to buy a yarn spinning machine is M. Suppose that the life of a means of production is 10 years. According to it, there is a transition from fixed capital into production process in the amount of $M/10$ every year. Fixed capital which has been spent by the capitalist for means of production will run out at the end of ten years. If capital does not add to production process depending to time, changing capital will appear. The capital which has been spent for raw materials and wages forms the changing capital. The value of raw materials and wages has passes to the production value in one time and wholly. They has been transmitted to production gradually as the elements of fixed capital (Marx, 2004: 100). The changing capital which has been paid in for wages causes to hand in a surplus-value via employees who have not got anything to live without wage : "c" turns into "c+...". Any wage has not been paid for that "+..." which has been added to "c". That is labor of

which response has not been paid.

Generally, profit and plus-value have been mixed with together. But there is an important difference between them. "Although every kind of surplus-value crystallizes under any private style (such as profit, usury and rent) later, originally it is like a substance structure of a labor of which response has not been paid. The secret to make capital bigger appears itself as saving authority which is related to others' a number of labors whose response has not been paid at the end" (Marx, 2003a: 457) "... profit is an other name which is given to surplus-value itself and it has been presented in correlation with total capital, it has not been presented with changing capital." (Marx, 2004: 191) "... On the other hand, the surplus-value rate is the rate of surplus-value to changing capital part." (Marx, 2003a: 448) We should think profit on total capital , in other words we should think it on "c". On the other hand , we should understand surplus-value on changing capital , in other words we should understand it on "c".

The fixed capital which is 400.000.000 Sterlin and the changing capital which is 100.000.000 Sterlin are different in every country in addition to that if we suppose that we have surplus-value as the amount of changing capital, let's think that we have a capital which is 600.000.000 Sterlin. Our profit will be 20% in other words our profit will be 100.000.000 Sterlin in that investment process. The surplus -value which has been won without paying any wage to employees will be 100% in other words it will be 100.000.000 Sterlin.

Suppose that capital which has been given as wage is 100 Sterlin. If the produced surplus-value is 100 Sterlin, it shows that the half of an employee' workforce occurs from the labor which has not been paid. Also if we measure that profit with capital which has been given as wage, we will say that the profit rate is hundred out of hundred because the given value is hundred and held value is two hundreds. On the other hand, if we take into account not only given capital as wage but also given social capital for example if we consider 400 Sterlin as the value of raw materials and 500 Sterlin as the value of machines, we will say that the rate of profit is 20%. Because a profit which is 100% is 1/5 of given total capital (Marx, 2003b: 81).

We should not see the difference between profit value and surplus-value only quantitatively. The qualitative difference between them is more important. The relation between capital and labor is relay clear in surplus-value. The amount of owned labor is certain without paying any labor. Profit causes a mediation because means of production have needed raw materials. Also whether means of production has been bought appropriately or not and whether raw materials have been bought affordly or not are included into work. Therefore, profit causes that surplus-value which is clear at the beginning will be seen with other things and it will be disappeared by other things at the end. The image of capitalist earnings are originated from these kind of things occurs. But the cause of getting surplus-value is not because of neither means of production nor raw materials directly or indirectly. The only way to live for an employee is labor without any wages is not paid more or less.

Weber who tries to explain the capitalist economy from the vital basis of a certain religion understanding says that the purpose of capitalism is not profit motive. " Many of the richest people, especially many of rich cities and the emperors which are the most developed ones suitably and economically in terms of natural

sources and associated networks accepted Protestantism in 16th century; the effects of these provide the Protestantism to be active in economic fight in today's world. But since that days that historical question has been asked to that situation. The question is that How will church revolution which is in economically developed places be explained? Surely the answer of is not easy. Getting rid of being traditional in economical situation has appeared as an element which support has supported process of insubordination to both religion tradition and traditional authorities. But today , it should be given too much attention to that subject: Reform is not to take totally all the effects of church authority on the people's life, reform is to change the presence style with a different meaning. Changing is to give its place to an authority who has an effect to all living styles, has a forever power, and observable effective in all the parts of private and social life .The rule of Catholic Church "which giving punishment to unbeliever and behaving softly to sinner" was more valid in the past than now it is. Now it is seen as a nice thing by people who has modern economic structure and also the people who lived in widest places richly and economically in 15th century saw it as a nice thing, too." (Weber, 2012: 24-25)

3. The Capitalism Analysis of Weber

Two important elements caused to the development of modern capitalism. "The discrimination of home and work" and "notebookkeeping" caused new capitalism to become more regular and planned. But these things are not enough for the development of capitalism. Capitalism is a product of certain living style It is a product of people who works for God, do not waste their money and tries to be away all the bad habits and luxuries things which will seduce them. It has developed as a result of life style in which people tries to exalt God's renown, spend every bit of time for God by working and give importance to time.

The intensive development of religion on life is related to an ascetic living style. We can not consubstantiate exactly that living style with traditional "first sin teaching". The first sin teaching of Middle Ages needed to break ties with life. On the other hand Puritan ascetic does not try to be away from that world. Unlike it gives importance to that world. It works on it, it exalts God's renown in such a way.

