



*Makalenin Türü: Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

*Geliş Tarihi / First Received: 23.08.2023

*Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 19.10.2023

*Atıf Bilgisi: Gürel, K. T. (2023). "Kültürel Çalışmalar Üzerinde Batı Marksizminin Etkisi". Hars Akademi, 6 (2), 286-296.

*Citation: Gürel, K. T. (2023). "The Impact Of Western Marxism On Cultural Studies". Hars Akademi, 6 (2), 286-296.

THE IMPACT OF WESTERN MARXISM ON CULTURAL STUDIES

*Kazım Tolga GÜREL**

Abstract

Marxism is an ideology that is mixed with many currents of thought. It has been embodied as a form of government in various forms in different geographies and has evolved under the influence of cultures and thinkers in the geographies where it was shaped. In many countries where the working class did not directly take power, it also influenced the practices of bourgeois-democratic governments in capitalist countries. It had an impact on political movements such as social democracy. In addition, the struggles of the working class have influenced many practices, from the education system to the insurance system, from eight-hour working hours and holidays to equal voting rights and anti-fascist laws.

Marxism, an ideology that directly influenced the social sciences, apart from the political openings and new perspectives it caused, is one of the waves of ideas that most affected the cultural structure regarding ideologies. As Adorno emphasized, science needs the disobedient, and the pioneers of many intellectual movements that have had a significant impact on cultural life are Marxists or people who look at life from a perspective close to this perspective. This study will explain the influence of the representatives of British cultural studies, an essential link of Western Marxism, on Marxism and their contributions to social sciences.

Keywords: Cultural Studies, Ideology, Western Marxism, Orthodox Marxism.

KÜLTÜREL ÇALIŞMALAR ÜZERİNDE BATI MARKSİZMİNİN ETKİSİ

Öz

Marksizm, birçok düşünce akımıyla yoğrulmuş bir ideolojidir. Farklı coğrafyalarda çeşitli şekillerde yönetim biçimi olarak vücut bulmuş ve kültürlerin, şekillendiği coğrafyalardaki düşünürlerin etkisiyle evrilmiştir. İşçi sınıfının doğrudan iktidara geçmediği pek çok ülkede kapitalist ülkelerdeki burjuva-demokratik yönetimlerin uygulamalarını da etkilemiş, sosyal demokrasi vb. gibi siyasi akımlar üzerinde de etkili olmuştur. Bunun dışında işçi sınıfının mücadeleleri; eğitim sisteminden sigorta sistemine, sekiz saat çalışma süresi ve tatillerden eşit oy hakkı ve anti faşist kanunlara kadar birçok uygulamayı etkilemiştir.

Siyasi açıdan neden olduğu açılımlar ve yeni perspektifler dışında sosyal bilimleri doğrudan etkileyen bir ideoloji olan Marksizm, ideolojiler açısından kültürel yapıyı en fazla etkileyen fikir dalgalarından biridir. Adorno'nun vurguladığı gibi bilim, kendisine itaatsiz olana ihtiyaç duyar ve kültürel yaşamda büyük etkileri olan nice düşünsel akımın öncüsü Marksist ya da bu perspektife yakın açılardan yaşama bakan kişilerdir. Bu çalışmada Batı Marksizminin önemli bir halkası olan İngiliz kültürel çalışmaları temsilcilerinin Marksizme etkisi ve sosyal bilimlere katkıları anlatılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kültürel çalışmalar, ideoloji, Batı Marksizmi, Ortodoks Marksizm.

* Dr., kazimtolgagurel78@gmail.com / ORCID: 0000-0002-1893-8887

Fundamental Distinction: Differences Between Western Marxism And Orthodox Marxism

Until 1914, European Marxism was dominated by Leninist interpretations of Marxism. The Second International was founded in 1889 and dissolved in 1916. The main reasons for this disintegration were the divergence of social democrats and revolutionary communists on many points. One of the main reasons for this rupture was that social democratic parties supported their countries during World War I (Giddens 2013; Scharf 2019). According to Vincent, after the Second International, which dominated European Marxism until 1914, the driving force of Marxism was the German Social Democratic Party, which derived from the Social Democratic Workers' Party of 1869 (Vincent, 2006: 136). After the Soviet Union was established, it directly took over the Third International.

The phenomenon of most of the essential Marxist-oriented parties in France, Germany, and Austria voting in favor of war loans in 1914 quickly destroyed any notion of revolutionary international unity and solidarity (Drucker 2012; Eagleton 2013). The Third International, which emerged in the heat of the 1914-1918 war, was this time based on the Bolsheviks in the USSR. Lenin was now the central figure, and Marxist-Leninism became the primary official doctrine (Xiu-qin 2015; Kachurin 2013). Marxist revisionism, which had begun to flourish in the early 1900s, spread across Europe without losing power. The German Social Democratic Party gradually shifted to a more revisionist democratic socialist stance, especially after 1945. British socialism retained its unique and peculiar reformist direction. More profound differences emerged within Marxism, whose cracks widened significantly after 1945 (Fitzpatrick 2007; Taras 2015).

Apart from these historical developments, Western Marxism's ideological structure differs from Orthodox Marxism in that it is based on Marx's early ideas. The late Marx shapes orthodox Marxism. Marx was a Left Hegelian in his early works. According to Lambier, it was the Right Hegelians who saw the concept of the "Organic State" that Hegel suggested would be established in the future as the Germany of that day and the Left Hegelians who did not see it as the Germany of that day and stated that this state would be established at a later stage through a different evolution (Lambier 2008). Marx's youth was spent among the Left Hegelians. In the 1844 Manuscripts, he is seen to criticize political economy, and it is as if he is making a preliminary preparation for Capital. Starting with criticisms of political economy such as "the union between capitalists is habitual and efficient, the union between workers is forbidden and fraught with sad consequences for them" (Marx 1993: 88), "Capital is accumulated labor" (Marx 1993: 103). Marx enters the phenomenon of alienated labor in the next chapter.

