

Paradigm Of Historical Materialism In Socio-Cultral Studies

Resa Dandirwalu, Johan Saimima, Dedi Irwanto

Article Info

Article History

Received:
April 16, 2020

Accepted:
June 22, 2020

Keywords

Paradigm, Historical
Materialism, Socio-
Cultural

DOI:

10.5281/zenodo.3903656

Abstract

This article aimed to explain the use of historical materialism paradigms in socio-cultural studies. Through this article, it was stated that historical materialism was an approach which centered on the real world and not on ideas/thoughts. The method used in this article was library method by a number of related source. It was used to construct this article. Based on the explanation result, it was revealed that the historical materialism paradigm was considered relevant to be applied in socio-cultural studies (Sociology, Anthropology, History, Linguistics, Archaeology) which tend to relate directly to political, economic and social realities. With the historical materialism approach, the social cultural phenomenon could be presented in the form of a description of material movement reality reflected by the human mind and translated into thought forms or conception as the search results and the presentation of reality. The use of historical materialism paradigms in socio-cultural studies was to emphasize that any form of ideas produced by thought. It was not based on something abstract but refered to something concrete and it had existed before in the socio-cultural life.

1. Introduction

Understanding historical materialism as a form of paradigm in socio-cultural studies is a work which is not easy to do, because it firstly explores the science philosophy, so that the basic foundation becomes strong and the truth can be justified. Truth in science has two faces, namely empirical truth that can be proven physically/materially, and symbolic truth that cannot be proven by certain material.

As a paradigm in socio-cultural studies, historical materialism, is an approach which is centered on the real world and not on ideas/thoughts, so the ideal is not an idea but a material world which is reflected by the mind and translated in forms of thought. If the material world is ideal, then the real one is only source to be examined or researched and not something abstract. Historical materialism, although as evolutionism, supposes historical development, but it has the uniqueness of evolutionionism. History, according to this understanding, develops dialectically. This thought was rooted in the dialectical understanding of Hegel's idealism. Philosophically, dialectics can be described as a thesis , anti-thesis and synthesis process. The difference, Hegel applies a dialectic to something abstract, namely: ideas, souls and spirits (Geist), while Marx emphasizes the dialectics in an objective reality.

In the process of research using the historical materialism approach, it is important to use methods and theories which help to understand the problems encountered. As an originator of the historical materialism, Marx said that the method he used was the dialectical method with historical aid. It was utilized to present the reality related to human problems, especially the way of production and relationships were formed by the production process. Meanwhile, historical materialism theory begins from a principle that material productivity is the basis of human life and its history.

According to Marx, it was imperative for human to be the center which is able to place it in this life, as they were required to be able to create history. As it is known that this life is not only limited to eating, drinking, shelter, clothing and so on, then the work is how to be able to create appropriate facilities to meet the needs. The concrete point, work creates material. Therefore, the human power to be able to create material is the most important element in life. Because it is a measure of all things.

Schiebel, Joseph examined that the history of law used the paradigm of historical materialism, so for him historical materialism was a dogmatic statement that "the development of society is a process governed by law", and that "the law determines the general direction of the next movement from other objective conditions". This view stems from the reality in historical materialism, that humanity as a whole has passed four successive stages namely the primitive communal, slave, feudal, and capitalist. At present, the human being is in the era of living in the transition to the next formation, namely Communist, whose first stage is called socialism.

According to Waldemar Czajkowski, Marx's historical materialism could be found in his work, namely capital. Furthermore, Czajkowski mentioned historical materialism as "Marxist paradigm". The word "paradigm" used by Czajkowski is derived from Thomas Kuhn. To provide an understanding of the paradigm, Czajkowski admitted that he could not make it precisely, but intuitively it can be mentioned some of his views

on the paradigm, namely: first, between paradigms and theories has relative differences in character: what can be described as "theory" in relation to a set of propositions with respect to others can be called "paradigm". Second, the paradigm framework allows for a number of different theories, even opposite each other. Third, the difference between paradigm and theory has nothing to do with theories and methods.

Regarding historical materialism, as stated above, Czajkowski mentioned that this view could be found in Marx's work, namely *Capital*. Why *Capital*? This question was answered by Czajkowski, including: First, not only *Capital*, but some constitutive ideas can be found in manuscripts and especially in *German Ideology*. However, only in *Capital* construction the desired theory can develop properly. Second, the essence of *Capital* is to contain subtitles about the *magnus opus* Marx, which is a critique of political economy. Criticism of Political Economy to this day is very popular from what came to be known as "historical materialism."

In the introduction to his book "*Capital*", a critique of political economy, Marx argues: what I must investigate in my work is the capitalist mode of production and the relations of production and the forms of traffic / exchange that correspond to it.* According to George Ritzer, Douglas J. Goodman, production was a means for people to meet their material needs. Because of the importance of the ways in which people fulfill their material needs, as well as the economic relations formed from it, Marx positioned the economic basis of production as infrastructure and non-economic relations, social institutions (state, law, religion) and ideology as a superstructure.

Marxist theory, according to Gottlie, identified the movement of economic law in all societies. For feudalism, the class relation is very important, but the relationship is not determined only by the appropriation structure of economic surpluses. This class is also formed by specific political and historical relations. The form and distribution of political power is partly, not merely the product of, the mode of production. In addition, class relations involve not only groups which face each other directly in production and expropriation, between masters and farmers, but also distant geographical groups connected to the world trade network. In the absence of a "prime mover" of feudal society, the historical changes in the feudal society are very much the result of being influenced indefinitely by political struggle, not a mere prediction of mechanical economic products.