Aziz Paulus underpinned the first sin in the first periods when Christianity started to spread. He believed that human being was removed from heaven because s/he ate illicit fruit and then s/he was taken down to earth. "Sin entered the world via a person and death entered the world via sin. Thus death spreaded to all people. Because they all sinned." (Rom.5: 12) "Only one sin will cause condemnation of all people also only one accuracy event will acquit all people in the life." (Rom.5: 18) "Because how many of them were all seen as sin because of an intractable man, many of them will be seen as truthful after obeying behaviour of a man." (Rom.5: 19) "God presented the Messiah as the sacrifice whose blood would forgive sin and it was embraced with faith. Thus God showed the justice. Because God forgave all the old sins by being patient. God did it to show God's own justice, to be stay in just, to acquit people who believed in Jesus in present time ." (Rom.3: 25-26) "Jesus was confessed to death for our sins and he was awakened for our acquittance." (Rom.4: 25) According to Augustinus, if God is good and if the world is God's creation, how will be devilry in that world? Augustinus tried to overcome that conflict like this : "I am sure that when I want something or not, There is not anybody except me who

want this or not. So this is me. The reason of sin was that which I tried to understand gradually." (Augustinus, 2012: VII. 3) The reason of sin was me. If I had not sinned, How would I have underwent a trial due to a sin which was not related to me? God does not want me to do anything bad so the reason for unhandled sin is not to obey the rules of God and to choose the bad though I should head towards good.

Boethius is asking, too. His question is that "If there is God, Where does devilry originate from? If there is not God, Where does goodness come from?" (Boethius, 2006: 67). But additionally, he answered like this: "An being who has the power to do everything, s/he will do everthing. There was nothing, I said. Then Will God do devilry? No, I said. Then...There is no devilry." (Boethius, 2006: 229)

Thomas defended that there were two devilry types, one of them was physical devilry and the other was ethic devilry. "We needed to present illnesses as the original penalty of sin as the requirement of Catholic belief." (Thomas, 2003: 243) He was answering like this. "Body had the penalty of sin which had been done by Adem." (Tomas, 2003: 247) The first sin was not the source of ethic devilry. The reason of it was our own self-control. Ethic devilry occurs when our self-control is under enjoyable thing's domination (Tomas, 2003: 71). Therefore we can be responsible for the events which we have done so far.

The color of the first sin's comment changes vitally with Calvin. "If the apostacy by which man withdraws from the authority of his Maker, nay, petulantly shakes off his allegiance to him, is a foul and execrable crime, it is in vain to extenuate the sin of Adam. Nor was it simple apostacy. It was accompanied with foul insult to God, the guilty pair assenting to Satan's calumnies when he charged God with malice, envy, and falsehood. In fine, infidelity opened the door to ambition, and ambition was the parent of rebellion, man casting off the fear of God, and giving free vent to his lust." (Calvin, dateless: II. I) "In particular, the miserable ruin into which the revolt of the first man has plunged us, compels us to turn our eyes upwards ; not only that while hungry and famishing we may thence ask what Ave want, but being aroused by fear may learn humility." (Calvin, dateless: I. I)

Calvin thinks that the only saver of human beings is God. Paulus also defended that God was important for the saving of people. But Calvin goes beyond from Paulus. "In conformity, therefore, to the clear doctrine of the Scripture, we assert, that by an eternal and immutable counsel, God has once for all determined, both whom he would admit to salvation, and whom he would condemn to destruction. We affirm that this counsel, as far as concerns the elect, is founded on his gratuitous mercy, totally irrespective of human merit; but that to those whom he devotes to condemnation, the gate of life is closed by a just and irreprehensible, but incomprehensible, judgment." (Calvin, dateless: III. XXI)

According to Weber, the core of belief type which lies under capitalism is this. "The only thing we know is that some people will rescue and the others will stay as damned, to realise that humanistic skill or sin has an important role in defining that fate is a conjecture of the changement of God's unchanging absolute freedom behest from the eternity .(Weber, 2010: 83) At the beginning, there was a big rupture and dissociation between people and God . This was because of the first sin. But we should not think that we can join that rupture with only people working

or labor. Because God's decision is deathless and timeless.