According to Marx, the more wealth the worker produces, the more his production increases in power and volume, and the poorer he becomes. The more commodities he produces, the cheaper a commodity he becomes. The devaluation of the world of people increases in proportion to the appreciation of the world of things. Labor not only produces commodities; to the extent that it produces commodities in general, it produces itself and the worker as commodities (Marx 1993: 141). Marx focuses on the individual at many points during his youth. He focuses on the criticism of Hegel. Marx's early philosophical views cannot be limited to these, but these are essential. According to Vincent, Marx's early philosophical writings, especially his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts, discovered in the 1920s, reveal another side of Marx: the autonomous human self and free will. In these early writings, alienation is a moral and philosophical dilemma, not just a capitalist one. History is not subject to rigid objective laws but rather to the flexible tendencies of human beings and their liberation from spiritual alienation. Consciousness and moral convictions play a specific role in human events. This general trend of thought, which carried over into the twentieth century, was accompanied by the work of authors such as Gramsci, Marcuse, Lukacs, Korsh, and the Frankfurt School (Vincent, 2006: 153-154). These ideas are essential stages in the evolution of Western Marxism.

Marcuse, in particular, was a thinker who influenced Western Marxism in practice by influencing students in the 1968 street movements. "What is denounced as 'utopia' is no longer what 'has no place' and cannot have a place in the historical universe, but rather what is prevented from occurring by the forces of established societies." Marcuse's ideas were on the streets during the 1968 revolt (Marcuse, 2013:13).

Marcuse (1998), who says that the absence of human dignity in the options of reality, universal servitude, and prefabricated freedom emerges behind the veil of political democracy, emphasizes that capitalism, in particular, enslaves human beings by producing one-dimensional human beings. He focuses more on consumer society, alienation, and freedom. By saying that technological rationality is a political process (Marcuse, 1968:73), he expands the field of study of capitalist power considerably.

Cultural Studies in the Tradition of Western Marxism

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the women's and civil rights movements forced the recognition of the significance of gender and "race" in constructing forms of oppression and subordination, and a new analysis emerged (Munns, Rajan, Bromley 1995). Cultural studies began to spread around the world in the 1980s. It moved away from class analysis due to the effects of the historical context and the new right that neoliberal policies would shape. Racism, sexism, and the culture industry started to attract attention within cultural studies (During 1999). Different dimensions of domination and identification with different groups developed in this process. In this change, an analysis of hierarchies and inequalities is considered necessary. Class, race-ethnicity, and gender have taken their place in some analyses as the holy trinity in this respect (Hall, 1980: 269).

When we look at the prominent thinkers in cultural studies, we can see that these names are Marxist-leaning thinkers influenced by Western Marxism. Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, two critical thinkers of cultural studies, confirm this assertion (James 1988; Grossberg 2013). These representatives of cultural studies differ from orthodox Marxist thinkers in terms of examining cultural structure in depth, even though they ultimately emphasize the determinism of the economy (Kellner 2011).

In this context, they approach Weber in the Marx-Weber distinction, which is often perceived as a distinction due to Talcot Parsons' interpretations of Weber, where Weber ultimately recognizes the determinism of the economy (Turner 2000). In fact, without going into the debate on whether the roots of capitalism are in the economy or in culture, which is seen as the Marx-Weber distinction, it should be noted that Engels, in his letters to Joseph Bloch, emphasized that they would be accused of economic reductionism in the future and that they, of course, recognized the importance of culture. However, he states that he emphasized this because all the explanations of his time were far from emphasizing the determinism of the economy (Marx, Engels, 2018).

Like Weber, Marx believes in the structural irrationality of the capitalist spirit. Marx, however, sees this irrationality (which admittedly has its internal coherence and rationality) not as the product of external, non-economic, religious forces, as Weber suggests, but as the natural, intrinsic, and essential character of the capitalist mode of production (as an alienated social process) (Löwy 1999: 82). These ideas of Marx and Weber about the roots of capitalism have influenced cultural studies just as much as if not more than, the political distinctions of Marxism described in the previous section. This is because Weber's value of cultural elements, especially religion, is evident in the analysis of capitalism.

After the experiences of fascism and Stalinism, Benjamin realized that technology, even in Marxist hands, would sterilize life as long as it broke away from tradition. In this respect, he clung to surrealism and romanticism (Cohen, 1993: 108). All ideologies become instruments of oppression in the hands of the state and especially in the formulas of the nation-state. Just as Benjamin turned to surrealism in the negative experiences of orthodox Marxism, anti-capitalism finds a breath in this art movement.

After these trends, which are said to have an indirect impact on cultural studies, we can move on to other, less indirect trends, and at this point, Georg Lucaks can be brought to the fore. Georg Lucaks aimed to create a new Marxist aesthetic by returning to its Hegelian source (Lequenne 2000: 14). These transformations of Marxist aesthetic criticism in art circles are precursors of the evolution of orthodox Marxism.