The various experts above are still studying the paradigm of historical materialism using a philosophical approach to look at the phenomena of law, economics, politics, and production, so this article was made to explain the paradigm of historical materialism for socio-cultural studies. To examine more specifically about the paradigm of historical materialism, the substance of this article, focused on What is the paradigm of historical materialism and who is the originator?; What method is used to explain historical materialism?; and What is the contribution of the historical materialism paradigm to socio-cultural sciences?

METHODOLOGY

The methods used in the study were literature reviews, namely: research derived from books, encyclopedias, dictionaries, journals, and magazines.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Paradigm Concept

In the previous part, it has been presented the view of Czajkowski about the paradigm, but as Czajkowski stated that it was difficult to give understanding of the paradigm, then in this article we used the view of Ahimsa Putra, about the paradigm, which was a set of concepts related to each other logically form a framework of thought that served to understand, interpreted and explained the reality or problem at hand.

In socio-cultural studies, Ahimsa Putra argued that there were fundamental elements which formed the paradigm, namely: (1) basic assumptions; (2) values; (3) problem to be solved; (4) models; (5) concepts; (6) research methods; (7) analytical methods; (8) results of analysis or theory, and (9) ethnography or representation. We hope that after explaining the definition of this paradigm, we can go in and succeed in further discussions about Marx's paradigm of historical materialism which can be found in Marx "*Capital*" book, as Czajkowski stated above.

Philosophy of Materialism (historical): Marx's Paradigm

The originator of historical materialism is Marx, using the philosophy of materialism. Karl Marx is a progressive person in his philosophy. Marx was born in 1818-1883, located in Rhineland, Germany, from Jewish descent. Marx's thoughts connect very closely between the economy and philosophy.

Marx's thoughts were influential in the twentieth century. At that, Marx formulated Hegel's thought about the existence of the mind as a universal soul. In Hegel analysis through the dialectical method, according to Hegel this dialectical process is a kind of dynamic and progressive opposition where the initial idea of thesis faced with anti-thesis that is contradictory, and this resistance is in the synthesis of maintaining and combining what is rational in two positions, first and then form a new thesis.

Materialism is the previous concept produced by the famous philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach, about the relationship between the material and the mind. Feuerbach (1804-1872), known as the figure of mechanistic materialism, his view rejected metaphysics. The view of Feuerbach's materialism was born in response to the idealistic philosophy of Hegel, for example, about the creation of the world, what we know in the real world is precisely its mind which makes the world gradually a realization of an absolute idea that has existed in a place since Ancients, from the world and before the world. Against Hegel's view, Feuerbach was finally encouraged, that there was a pre-world "absolute idea" of Hegel, "in the first logical categories" before the world existed. It was none other than the imaginary remnants of belief in the existence of an external creator; that the material world which could be perceived by the five senses which we belong to, is the only one reality; and that our consciousness and our thoughts seems on the five senses, it is the result of the material organs, namely the brain. Material is not a result of the soul, but the soul itself is merely the highest result of matter. However, in subsequent developments Feuerbach is still referred to as an idealist; Because it assumes that exclusive natural-scientific materialism is actually the building basis of human knowledge, but not the building itself. Similarly, Feuerbach's view (1804-1872), was known as a figure of thought in mechanistic materialism, his view rejected metaphysics.

Starting from Feuerbach's thought, Marx gave rise to his thesis:

The main disadvantage of all materialism that exists today - including Feuerbach's materialism-is that the matter (*Gegenstand*), the reality, the sensuality, are described only in the form of objects or contemplations (*Anschauung*), but not as an activity of human senses, practice, not subjectively. Therefore, it has come to pass that the active aspect, contrary to materialism, is developed by idealism-but only abstractly, because, of course, idealism does not know the real sense of sensory activity as such. The objective truth (*Gegenständliche*) can be thought to be derived from human thought, it is not a matter of theory but a matter of practice. In human practice must prove the truth, that is, reality and power, the solitude (*Diesseitigkeit*) of his thought. The debate over the reality or not from the thought of being unfamiliar with practice is merely scholastic. Moreover, Feuerbach's materialism is a contemplative materialism, that is, a materialism which does not understand sensuality as a practical activity, but it is a contemplation of an individual in the "civil society". (Marx: 1845).

Furthermore, as quoted by Hans Jorgen Thomsen, regarding Marx's thesis on Feuerbach, philosophers had only *interpreted* the world, in many ways; but the problem was to *change it*. For Marx, the problem of philosophy is not only about knowledge and pure will, but also actions. Therefore, for Thomsen, the Feuerbach's materialism is precisely only a part of the philosophical framework of interpretation. Materialism generally recognizes the real objective existence (material) as independent of consciousness, sensation, experience, humanity, etc. Historical materialism recognizes social beings as independent of the social consciousness of humanity. In establishing the historical theory of materialism as the absolute requirement of materialist dialectics, Marx judged that humans were essentially free, but the great economic hegemony changed and determined the human's character. Marx stated:

The production model in material life determines the common character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not human consciousness which determines its existence, but rather, its social existence determines their consciousness.