There is a big conflict in that part. If a person is not sure that whether s/he will be chosen and rescued or not then Why does s/he work for God? Why does s/he try to increase God's chance? In exactly that point, Weber focuses on the impossibility of relation which we have established. "What we have focused on is the source of irrational element which lies under every "job" concept as it is here." (Weber, 2012: 62) "Decree absolute element of Calvinism was only one of the different possibilities. But nevertheless, we persuaded themselves that it had not got any unique consistency in its own type" (Weber, 2012: 105)

Result

The reason why Weber is interested in modern capitalism is the thought which says that there is not a direct relation between capitalism and gainings, also winning and picking up profit impetus. Because winning desire was the biggest desire of many people in the past as it is same in today's world. Waiters, doctors, drivers, artists, call girls and many people have a purpose for job. So winning desire is not the reason for the capitalism in modern societies. But there is a problem. Profit which has been believed as the reason for capitalism by Weber is not the reason for capitalism according to Marx. According to Marx; forming of capital, appearing of unemployed and idle people, the spinning machine which provide the place for people to work all together and application of steam power in industry are the main reasons for the formation of capitalism with the development of trade and usury since 15th and 16th centuries. The purpose of profit could explain the process of capitalist organizing. Marx is against of that idea, too. According to him, the problem is distaining to employee's labor without paying any money. But profit consists not only the other's distained labor but also capital which holds and exploits other's labor. (Marx, 2004: 452). Thus the profit rate depends on not only surplus-value but also many conditions such as; savings taken from fixed capital, the methods more productive than the average, means of production's buying prices (Marx, 2004: 330).

We should understand the difference between Marx and Weber. The reason for Marx's criticism about capitalist economy is not the "profit" which appeared after the production period and formed after "f+c+s". Marx is against to "s". "Marx always focuses on that his own surplus-value should not be mixed with profit or capital gaining because he says that in reality his own surplus-value is a kind of surplus-value or many times it is only a piece of surplus-value." (Engels, 2003: 239) The main problem is the unchanging reality which lies under those various profit images. The gaining which has been taken from changing capital provides those various profit images to appear. Profit makes that relation invisible. It makes an image which shows that taken gaining comes from means of production and other elements for which unchanging capital has been spent. But There is nothing like this in unchanging capital. Capital is against for labor slightly.

We can get surplus-value over employees via the help of changing capital and capital which has been paid for wages. We can get profit by getting surplus-value not only over employees via the help of unchanging capital and capital which has been paid for means of production but also over whole production process. There is an important discrimination between profit and surplus-value. Surplus-value takes place in the origin of all these relations. Profit is only the image of these relations. Its provision in

agriculture department is "rent". Surplus-value lies under their basic. If there is not any surplus-value, neither profit nor rent will develop. Surplus-value provides the formation of both profit and rent. In that meaning, surplus-value should be prevented and disaccorded firstly. Means of production should be the capital not only of only one person but also of whole society not to formation of surplus-value. It is not enough. Socialized means of production should be worked for society. By using this way we can prevent the holding of unpaid labor and exploitation of their labor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AUGUSTINUS, Aurelius (2010), İtiraf, Translator: Çiğdem Dürüşken, Kabcacı Publishing House, İstanbul
- BENJAMIN, Walter (2009), Pasajlar, Translator: Ahmet Cemal, Yapı Kredi Publishing House, VII. Press, İstanbul
- Boethius (2006), Felsefenin Tesellisi, Translator: Çiğdem Dürüşken, Kabcacı Publishing House, İstanbul
- CALVIN, John (Dateless), Institutes of the Christian Religion I, Translator: Henry Beveridge, The Edinburgh Printing Company, Edinburgh
- _____(Dateless): Institutes of the Christian Religion II, Translator: John Allen, Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia
- ENGELS, Friedrich (2003), Anti-Dühring, Translator has not been defined, Eriş Publishing House, III. Press, Place has not been specified.
- _____(2007), İngiltere'de Emekçi Sınıfın Durumu, Translator has not been defined, Eriş Publishing House, The place has not been specified
- _____(2009), "Ludwig Feuerbach ve Klasik Alman Felsefesinin Sonu", Felsefe İncelemeleri, Karl Marx-F. Engels, Translator: Cem Eroğul, Yordam Book, İstanbul, 11-77
- HEGEL, G. W. F (2011a), Tarih Felsefesi -1, Translator: Aziz Yardımlı, İdea Publishing House, III. Press, İstanbul
- _____(2011b), Tarih Felsefesi -2, Translator: Aziz Yardımlı, İdea Publishing House Yayınevi, III. Press, İstanbul
- Herodotus (2007), Tarih, Translator: Furkan Akderin, Alfa Press Extension, İstanbul
- MARX, Karl _____(1968), Alman İdeolojisi, Translator: Selâhatin Hilâv, Sosyal Publishing House Publications, İstanbul
- _____(2003a), Kapital I, Translator: Alaattin Bilgi, Eriş Publishing House Publications, III. Press, The place has not been specified
- _____(2003b), Ücretli Emek ve Sermaye / Ücret, Fiyat ve Kâr, Translator has not been defined, Eriş Publishing House Publications, The place has not been specified
- _____(2004), Kapital III, Translator: Alaattin Bilgi, Eriş Publishing House, II. Press, The place has not been specified
- PIRENNE, Jacques (Dateless), Büyük Dünya Tarihi, Meydan, The place has not been specified
- THOMAS, Aquinas (2003), On Evil, Translator: Richard Regan, Oxford Press, Oxford
- WEBER, Marx (2010), Protestan Ahlakı ve Kapitalizmin Ruhunu, Translator: Gülistan Solmaz, Alter Publishing House, II. Press, Ankara