Although it may seem distant from cultural studies, the rise of surrealist art in Europe is another point to be mentioned regarding the break with orthodox Marxism and the strengthening of different interpretations of Marxism (Short 1966). The new Marxist aesthetic understandings developed within surrealist art preceded the rupture of cultural studies. Lev Trotsky and Andre Breton's interpretations of art and Plekhanov and Lunacharski's criticisms of orthodox Marxist interpretations of art brought the tendency towards surreal art into Marxist thought, which became more widespread in the 1920s and 1968s. According to some Western Marxist thinkers, surreal art is a revolutionary art (Löwy, 2009). Especially during the Second World War, surreal art dominated the mass of intellectuals. Walter Benjamin stated that the closest art to communist art is surrealist art (Spiteri, Lacoss, 2020).

Cultural studies read the process of analyzing the symbols and elements of culture disseminated in society through sovereignty and cultural dependency. In this sense, it approaches semiology/semiotics and is fed by structuralism. In order to understand the development of cultural studies, it is necessary to look at

semiological studies (Morley 2003; Surber 2018). The study of semiology began in Europe with Ferdinand De Saussure. It continued after him with the efforts of representatives of the Soviet Language School, Bakhtin and Volashinov, Roland Barthes, Charles Sanders Pierce, Basil Bernstein, and others who worked on symbols and signification (Krampen 1987; Lewis 2013).

The main distinctions in the views of those who think about language and symbols are those based on taking synchronicity or diachronicity as the basis for the formation of language or on sharpening the distinction between language and speech. In this sense, Saussure distinguished between language and speech. Arguing that the structure of language functions just like the subconscious in Freud's theory, Saussure states that the speech circulating in society is fundamentally affected by this structure. Dividing language into three dimensions, Saussure makes a distinction between the language faculty-speech (langage), language as a system of forms (langue), and speech in transformation in society (parole). Among these distinctions, he places the structure of language (langue) on the ground of language research (Rıfat 2005). The language/speech distinction underlying Ferdinand De Saussure's views takes place within the framework of sociology and psychology at the end of the nineteenth century. According to him, linguistic communication is primarily a psychological and social phenomenon. A language is an event that concerns the whole society, not just individuals; it is a supra-individual system, an abstraction. It is only through this system that communication is established between people.

On the other hand, speech is a particular and variable form of realization of the language system; more precisely, it is the concrete use of language. Language is social (the phenomenon of memory), while speech is individual (the phenomenon of creation) (Rıfat 2005: 26-27). Saussure sees language as a trans-individual concept.

Volashinov/Bakhtin opposes Saussure's distinction and argues that utterance is a sign that can be taken as a basis for the study of language and that, like any sign, it cannot be separated from society and ideology. In this context, Volashinov/Bakhtin focus all their attention on speech and orality. They claim that social conflicts, relations of domination, resistance, and hierarchies can be seen in linguistic communication, which is inextricably linked to other communication systems (Volashinov 2001: 48).

Stating that speech, a signifier, is also involved in ideological relations, these thinkers do not separate the formation of consciousness from external reality. Volashinov/Bakhtin explains the ground on which the word gains reality and is structured with the following emphasis:

"The performative reality of language-speech lies not in the abstract system of linguistic forms, not in the isolated monological utterance, not in the practice of this isolated utterance, but in the social event of linguistic communication put into practice in a utterance or utterances" (Volashinov, 2001: 159).

The parallels between Volashinov's statements and Hall's work and the analysis of ideology show that semiological studies influenced the most important representatives of cultural studies.

Bakhtin states that the text (whether written or spoken) reflects reality, that it is an unmediated reality: *"Where there is no text, there can be no object of study, no object of thought"* (Bakhtin 2001:335). Focusing on the text to this extent will, after a while, direct attention to the constitutive objects of the text, in other words, coding. The ideology of signs and their relationship with domination will be questioned.

With the contributions of Roland Barthes, semiotic studies have shifted from the field of language to the signs in everyday life, and the ideological bombardment of signs has gained more clarity. In this sense, the impact of social changes on the spoken word cannot be considered independent of a structural system, the system's paradigm in which the spoken word is also embedded.

"The world is full of signs, but not all of these signs can be as simple as the letters of the alphabet, the signs on a transportation code or military uniforms: There are infinitely more intricate, more complex ones. Most of the time they are recognized as natural knowledge" (Barthes 2005: 186).

In this sense, the individual's consciousness is formed in constant interaction with a structure of signs within the system. Basil Bernstein's theory of the relationship and difference between the "voice" and the "message" and of the limited and functional linguistic forms produced, legitimized, and reproduced by classes in society has important implications for the language practices of the working classes. Bernstein proposes two codes: restricted and elaborated. Within the restricted code, found mainly among working-class speakers, language is context-dependent and concrete and contributes to communal solidarity. Dominantly, middle-class speakers of elaborated codes maintain their roles, and their language is universalizing, abstract, formally

complex, and self-reflexive. The terms of this opposition can be applied to the difference between popular and high culture (Güngör 1999).

According to Basil Bernstein, working-class children have limited access to elaborate codes and, therefore, limited access to the dominant culture carried within such codes. This is a kind of cultural and perhaps cognitive and linguistic poverty. Bernstein's ideas suggest that elements of popular culture lead to a shaping of thought (Bernstein 1958).

All these studies mentioned above have been instrumental in the emergence of the school of cultural studies by creating a corpus of codes and significations. The work of thinkers such as Basil Bernstein directly on subcultures and the working class has been instrumental in cultural studies seeing the working class as a cultural field and moving in that direction. However, it is essential to go back further and examine Antonio Gramsci in particular in order to show the emergence of cultural studies and the elements that influenced it. Gramsci's contributions to Marxist ideology and the concepts he produced are at the very center of cultural studies.