Marx with his materialist views, according to Lenin, criticized the idealistic Hegel by saying:

So when the world outside truth is lost, the task of historical science is to ensure the truth of this real world. When the sacred form of human alienation has lost its mask, then the task of philosophy, which became the maid of historical sciences, is to immediately strip out the masks of alienation in unholy forms. So criticism of heaven is transformed into criticism of real nature; criticism of religion into criticism of the law, and criticism of theology into criticism of politics.

In addition, the reason Marx rejected Hegel, was also based on his view which agreed with Feuerbach's opinion that teaching human had to be viewed as *gattung*, as a natural creature. Therefore, speculative thought as Hegel said had to be rejected, because only fact is true. Marx's materialism is deeper than the previous materialism. According to Marx, human was determined by nature, but this nature was viewed from people's point of view, rather than in terms of the individual. Community has to develop, and this development is called history. What makes the community develop is the power of material power to produce something. So the development of the community is sourced from the development of materials. The real developments is driven by a sense of life. The life frames include eating, drinking, and clothing..

Marx deepened and developed the philosophy of materialism entirely, and expanded its recognition of nature by incorporating an introduction to human society. The dialectical historical materialism is a major milestone in scientific thought. Rampant chaos in various historical and political views is replaced by a

scientific theory which is very integral and harmonious, which demonstrates how, in consequence with the growth of productive forces, a social life system emerges from the previous social living system and develops through various stages. The concrete example: capitalism emerges from feudalism. As well as human knowledge reflects nature (which is a thriving material), whose existence is independent on human beings, nor social knowledge (various views and doctrines produced by humans: philosophy, religion, politics, etc.) reflect the economic system of society. Various political institutions are superstructures on the economic foundation. We see, for example, that the various political forms of modern European countries strengthened the dominance of the Bourgeoisism against the proletariat. Such reality, needs to be addressed through the process of political power struggle "bourgeois revolution", after which it can be used to sweep the remaining obstacles for the full development of the productive power of society. Marx's thought reached his climax when the Soviet Union Communist Party headed by Lenin (1917) became the fundamental ideology of Communist teachings (Marxism-Leninism). With Lenin's cold hands, the Soviet union became a strong country.

Marx's view, can be said to be his concern over reality, historical development, the society formed of an economic process, which separates the owners and workers. Society consists of social classes who distinguish themselves from each other based on their respective position and function in the production process. This pattern of society can be found in the capitalist society, then it is known as the bourgeoisie (owner) and the labor/workers (proletariat). The bourgeois class lives from the exploitation result of the proletariat class. The proletariat has a workforce and sells their work, it depends heavily on the bourgeois class who controlling their work, to survive. The person who controls the work is capitalist because they also provide salary, and have production tools. Then, Marx's view is developed in his work "Capital", a critique of the political economy, which, in subsequent developments, is known as historical materialism.

Furthermore, Marx's view on "Political Economy was continued by Engels. Where Engels argued that Political Economy, in a broad sense, was the science of law which regulated production and material exchange as a means of subsistence in society. Production and exchange were two different functions. Production can occurred without exchange, but exchange cannot occurred without production". The view of Marx and Engels, responded by Czajkowski, as a view that had consequences for the development of Marxism. In economics, the bourgeois economists saw inter-material relation (inter-commodity exchange), while Marx was concerned in human's relation. Commodity exchange reflects the relationships among individual producers that are interwoven through the market. Through Marx's historical materialism, Bertrand Russell mentioned: Marx as a materialism generator, by giving new interpretations and relations to human history. But in other aspect he was the last person to build this great system, the successor of Hegel, someone like him who believed in a rational formulation that concluded human evolution.

Materialism before Marx only understood the material as a mere sensory object. This understanding is unable to realize that material objects are also the result of human subjective activities. The centrality of this object is reversed by Marx by demonstrating the central role of the subject, human, in the materiality constitution of matters. With an approach which can be called as "subjective materialism", then Marx can show something, other than material objects, that is constitutive of reality. Those something are *behavior, work, praxis*.

Marx's definition of materialism is something new in history. The definition was also in the interpretation of Etienne Balibar, for the first time was able to release materialism from idealism. During materialism only stops at the material as the essence of reality, the materialism will not be more than "disguised idealism". Based on Marx's new conceptualization, today materialism became subjective and expressed in concrete praxis. The renewal also, for Balibar, produced in a new conception of the subject, which is the equation of the "subject = practice". Marx's materialism is the notion that the whole object which constitutes this reality is nothing but the effect of the subject's activity. From this framework, it can be conclude that nothing completely natural in everyday reality, there is no nostalgia for the purity of *azali*.

To examine more deeply about historical materialism, Czajkowski quoted Marx's views, as follows:

In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite *relations* that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production *correspond* to a definite stage of development of their *material powers* of production. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social *being determines* their *consciousness*. At a certain stage of their development, the material *forces* of production *come* into a *conflict* with the existing *relations* of production. Then occurs a period of social *revolution*. With the *change* of the economic foundation the entire immense *superstructure* is more or less rapidly *transformed* [W]e can designate the Asiatic, the ancient, the feudal, and the modern bourgeois modes of production as *progressive* epochs of the economic formation of society. The *bourgeois* relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production. With this social formation . . . the *prehistory* of human society comes to an *end* (*italics added*).

Similar to the quotation above, Ritzer and Goodman when explaining Marx's historical materialism, they cited Marx's understanding of historical materialism, which was similar to Czajkowski's quote. According to them, this quote is one of the best summaries of Marx's understanding:

In the social production process, humans are moved by certain relationships which do not depend on their desires. These production relationships depend on a particular step of the development of their material production forces. The totality of these production relationships forms the economic structure of society, which is the true foundation of a legal and political superstructure that relates one-to-one with the obvious forms of social consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the forces of material production in society conflict with existing production relationships or -especially if not the legal expression of the same thing- as the relation of the property in which they worked in before. From the development forms of these production forces, these relationships turn into binding constraints. Then came a period of social revolution. When the economic foundation changes, the whole superstructure also changes more or less the same.

In the quotations above, both Czajkowski and Ritzer and Goodman were presented, they both began from the same point, which was the material production force. The forces described by Ritzer and Goodman are actual devices, machines, factories, and so on, which are used to meet human needs. While the relationship of production refers to the type of association or society created by each other in fulfilling their needs.

Gramsci also has the same views as Czajkowski and Ritzer and Goodman, but with his own language as Bellamy suggests, in the quotations of Patria and Andi.

1. Human only confront themselves with the problems they can solve; the task itself arises when the material conditions for its completion already exist or at least are in the process of forming.
2. A social formation does not disappear before all productive forces have been developed, and the new higher production relationships will not replace it before the conditions for its existence have developed in the womb of the old society...

Paradigm of Historical Materialism: Basic Assumptions, Models and Methods

As a paradigm, historical materialism certainly has elements as Ahimsa Putra stated in the previous section. However, in this article is not all of these elements will be discussed. The three elements which we consider important will be presented here: assumptions, models and methods.

Basic Assumptions of Historical Materialism

From the description of Marx's thoughts above, we could find the main points of thought which later become the basis for the historical materialism paradigm in the socio-cultural studies. Some points of thought which can be the epistemological foundation of historical materialism paradigm that we try to appear here is as follows: First, the real world (material) or the reality of empirical which can be captured or observed with the senses is a research object and not an idea. Something is considered to exist when it is a material which has a form and includes three dimensions (length, width and solid) or includes a typology of the material so that it is treated with quantity and can be shared. On this basis materialism denies the God, because of His form is non-material and metaphysic. The material is *azali*, eternal, not created and does not require any cause, which in philosophy is called *wajibul wujud*. Because material is primary and not an idea, Marx has the view that the idea is a real world (material) reflected by the human mind and translated into sharing sorts of thoughts. Thus, the presentation must be different from the research form. In the research, it must be master the materials in detail, analyzing the different forms of development, searching the internal linkages. Only after this work has been completed, the actual movement can be adequately described.

Second, an objective truth (*Gegenständliche*) which sourced from the real world (material) can be derived from human thought, it is not a matter of theory but a matter of practice. In human practice must prove the truth, that is, reality and power, the solitude (*Diesseitigkeit*) from the results of the construction thoughts on the reality faced. Thus the truth is not based on a contemplation of sensory activity, but must be realized in practice/action.

Third, because the truth is not derived from the mind or brain, as a critique of Hegel, then the truth according to historical materialism is a priori building which is not understood in general, namely a rational accountability based on the thought of *Ansih*, but it is a reflection of real life before in the form of ideas.

Fourth, historical materialism generally recognizes humans as social creatures, as "the totality of social relations" which independent from social consciousness of humanity. Social relations are created from a production process, as a productive force. Furthermore, to understand human beings must take into account the social and historical factors whose the purpose is to build people toward a humanist change.

Fifth, we cannot say that nature has a purpose and final cause, because there is no actor who has knowledge and will so that an objective of creation can be attributed to him.

Sixth, production is fundamental to historical materialism. Therefore, the material aspects of the history of human society are what is produced and how the production in preserving lives. Production is the means to meet the needs of life. Thus, whatever form of capitalist exploitation is not humanist, only for the one side (bourgeois) interest and the expense of the other side (proletariat).

Seventh, indeed a natural phenomenon (read: not the main material) arise due to the displacement of the material atoms, and the interaction between one another. From this, it can be said that the previous natural phenomenon act as terms and causes for the subsequent phenomena. In this case, we can also accept the most distant possibilities, that the previous natural phenomenon is as a cause of natural actors among material things. For example, a tree can be considered a natural performer for bear fruits. While the things that are physical and chemical can be based on the factors which affect them. However, there is not a single phenomenon whose needs a performer and divine creator.

“Model” of Historical Materialism

It had been stated earlier on the first assumption that, historical materialism aimed to present a different research result to the form of research. To conduct research it is necessary to master the material in detail, analyze the different forms of development, and search for internal linkages. Only after this work has been completed, the actual movement can be adequately described. Thus, the model which can be expressed here is empiricism. The empirical model was to emphasize on something which is received through a sensory or observable. A thing called empiric was based on direct experience or observation in the real nature. Thus, the actual movement can only be presented after careful and detailed empirical observation. This presentation is the real knowledge that seems to appear a priori, because only thus actuality can be presented and expressed, so the significance is not the continuity of a movement (live), but the understanding of the movements of traces or signs, the impacts, the diversity and the relationships. The presentation describes the reality of material movement which reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought or conception, and it must be completely trace and present that reality.

With those models, the socio-cultural phenomenon will be understood as a phenomenon which arises from the real world/empirical (material) dialectically. Furthermore, proper thinking, objective, for socio-cultural phenomena can be obtained by understanding the real world/material that it is devoing. The objective understanding of the material world can only be known when the understanding is described, presented in the form of a description using writing. This presentation is a form of understanding of historical materialism on the socio-cultural phenomena under study.