According to Gramsci, culture enters the picture when it is realized that an essential element of state power is the control of ideas as much as the use of physical force (for example, by the police). The key concept here is hegemony. Hegemony is the ability of the state and the ruling class to regulate beliefs within civil society. Hegemonic beliefs are dominant cultural motifs that reinforce inequality and stifle attempts at critical thinking. They reduce the level of power needed to maintain social order while paving the way for even more effective rule for dominant groups (Smith 2007: 62).

Gramsci speaks of a group that controls the codes and symbols distributed throughout society and calls them "organic intellectuals". According to Gramsci, the activities of organic intellectuals play a central role in disseminating hegemonic beliefs. These people, like priests and journalists, translate complex philosophical and political issues into everyday language and guide the masses on how to act (Gramsci, 2005). Gramsci's ideas about organic intellectuals were formed early when he had not yet joined the communist party. His thoughts on petty-bourgeois culture and bureaucratic sectors in his writings after December 2-3, 1919, in Italy were the basis of his ideas on organic intellectuals in later years. In these early years, he defended the liberal democratic structure due to historical circumstances, and his ideas were not yet radicalized (Filippini, 2016). In one of these early writings, Gramsci states:

"In the final analysis, the struggle was for the defense of the liberal-democratic state, for the liberation of the liberal-democratic state from the yoke of a section of the bourgeoisie, the worst, the most odious, the most useless and the most parasitic section of the bourgeoisie: the petty and middle bourgeoisie, the 'intellectual' bourgeoisie, the patrilineal bourgeoisie of public services, the petty tradesmen, small industrialists and farmers, the urban merchants and rural moneylenders. (...) The petty and middle bourgeoisie is, in fact, a rotten, despicable and degenerate mass of people that capitalism uses to maintain its economic and political power" (Gramsci 1998: 31-32).

From 1919 until his arrest in 1926, Gramsci's political insights were dominated by 'revolutionary realism' (Löwy 1999: 144), shaped by the first four congresses of the Communist International. Gramsci's comments on the bureaucratic sectors, the "intellectual" bourgeoisie, and the petty bourgeoisie would be written more regularly in the following years. They would feed into his comments on the sectors that maintained hegemony (Monasta, 2010).

Gramsci's emphasis on culture and ideology, on mass revolution, can best be expressed in terms of hegemony, a concept first used in Greek times to describe the domination of one state or ruler over another: Gramsci later expanded this concept to describe the dominance of one social class over another social class, its ability to impose its worldview, its ideology, partly by force, but mainly by persuasion or at least acceptance (Slattery 2007: 240-241). *"Gramsci recognizes that hegemony can never be complete, that there will always be struggles for ideological control - among the ruling and working classes. All ruling classes have to make compromises if they want to maintain popular support and remain powerful. Complete brainwashing is impossible, even in a totalitarian state"* (Santucci 2010). Even if capitalist ideas permeate modern society, people's experience clearly reveals the capitalist economy's weaknesses, harms, and exploitation. People can understand capitalist propaganda; they can see the need for reform if not radical change; they can see life as it is and as it should be. Therefore, For Gramsci, complete hegemony is impossible until reality and ideology are

the same. Capitalism cannot achieve complete domination because of its fundamental contradictions. In order to maintain its power, it has to make concessions and gain the consent and legitimacy of society (Slattery 2007: 242-243). Gramsci's ideas on hegemony were combined with the more powerful interpretive tools of British cultural studies during the 1970s. They formed the basis of their efforts to understand mass media and everyday life (Ruggieri 2021).

According to Gramsci (1983), organic intellectuals are the ambassadors of the ruling class. Their task is to maintain social hegemony and disseminate ideas in the political leadership's interest. Bora (2021: 78) argues that Gramsci states that no power in the modern period can survive solely through coercion and force or political leadership alone, that politics based on a balance of coercion and persuasion is necessary for hegemonic power, and that this balance must be constantly reproduced. He emphasized that a historical bloc is necessary to establish hegemony.

Gramsci argues that in the democratic societies of the modern period, power is produced and operated in an environment of hegemonic relations based on consent. He points out that in democratic societies, especially civil social organizations are important hegemonic spaces. He also states that intellectuals play an essential role in establishing and maintaining power in hegemonic relations. In particular, organic intellectuals, who emerge periodically and are somehow articulated to the powers of the period in which they are involved, have an essential role in the execution of the hegemonic relationship (Gramsci, 1997).

After a brief look at Gramsci's concepts, it can be shown that the two most prominent names of cultural studies, Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, are close to Western Marxism.

Prominent Figures in British Cultural Studies: Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall

In the 1960s, the multicultural structure of Western countries created mixed communities with waves of immigration. This was especially true in the USA. Similar multiculturalism in the UK has led to a plural society. Cultural Studies witnesses a paradigm shift around this new reality. Culture is now considered "a set of differences as opposed to nature" (Bourse, Yücel 2017: 130). The subculture and class relations produced by these immigrants have produced new fields of study and topics in social sciences.

The Frankfurt school articulated cultural situations in which monopoly capitalism and Fordism (mass production and consumption regime) were on the state stage. British Cultural Studies was born in the 1960s, a period of global resistance to consumer capitalism, a series of revolutionary movements (the 1968 generation), and the emergence of new capital relations characterized as "Post-Fordism." Post-modernity and other terminologies were also used to characterize social and cultural formation during this period. Moreover, while in the 1950s and early 1960s in Britain and much of Europe, there were still significant tensions between the old working class-based culture and mass culture based on the products of the American culture industry, early British cultural studies evaluated cultural forms with class contradictions in mind (Kellner 2016).