“Method” and Theory of Historical Materialism

Marx's work in "Capital", according to Lenin, explicitly stated that the method he developed in explaining criticism of political economy was the dialectical method. Dialectics, which is the doctrine of developments in its most dense, deepest and very comprehensive form. The doctrine about the relativity of human knowledge which complements us with a reflection on the material continues to evolve. The latest discoveries in the field of natural sciences: radium, electrons, transmutation of elements, are evidence of the dialectical materialism taught by Marx, in contrast to the teachings of the bourgeois philosophers with their outdated and decadent idealism. Marx's philosophy of materialism is materialism which moves the mind. The merging of the two theories between materialism and this dialectical method resulting the method of dialectical materialism. According to Marx the diacletic method, in essence, is not only different from the Hegelian method, but it is directly opposite the Hegelian method. Marx clearly states:

For Hegel, the thought process, which was even transformed into an independent subject, namely *idea*, is the creator of the real world, and the real world is only an external appearance of the idea. For me, on the contrary, the ideal is the world of material which reflected by the human mind, and translated into thought forms.

Hegel's view is known as the philosophy of historical idealism. What interprets history is the history of the idea and means that the locomotive of change is the idea, starting from the human mind then carried out in human life. Another interpretation of Hegel's view (dialectics) that any historical lesson in life does not follow the accumulative development over time. But the development of society precisely because of opposition (the power of contradictions). For Hegel, the contradiction is in the idea known as thesis, antithesis and synthesis which are also known as dialectics.

Hegel's dialectics which emphasizes the idea is called Marx contains a mystical sense and has been criticized for almost 30 years, when he was still a fashion in Germany. It is said to be mystical because it seems to change the shape and glorify the existing. Further, for Marx, this mystical dialectics must be transformed into rational by reversing its position standing above the head, in order to return to its feet, so that it can be found a rational core wrapped in a mystical complexion. It can be said that in order to construct the dialectic, Marx took over the framework of Hegel's mind, but he replaced knowledge with the work, and intellect with the natural human. Thus for Marx, it is meaningless to oppose the subject-object, human and the world: both may only be in intercession. Human can not exist without the nature of where he lives and works. But even nature, as human deals with it, is only nature through human: It is the nature which is given form by humans.

The dialectical process is not the process of mechanic and deterministic, but there are many interacting factors, in which the product of life's necessities is the dominant factor. Marx rejected Hegel's idealism, but accepted his dialectics, so that the historical idealism of Hegel's mind was adopted only by its historical aspects and added to his dialectical aspects, so that Marx arranged it into historical idealism, which eventually became historical materialism, after criticizing it ferociously and taking aspects of materialism from Feurbach.

In later developments, Althusser in his writing "*In For Marx*", proposes to define philosophy (dialectical materialism) as theoretical practice theory, that is, the theory of science. Althusser's view was later rejected by the practical theoretical journal, which was published in January 1973. Althusser argued that materialism began with the real recognition of objects which exist "out of the head," which can be known through science. Responding to Althusser's view, David W. Schwartzman by quoting Graham, said that in any case, Marxist was only able to produce materialism based on "assumptions that were more in line with implicit naturalism in most of sciences." Starting from this view, Schwartzman has the view that the theory of dialectical materialism with regard to the sciences, perhaps most striking, with geological and astronomical sciences (Earth and Solar system pre-existing than humans) and biophysics and chemistry (consciousness, thoughts and emotions as the object of science). This relationship can only be a starting point in researching the philosophy of dialectical materialism.

In addition, Schwartzman (Schwartzman, 1975:329) posited the concept of dialectical materialism. Althusser paid attention to the structural causality which defined as the effect of all parts in a complex totality of a structure in power. For example, the economic basis "determines" as a power element in social formation. Overdetermination of the contradiction is the reflection on its existence in complex conditions, namely other contradictions in the whole complex (uneven development). For non-antagonistic contradictions overdetermination take the form of displacement, and antagonistic contradictions assume the form of condensation with potential leading to restructuring (i.e., socialist revolution).

Marx was not the first to talk about dialectics, but since Platon, philosophical thought has always been characterized by dialectical properties. Socrates, has philosophy of dialectics with dialogue (remember: The origin of the Greek word from the dialectics is *dialegesthai* which means "dialogue"), and because of Hegel, Marx drew a lesson about dialectics. The basis of Hegel's dialectic is *internal relationalism*, which is the whole reality as the self-manifestation of the spirit, is always connected to one another in unbroken relationships. Logically, term A can only be understood to the extent there is also a non-A term from which A is determined. Ontologically, there can be understood as far as it is coexist with absence: internal absence in definition of exist and exist is internal in the definition of absence. The internal relationalism of all matters which enables the realization of reciprocal determinations between elements of reality. Based on Spinoza's notion that "*omnis determinatio est negatio*" (all determinations are negation), for Hegel, this reciprocal determination relationship is also a reciprocal negation relation: affirmation (A), negations (non-A) and affirmations at a higher level or negation over negation (non-non-A which includes the essence of A and non-A). This is what we usually know as dialectics between thesis-antithesis-synthesis. This dialectics which understood by Hegel as the internal dynamics of reality and mind.