The influence of Gramsci's concept of "Hegemony" on the thinking of the Cultural Studies Tradition, especially Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, is significant. Cultural studies interrogate processes of signification and representation. According to Wood, Birmingham's studies of the 1970s often had a strong relationship with sociology. They tried to embrace social cohesion, subculture, labeling, etc., by subjecting them to Marxist critique rather than abandoning them altogether. Within this framework, he attempted to analyze hegemony (Wood 1998). His work criticizing Margaret Thatcher's right-wing conservative policies that protected the ruling classes deciphered state hegemony (Jessop & others 1985). Hall and Williams have been influential enough to generate various debates on some Marxist approaches.

Today, these approaches emphasize the materiality of culture, but they do not accept a 'reflexive' understanding of culture (where the cultural and ideological superstructure mirrors the infrastructure). They treat hegemony/dominance and cultural dependency as dynamic relations; in other words, domination is not a passive form of domination; relations of domination are always being defended, revised, and open to resistance and debate. They do not only focus on how the media produce and reproduce domination and ideology and how they position the audience but also on how the lower classes or the working class resist and create their own cultures of resistance (Erdoğan, Alemdar 1998: 285).

Cultural Studies approaches to culture are based on Williams' conceptualizations, and in this sense, Williams examines the process of culture finding meaning on economic, political, and social axes. Williams approaches culture from a holistic perspective and emphasizes that the history of culture is formed with

changing social conditions. Although Williams' approach to culture focused on the sociological axis in later years, the basis of his understanding of culture is the reproduction and distribution of culture, the impact of culture on consciousness, and the role of social institutions in the formation of the form of culture (Smith 2007: 211).

In his book "Culture", Raymond Williams states the three main qualities of his work as follows: a) emphasis on the social material in artworks, b) emphasis on the social conditions of art, c) emphasis on the social relations that emerge in artworks (Williams 2017: 19). In the book's first part, where these emphases are summarized, Williams notes the need for more of Marx and Engels' work on art as if to complete this deficiency (Williams 2017).

Williams states that the sociological analysis of culture should start with the concrete elements seen, but if it is limited to these concrete elements, the interpretations will be sterile. It is fundamental for Williams to go down to the substructural process and to look for the impact of these substructural changes on the cultural element. He states this as follows: There is often a close connection between the official and conscious beliefs of a class or other group and the cultural productions that are articulated with them: Sometimes, these are direct links to beliefs within a particular context; often, these links can be traced in the relations, perspectives, and values that legitimize or normalize beliefs and the characteristic choices of the subject (Williams 2017: 26).

The sections in which he emphasizes the reproduction processes occupy ample space in the book and indicate that the young Marx influenced Williams and did not experience a fundamental break with his work. He deconstructs examples of these conditions of reproduction in art (Higgins 2013). Referring to the struggle of asymmetrical social relations, Williams gives examples of asymmetry, such as the state-capitalist market and church-publication production techniques. He states that the market is liberating in art, but this role also reproduces sovereign control. Briefly mentioning the transition from oral to written form and the evolutionary writing process, he also influenced technological determinists such as McLuhan, Walter Ong, and Barry Sanders came after him (Higgins 1982).

In another work, "Marxism and Literature," Williams enters issues that the Marxist tradition of thought does not approach and continues to interpret these issues. He also reformulates the questions posed by the Marxist tradition. He discusses the question, "Is man the maker of history?". Through Vico and Herder's thoughts, he also shows the evolution of this question. However, he defends the rightness of Marxism and says that the interpreters before Marx missed the power relations in how the concept of "civilization" is handled. "Marxism's most significant later departure was its rejection of what Marx called 'idealist historiography' and, in this sense, the theoretical operations of the Enlightenment. Williams criticizes Marx in this respect. He says that "culture" is taken only as a superstructural institution, and its constituent elements are obscured by economic reductionism (Williams, 1977).

In the following chapters of his book "Marxism and Literature," Williams touches upon the language issue. He states that Marxism has not addressed this issue and that he will attempt to develop Marxism in this regard. He says that two points concern Marxism in the development of language studies. These are "language as activity" and "the study of language history." The approach to language as an activity parallels the idea of "man creating his society" developed in the eighteenth century. In the section on the history of language, where he examines its historical process, he describes the period from Plato to the ideas of the Soviet Language School (Volashinov) excellently (Williams 1958).

Before examining his views on literature and the changes in literature, Williams describes the theories of language and consciousness. However, he explains the language process neither by suppressing only the social aspect like Volashinov nor by basing it on the biological evolutionary process like Chomsky. Both are acknowledged, but changing social practices are expressed more dominantly. He does not reduce the shifts in meaning provided by these changing social practices to a substructural process (Wallace, Jones, Nield 1997).

In the substructure-superstructure debate, he stated that this process of structural interaction is based on one of Marx's two different expressions and attempted to explain the superstructure concept. Legal processes indicate modes of production, forms of consciousness, and people's positions, which they feel to some extent. Williams takes their analysis as an examination not only of their relations with the substructure but also of their relations with it and each other. He first analyzes the visible expressions of each field. Combining this with the knowledge gained in the next chapter (productive forces), Williams says that the concept of productive forces lies at the heart of the debate on infrastructure and superstructure. However, he states that it is essential to know

the changes in this concept to understand Marxist orientations and embarks on this. He states that the productive forces are all the means that produce and reproduce life. In general, in this section, Williams shows the impact of the interpretations of Marxism in its historical process on the determination of this substructure (Brenkman, 1995).