In the dialectical philosophy, especially the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels considers that in reality there is nothing to stand alone forever, there is nothing absolute and sacred as it is metaphysically pointed out by Hegel called the "absolute spirit". The two fundamental principles of the Marxist dialectics, first, Marxist dialectics are contradict to metaphysics. Marxist dialectics do not perceive nature as a heap of all phenomena or heaps of phenomena which are accidental, unrelated and free to each other. However all natural phenomena as the organic reality are static. Second, different from metaphysics, in dialectical conceptions argue that nature is not a static state but a reality which is constantly moves and changes, falls, dies and regrows. Third, dialectics also explain that the process of development is not a simple process of growth, where the quantitative changes will lead to developments which open to qualitative change.

Some basic laws are dialectics in historical materialism, as suggested by Hoffman, namely:

1. The law of dialectics is always related to time.
2. The law of dialectics is always related to the integration outside itself.
3. The law of dialectics is always related to the law of contradictions.
4. The law of dialectics is always related to movement.

For Marx, dialectics is not merely the law of the mind movement as a mirror of reality, but the law of truth thinking when the point of the real object. The law of contradiction and integration itself is also recognized by Marx and Engels, only in terms of the unpeaceful struggle of two real objects, the opposition of two classes in society. The opposition in the society between the classes which determined by the pattern of its society production. With the technical advances in the pattern of the society production which make the rich and powerful increasingly richer and more powerful. Whereas the poor and powerless are increased in the valley of the poor and there is no power. This new blend of synthesis is the "shared property" of production tools which produce for "shared prosperity". This synthesis is imagined in the brain as a departure from objective reality, materialism. Furthermore, politics and other operational instruments are fully implemented to create new society

based on "shared property", society controlled by non-existent class, socialism, until the formation of society without class as desired, communism.

Historical Materialism and Socio-Cultural Studies

Based on the explanation of Marx's historical materialism, as revealed in his work "Capital", then Engels and other Marxian emphasized on the aspect of the presentation or presentation sourced at the empirical observation of reality which moves dialectically. The form of presentation to be submitted, for Marx must be different from the form of research. Research must master the materials in detail, analyzing the different forms of development, to examine the internal linkages. Only after this work is done, actual movement can be adequately described. If this is successful, then the movement can appear as if we are getting a priori building solely before us. (Karl Marx, Capital, XXXIX).

Based on that view, it can be said that an actual reality can only be presented after careful and detailed empirical observation. The presentation is the real knowledge that appears dialectically in the form of a priori, because only thus actuality can be presented and expressed. The presentation describing the reality of material movement which is reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought or conception on the condition of having to completely trace and present that reality. This historical materialism paradigm is very relevant to be applied in socio-cultural sciences (sociology, anthropology, history, linguistics, archaeology) which tends to be directly related to political, economic and social realities.

In his work on Marx's "Capital", it shows clearly that there are classifications of society based on the bourgeois (capitalist) class and the proletariat (workers), where the working class is totally dependent on the bourgeois class and bourgeois exploits proletariat for the benefit of surplus value, while the results obtained from work are not comparable to work time, is a form of injustice that must be criticized. This kind of reality depicts something contrary to humanist values. In fact, the material produced in a production process will be useful if it is offered for human benefit or for the sake of humanism. Furthermore, in political reality, there is a hegemony process (Gramsci language as a Marxian) occurs, which is carried out by the State towards civil society in accordance with the collective desires of the State.

In fact, it can be said that human beings are not helpless creatures in the presence of what is often called "the destiny". But he also cannot arbitrarily change history. Marx says: Humans make their own history, but they do not make it as they will; They do not make it under the situations chosen by themselves, but under existing situations, which are determined and transmitted from the past. So humans can only change history within the constraints that existed at that time. The history described by the ruling class to this day has always been the history of the great people. In their minds, history is driven by a handful of people: accomplished thinkers, great leaders, charismatic orators. In the history of the rulers, the commoners did not play a role at all. They are not factors. They are only the sheep that follow their leader. And even if they play a role, only as a bunch of wild people who are doing riots. Historical materialism overturns the history of the rulers, that the people are the main actors in the change of history. If there are leader figures, it is the embodiment of the classes in the society.

The difference between Marx's philosophy and previous philosophies lies in the matter that philosophies before Marx only talking about the natural phenomena, while his views on the history of society are unclear and consequently talk about social phenomena or the history of society. Hence the birth of Marx's historical materialism philosophy is a revolution of the philosophy history. Marx's historical materialism teaches about the social conditions determining social consciousness, general law of society development, bases and upper buildings. Social conditions determine social consciousness. Social conditions have conditions and consist of three factors: geography, population and production.

Of these three social condition factors, the most decisive factor is the way of production. The way production factor is the most automobile, progressive and revolutionary factor in pushing forward social conditions. Geographic and population factors are factors that have an influence and take the decisive in pushing forward the social conditions, but not faster than the production factor method.

The geographic and population factors are changing and developing very slowly. So slowly changing and developing geographic and population factors, so it missed out very far from the changing and growing factor of production. Therefore the role in pushing forward the social conditions until such is not felt. Then the nature changes and the development of social conditions becomes determined by changing and developing factors of the way of production. The social consciousness which is determined by social conditions, it is also determined by the means of production way.

Social consciousness is an understanding, views and social attitudes to human life. As well as to the life and social life of society. The social consciousness of a person depends and is determined by his social conditions. Social conditions determine social consciousness. Change and development of social conditions also bring and determine the change and development of social consciousness. However, social consciousness is not passive to social conditions. Social consciousness has an active influence on social conditions, to the change and development of that social conditions. The social factors which influence and determine social consciousness are geography, population and way of production with their respective roles.

Discussing about culture, historical materialism has a study of the material aspects of culture, or often called material culture. While on the other hand, there is a scientific paradigm to understand culture, which is more focused on the aspects of the material, or that we call cultural materialism. There is always debate, which is exactly what is more decisive in culture. That is, whether the ideas which produce behavior, or vice versa, precisely the behaviors and actions which determine the idea. Whichever is more dominant, the cultural traces can be seen from the verbal and nonverbal (non-linguistic) aspects. The verbal aspect itself is divided into two, which are oral and written text. While nonverbal aspects are also divided into two, namely the form of artifacts and nature.

Cultural materialism is a study of historical materials in a political framework. Cultural materialism relates to the historical document, its analysis, and the re-creation of the view about a certain historical period. Cultural materialism also discusses the hegemonic pressure on society in the creation of canon works. According to Hodges, mute evidence, such as written text and artifacts, is different from spoken words. The mute evidence physically lasts for a long time, and therefore can be separated in space and time from the author, the producer, or the user. These material traces often have to be interpreted without being able to utilize the original commentary from the source (*indigenous commentary*).

Material traces and residues thus present special problems for qualitative research. The main disciplines that have tried to develop theories and methods that are suitable for this purpose are: history, art history, archeology, anthropology, sociology, cognitive psychology, technology, and cultural studies of modern material. The material traces can be in the form of documents and records. Lincoln and Gubadistinguish between written documents and records, based on whether the text was prepared for evidence of a formal transaction. So, the means by recording include: marriage certificate, driver's license, construction contract, and banking statement. As the document means, the text is made for personal reasons rather than the official reasons, such as: daily notes/diary, memos, letters, and field notes.

The problem is the interpretation of the written text, whatever kind. The texts are important for qualitative research, because they are relatively accessible and inexpensive. In addition, the information presented may differ from the oral form, or is not available in oral form. Since the written text is more durable and lasts long, it also provides historical insight. Written text is a special case of artifact, which gets an almost identical interpretation procedure. Both in the text and artifact, the problem is how to place the material culture in various contexts, while at the same time, entering into a dialectical relationship between the context and the context of the analyzer. This hermeneutics exercise, in which the experience surrounding the material culture is translated into a different interpretation context, is common, both for text and other forms of material culture.

Materialism is one of the understandings which assumes that human life in the world is the result of material engineering. This means that while a human lives in the world, he actually lives in the material world. He wants to live, he has to eat, he wants to organize his value system and his culture must use tools (material). Cultural view of materialism is the collection result of learned thoughts and behaviors exhibited by members of social groups, which is passed on from one generation to the next. This materialism view is related to the relationship between humans and their environment, by Marvin Harris, called an empirical variable and this is termed techno-economic and techno-environment. Culture is not irrational, incomprehensible, full of subjectivity, but material, clear and measurable. In this regard, culture is defined as a collection of learned thoughts and behaviors exhibited by members of social groups. All of this is passed from one generation to the next. Culture is independent of genetic heredity.

Material culture, including written text, presents challenges for an interpretive approach, which often emphasizes the importance of dialogue with and verbal critical commentary from participants. Evidence of material culture, on the other hand, may not have surviving participants, who can respond to interpretations. Even if such participants still exist, they are often unable to articulate the meaning of the material culture. Whatever happens, the material culture lasts long, so the original author and user may only be able to give a partial picture of the entire history of the meanings given to an object, given that the object is used and interpreted in a long period of time.

The challenges posed by the material culture are important for anthropological and sociological analysis, as material culture is often a medium in which alternative sounds and voices are often silenced, which can be expressed. For critics of historical materialism, the view that the law of science is not only descriptive of the past, but in a particular sense the scientific law of such knowledge must also be as a form of future analysis. Therefore, they tend to distinguish both types of scientific law in two propositions, i.e. the knowledge we have about past events (i.e., facts) and the kind of knowledge we have about future events (i.e., the law).

It means that the law of science has something that is believed to embrace the future, and therefore involves prediction, whereas factual statements are limited to a certain time in the past.

In other forms, the historical materialism of Marx contributes to the construction of knowledge about language which does not exist with its own but as the linguistic phenomenon of language has a vitality only in the organic relationship with society. This is as stated by Marr that:

Language is a reflection of the relationship regulating production, and this is not only on the level of 'content' ('mind') but also its 'form'. So in the same case, he commented that: "Not only the concept are expressed with words but the words themselves and their form, their actual appearance, the problems of social structure, the prints of super-structural, and, through them, from the economy, from economic life.... There is no physiological phonetic law in speech, the physiological side of this problem is a technique adapted, altered, refined and instructed by humans. This means that it is adjusted to the laws of society; The law of oral speech exists, the phonetic law or the voice of human speech exists – but these are social laws... "Because the relationship defined by the material production relationship is the class relationship, the relationship of class struggle, means the language is entirely and formally ideological, the reflection of the class struggle. Further Marr is written: 'Formal elements in the language can not be treated other than ideological linking in the way of society production; and concludes: there is no national-language, but that there is a class language'. (Stephen Heath, 1977:71).

Heath's view, expressed based on the reality expressed in the form of musical and theatrical dramas taken from a character in it namely Rameau's nephew, whose character is displayed as a person who conveyed the cry, expressed feelings/emotions, interruptions, affirmations, negation to, social structures and economic life encountered in society.