In his book "Marxism and Literature," Williams discusses the formation of art and develops this discussion in the section entitled "From Reflection to Mediation." He states that orthodox Marxist views deal with the idea of reflection and defines *reflection* as the statement that "in the last instance it will necessarily be a reflection of a material reality". Since the artist's mind is also affected by material processes, it is causally material in origin. However, according to Williams, activity, that is, the activity of the individual, is excluded here. In this activity, the elements of culture should be noticed. Mechanical materialism excluded this activity. However, historical materialism interpreted this activity as one of its foundations. In the end, what is produced is not art but ideology. However, orthodox Marxism takes some concepts negatively. Mediation is one of them. According to Williams, the contributions of the Frankfurt School have shown that this concept is not harmful. Mediation is inherent to the object and, therefore, to reality. Ultimately, Williams interprets the elements that develop it materialistically (Williams 1991; Simpson 2000; O'Connor 2006).

Stuart Hall is best known as a founding member of the Birmingham Center for Cultural Studies and his writings on Thatcherism. Although he has offered a sophisticated reinterpretation of some of the significant thinkers of poststructuralism, Hall's real intellectual touchstone is Gramsci (Procter 2004). Hall's specific contribution to mass communication research has been to link ideologically coded cultural forms to the decoding strategies of audiences. In doing so, he simultaneously considered the changing political contexts of media signs and messages. Other determinants of the media, such as the ownership structure of the media, were left out of his analysis due to his over-focus on ideology (Makus 1990; Rojek 2009).

Policing The Crisis remains the most influential of the texts produced by the Birmingham Center for Cultural Studies founders. It is a complex hermeneutic that attempts to establish an ambitious relationship between the moral panic spread through the press about the street robbery, the collapse of post-war consensus politics, and the growth of an authoritarian state. The characterization of street robbery was imported from the US and used by the prevailing culture of control to undermine the consensus politics of social democracy. Police mobilization against deviant blacks was intensified before the attacker panic emerged in the press. This strategy resulted in the appearance of black crimes in the courts, thus setting the stage for increased media engagement (Connell 2015; Hall et al., 2017).

Hall argues that the mass media constitute the primary ideological institution of contemporary capitalism. Mass media operate through the production of hegemonic codes that hold society together. Moreover, the codes representing reality are compiled from a limited field of dominant discourse that utilizes a restricted set of social explanations. Hall distinguishes these codes: The first hypothetical configuration is the "dominant-hegemonic positioning". When viewers do not receive the literal meaning of a television news bulletin or a current affairs program fully and directly but codify the message with the referent codes in which it is encoded, wee viewer operates within the dominant code. "Perfectly transparent communication" is what we are expected to achieve "for all practical purposes". The second construal can be described as the "negotiated code" or construal. Most audiences are likely to understand dominantly defined and professionally signified messages adequately. Dominant definitions, however, are hegemonic because they describe definitions of global situations and events that are definitely "dominant". The codes within negotiated adaptation contain a mixture of adaptive and counter-adaptive elements: this form accepts the legitimacy of hegemonic definitions to realize abstract grand significations while making its own domain rules at a more restricted, situational level - operating in a way that constitutes an exception to the rule (Hall 2003).

According to Hall, who emphasizes that it is impossible for the field of communication not to deal with ideology at the point of developing itself due to its structure, ideological systems can always find their own political, cultural, and economic spaces within the social structure at the point of its development. In terms of making sense of and representing these systems, it does not seem possible for the field of communication to make an evaluation that excludes ideology in order to make sense of how and in what way these structures are in relationship with the dominant paradigm and how this relationship relates to the functioning of power (Hall, 1997: 91).

In his recent work, Hall develops the idea of an identity in constant formation, albeit dependent on ideological and psychic processes of division and identification. It is recognized that the modern self comprises multiple identities, not one (Hall 1992). Thatcherism has skillfully asserted itself as a political strategy by appealing to different subject groups. According to Hall's analysis, Thatcherism thus succeeded in squeezing discrete and culturally complex identities into a powerful hegemonic formation. In essence, this cultural construction's ability to focus on different group identities is why Thatcherism dominated politics throughout the 1980s (Hall 1983).

Throughout the 70s, the influence of semiology and ideology theory were the main concepts that determined the direction of cultural studies in media analysis. This approach is based on Hall's "Encoding/Decoding" model. Although the theory was formulated with television in mind, it can be applied to other mass media. According to this theory, receivers can read between the lines and even reverse and distort the intended direction of the message. According to Hall, texts coded within dominant discourses can be read in the opposite direction to the preferred meaning by the audience (Hall 2005).

Stuart Hall's concept of 'coding-codification' is essential in terms of individuals constructing their worlds of meaning with their priorities, despite all the ideological functioning of the media. According to Hall, messages transmitted from media centers by a particular ideology can be paraphrased in a preferred way, sometimes in a controversial way, and sometimes in an oppositional way. In favored reading, a codification is realized as desired by the dominant ideology, while argumentative reading indicates the negotiation of the text, both a resistance and an adaptive codification (Hall 1999). In oppositional reading, the reader, aware of the ideological message conveyed, consciously rejects the message. In other words, despite the desire of the dominant ideology, individuals can paraphrase the messages sent to them in line with their ideologies rather than in the preferred way (Hall 1999).

CONCLUSION

British cultural studies are essential in both reinterpreting Marxism and bringing the ideas they produced influenced by Gramsci's concepts of hegemony to the media. The school, which produces valuable studies on building a bridge between social sciences and arts and humanities, organizes different definitions of culture in these studies. During these studies, the weight given to the concept of ideology and the way of defining the concept was highly influenced by Western Marxism. This is the reason why we emphasize the literature of Western Marxism in this study. The fact that one of the essential theoretical foundations of the school is hegemony makes it necessary to mention Gramsci.

The shortcomings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in emphasizing the importance of culture in analyzing societies are due to periodic conditions. Marx and Engels saw the importance of culture, but due to the weakness of the thinkers of their time on the determinism of the economy, they emphasized this determinism. In this sense, British Cultural Studies should not be seen as a Marxist deviation, as the orthodox accuse, but rather as the development of a Marxist perspective on the dominant relations in a changing world and the emphasis on specific issues that Marx could not complete. The emphasis of Marx and Engels in their time was on economics, and the material approaches to the social sciences in British Cultural Studies should all be accepted by the Marxist point of view, which will enrich Marxism and can never be accepted as a deviation.

In this sense, British Cultural Studies offers a precious corpus in terms of adapting the concept of hegemony to Postmodern periods and addressing the concept of culture, which needs to be stronger in Marxism. This is especially evident when we consider how the media today, especially in wars, softens the use of state terror and encourages the spread of disinformation. In October 2023, when Israel began its occupation of Gaza, the "state terror" it practiced was softened, especially in the Western media, to increase support for Israel. Today, it is essential to return to the issues addressed by Western Marxism to put forward new measures to enlighten humanity and people to protect them from "state terror." Since the Gulf War, the nation-state has been repeating the claim that while it is politicized by taking on the policies of corporations, it does so by opposing terrorism. States that generate public opinion and support for occupation through the sparks of violence generated by their intelligence agents can oppress people in a manner no different from a terrorist organization. It is precisely here that the ideas of Western Marxism thinkers are worth discussing to analyze today's hegemony.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. (2001). *Karnavaldan Romana*, (Çev. Sibel Irzık). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Barthes, Roland (2005). *Gösterebilimsel Serüven*, (Çev. Mehmet Rıfat, Sema Rıfat). İstanbul: YKY.
- Bernstein, B. (1958). "Some Sociological Determinants of Perception: An Enquiry Into Sub-cultural Differences", *The British Journal of Sociology*, 9 (2), 159-174.
- Bora, T. (2021). *İnşaat Ya Resulullah*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Bourse, M.; Yücel, H. (2017). *Kültürel Çalışmaları Anlamak*, (Çev. Halime Yücel). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Brenkman, J. (1995). "Raymond Williams and Marxism", *Cultural Politics*, 9, 237-267.
- Cohen, M. (1993). *Profane İllumination: Walter Benjamin and the Paris of Surrealist Revolution* (Vol. 5). Univ of California Press.
- Connell, K. (2015). "Policing the Crisis 35 Years on", *Contemporary British History*, 29 (2), 273-283.
- Drucker, P. (2012). *The New Realities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- During, S. (1999). *The Cultural Studies Reader*. New York & London: Routledge Publications.
- Eagleton, T. (2013). *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. Routledge.
- Erdoğan, İrfan; Alemdar, Korkmaz (1998). *Başlangıcından Günümüze İletişim Kuram ve Araştırmaları*. Ankara: My Yayınları.
- Filippini, M. (2016). *Using Gramsci: A New Approach*. Pluto Press.
- Fitzpatrick, S. (2007). "Revisionism in Soviet History". *History and Theory*, 46 (4), 77-91.
- Giddens, A. (2013). *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gramsci, A. (1983). *Aydınlar ve Toplum*, (Çev. Ferit Edgü, Vedat Günyol, Bertan Onaran). Ankara: Örnek Yayınları.
- Gramsci, A. (1997). *Hapishane Defterleri*, (Çev. Adnan Cemgil). İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.
- Gramsci, A. (1998). *Komünist Partiye Doğru*, (Çev. Celal A. Kanat). İstanbul: Düşünce Dizisi.
- Gramsci, A. (2005). "The Intellectuals", *Contemporary Sociological Thought—Themes and Theories*, 49-58.
- Grossberg, L.; Nelson, C.; Treichler, P. (Eds.) (2013). *Cultural Studies*. Routledge.
- Güngör, Nazife (1999). *Popüler Kültür ve İktidar*. Ankara: Vadi Yayınları.
- Hall, S. (1980). "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms", *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 57-72.
- Hall, S. (1992). "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies", pp. 277-294.
- Hall, S. (1999). "Encoding-decoding", *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (2005). "Introduction to Media Studies at the Centre: Some Problematic and Problems", *Culture, Media, Language* (Ed. D. Hobson. S. Hall, A. Lowe, P. Willis). Londra ve New York: Routledge.
- Hall, S.; Critcher, C.; Jefferson, T.; Clarke, J.; Roberts, B. (2017). *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Hall, S.; Jacques, M. (Ed.) (1983). *The Politics of Thatcherism*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, Stuart (2003). "Kodlama ve Kodaçım", *Söylem ve İdeoloji: Mitoloji, Din, İdeoloji* (Der. Barış Çoban, Zeynep Özarslan). İstanbul: Su Yayınları, s. 322-323.
- Hall, Stuart (1997). "İdeoloji ve İletişim Kuramı", (Çev. A. Gürata). *Medya, Kültür, Siyaset*. (Der. Süleyman İrvan). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları, s. 79-99.
- Higgins, J. (1982). "Raymond Williams and the Problem of İdeology", *Boundary 2*, 145-154.
- Higgins, J. (2013). *Raymond Williams: Literature, Marxism and Cultural Materialism*. Routledge.
- James, M. E. (1988). *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jessop, B.; Bonnett, K.; Bromley, S.; Ling, T. (1985). "Thatcherism and the Politics of Hegemony: A Reply to Stuart Hall", *New Left Review*, 153 (1), 87-101.
- Kachurin, P. (2012). "Working (for) the State: Vladimir Tatlin's Career in Early Soviet Russia and the Origins of The Monument to the Third International", *Modernism/modernity*, 19 (1), 19-41.
- Kellner, D. (2011). "Cultural Studies, Multiculturalism, and Media Culture", *Gender, Race, and Class in Media: A Critical Reader*, 3, 7-18.
- Kellner, D. (2016). "Kültürel Marksizm ve Kültürel Çalışmalar", (Çev. Fatih Tezcan), *ETHOS: Felsefe ve Toplumsal Bilimlerde Diyaloglar*, Temmuz/July 2016, 9 (2), 132-151.
- Krampen, M. (1987). "Ferdinand de Saussure and the Development of Semiology", *Classics of Semiotics*, pp. 59-88.
- Lambier, J. (2008). "The Organismic State Against Itself: Schelling, Hegel and the Life of Right", *European Romantic Review*, 19 (2), 131-137.
- Lequenne, M. (2000). *Marksizm ve Estetik*, (Çev. Erhan Bener, Yiğit Bener, Aslı Aydın). İstanbul: Yazın Yayıncılık.
- Lewis, J. (2013). *The Ideological Octopus: An Exploration of Television and Its Audience*. Routledge.
- Löwy, M. (1999). *Dünyayı Değiştirmek Üzerine*, (Çev. Yavuz Alogan). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
- Löwy, M. (2009). *Morning Star: Surrealism, Marxism, Anarchism, Situationism, Utopia*. University of Texas Press.
- Makus, A. (1990). "Stuart Hall's Theory of İdeology: A Frame for Rhetorical Criticism". *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54 (4), 495-514.
- Marcuse, H. (1998). *Karşı Devrim ve İsyen*, (Çev. Gürol Koca, Volkan Ersoy). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Marcuse, H. (1968). *Tek Boyutlu İnsan*, (Çev. Seçkin Çağan). Ankara: May Yayınları.
- Marcuse, H. (2013). *Özgürlük Üzerine Bir Deneme*, (Çev. Soner Sosyal). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

- Marx, K.; Engels, F. (2018). *Tarihsel Materyalizm Üzerine Mektuplar 1890-1894*, (Çev. Öner Ünalın). Ankara: Kor Kitap.
- Marx, Karl (1993). *1844 El Yazmaları*, (Çev. Kenan Somer). Ankara: Sol Yayınları.
- Monasta, A. (2010). *Antonio Gramsci*. Editora Massangana.
- Morley, D. (2003). *Television, Audiences and Cultural Studies*. Routledge.
- Munns, Jessica; Rajan, Gita; Bromley, Roger (1995). *A Cultural Studies Reader- History, Theory, Practice*. Routledge.
- O'Connor, A. (2006). *Raymond Williams*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Procter, J. (2004). *Stuart Hall*. Routledge.
- Rıfat, M. (2005). *XX. Yüzyılda Dilbilim ve Göstergibilim Kuramları*. İstanbul: YKY.
- Rojek, C. (2009). "Stuart Hall on Representation and Ideology", *Media/Cultural Studies: Critical Approaches*, 49-62.
- Ruggieri, M. (2021). "Eco and Gramsci: Unexplored Connections in Cultural Studies", *Italian Studies*, 76 (4), 421-435.
- Santucci, A. A. (2010). *Antonio Gramsci*. NYU Press.
- Scharf, C. B.; Scharf, C. B. (2019). *Politics and Change in East Germany: An Evaluation of Socialist Democracy*. Routledge.
- Short, R. S. (1966). "The Politics of Surrealism, 1920-36", *Journal of Contemporary History*, 1 (2), 3-25.
- Simpson, D. (2000). "Raymond Williams: Literature, Marxism and Cultural Materialism", *MLQ: Modern Language Quarterly*, 61 (3), 559-561.
- Slattery, Martin (2007). *Sosyolojide Temel Fikirler*, (Çev. Ümit Tatlıcan, Gülhan Demiriz). Bursa: Sentez Yayıncılık.
- Smith, Philip (2007). *Kültürel Kuram*, (Çev. Selime Güzelsarı, İbrahim Gündoğdu). İstanbul: Babil Yayınları.
- Spiteri, R.; Lacoss, D. (Eds.) (2020). *Surrealism, Politics and Culture*. Routledge.
- Surber, J. P. (2018). *Culture and Critique: An Introduction to the Critical Discourses of Cultural Studies*. Routledge.
- Taras, R. C. (2015). *The Road to Disillusion: From Critical Marxism to Post-communism in Eastern Europe: From Critical Marxism to Post-communism in Eastern Europe*. Routledge.
- Turner, S. (Ed.). (2000). *The Cambridge Companion to Weber*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vincent, Andrew (2006). *Modern Politik İdeolojiler*, (Çev. Arzu Tüfekçi). İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- Volaşinov, V. N., (2001). *Marksizm ve Dil Felsefesi*, (Çev. Mehmet Küçük). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Wallace, J.; Jones, R.; Nield, S. (Eds.) (1997). *Raymond Williams Now: Knowledge, Limits and the Future*. Springer.
- Williams, R. (1958). "Culture is Ordinary", *Schooling the Symbolic Animal: Social and Cultural Dimensions of Education*.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature (Vol. 392)*. Oxford Paperbacks.
- Williams, R. (1991). "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory", *Rethinking popular culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*, 407-423.
- Williams, R. (2017). *Kültür ve Toplum 1780-1950*, (Çev. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Wood, B. (1998). "Stuart Hall's Cultural Studies and the Problem of Hegemony", *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49 (3), 399-414.
- Xiu-qin, Z. (2015). "The Second and Third International Theorists and the Formation of Western Marxism- A Discussion from Perspective of Relationship Between the History of Ideas", *Teaching and Research*, 49 (12), 74.