Conclusion

In this article, we had tried to briefly explain the paradigm of historical materialism, its epistemological aspects, which were developed by Karl Marx and the construction of these paradigms for use in the socio-cultural sciences.

Historical materialism was a philosophy of science which emphasized on the real world (material) as whatever form it took, the object of study of historical materialism was an object and not an idea. Idea was only a reflection of the material which is captured by the senses. Furthermore, through the dialectical method which emphasized on the forward movement, thesis-antithesis-synthesis is the process of presenting research results, it can be adequately described in the form of language. The question of whether the truth presented was objective (*gegenständliche*) it was not a matter of theory but a matter of practice. Therefore, in practice humans must prove the truth, that is, reality and power, this solitude (*Diesseitigkeit*) of his thought.

With the paradigm of historical materialism, the perspective of socio-cultural studies will be more enriched. It can be realized that any form of ideas generated by the thought, it was not sourced in abstract but was referring to something concrete and ever existed in the socio-cultural life. As such, people cannot argued without leaving from an existing reality.

References

- Ahimsa-Putra, Heddy Shri. *Paradigma Ilmu Sosial-Budaya -Sebuah Pandangan-*, makalah disampaikan pada kuliah umum "Paradigma Penelitian Ilmu-ilmu Humaniora" diselenggarakan oleh Program Studi Linguistik, Sekolah Pascasarjana, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, di Bandung, 7 Desember 2009.
- Barham, Lawrence S. "Let's Walk before We Run: An Appraisal of Historical Materialist Approaches to the Later Stone Age" dalam *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*, Vol. 47, No. 155, Jun., 1992, hlm. 44-51.
- Carling, Alan. "The Strength of Historical Materialism: A Comment" dalam *Science & Society*, Vol. 58, No. 1, 1994, hlm. 60-72.
- Cohen, G. A. "Walt on Historical Materialism and Functional Explanation" dalam *Ethics*, Vol. 97, No. 1, Oct., 1986, hlm. 219-232.
- Cunningham, Frank. "Practice and Some Muddles about the Methodology of Historical Materialism" dalam *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, No. 2, Dec., 1973, hlm. 235-248.
- Czajkowski, Waldemar. "Marx's Paradigm: A Paradigm to Be (Re) Discovered? Or How Marx Can Help Us to Construct Unitarian Theories of History, dalam *Review* (Fernand Braudel Center), Vol. 21, No. 4, *The States, the Markets, and the Societies: Separate Logics or a Single Domain? Part Two*, 1998, hlm. 389-468.
- Ehrenberg, John. "The Politics of Historical Materialism" dalam *Contemporary Marxism*, No. 9, Imperialism and the Transition to Socialism, 1984, hlm. 44-55.
- Etienne Balibar. 1995. *The Philosophy of Marx*. New York: The Varick Street.
- Eyerman, Ron. "Social Movement and Social Theory" dalam *Sociology*, Vol. 18, No. 1, February 1984, hlm. 71-82.
- Feuer, Lewis S. "Ethical Theories and Historical Materialism" dalam *Science & Society*, Vol. 6, No. 3, Summer, 1942, hlm. 242-272

- Gruen, William. "Determinism, Fatalism, and Historical Materialism" dalam *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 33, No. 23, Nov. 5, 1936, hlm. 617-628
- Harris, Marvin. 2010. *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture*. New York: Altamira Press.
- Hodges, Donald Clark. "Society Historical Materialism in Ethics" dalam *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 23, No. 1, Sep., 1962, hlm. 1-22
- Hoffman, John. "James Connolly and the theory of Historical Materialism" dalam *Saothar*, Vol. 2 1976, hlm. 53-61.
- Gottlieb, Roger S. "Historical Materialism, Historical Laws and Social Primacy: Further Discussion of the Transition Debate" dalam *Science & Society*, Vol. 51, No. 2, Summer, 1987, hlm. 188-199.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. dan Egon G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Marx, Karl. 2004. *Kapital: Sebuah Kritik Ekonomi Politik*, Jakarta: Hasta Mitra.
- Mehrotra, Santosh K. "On Some Issues in Marxian Economics and Historical Materialism" dalam *Social Scientist*, Vol. 9, No. 12, Dec., 1981, hlm. 68-76.
- Nielsen, Kai. "Historical Materialism, Ideology and Ethics" dalam *Studies in Soviet Thought*, Vol. 29, No. 1, Jan., 1985, hlm. 47-63.
- Osterberg, Dag and Michel Vale. "The Concept of Anomie and Historical Materialism" dalam *International Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1979/1980, hlm. 63-74
- Patria, Nezar & Andi Arief. 2009. *Antonio Gramsci Negara & Hegemoni*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Railton, Peter. "Explanatory Asymmetry in Historical Materialism" dalam *Ethics*, Vol. 97, No. 1, Oct., 1986, hlm. 233-239.
- Ritzer, George, Douglas J. Goodman. 2010. *Teori Sosiologi: Dari Teori Sosiologi Klasik Sampai Perkembangan Mutakhir Teori Sosial Postmodern*, Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- Russell, Bertrand. 2007. *Sejarah Filisafat Barat*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Schiebel, Joseph. "Changing the Unchangeable: Historical Materialism and Six Versions of Eternal Laws of Historical Development" dalam *Studies in Soviet Thought*, Vol. 7, No. 4, Dec., 1967, hlm. 318-332
- Schlauch, Margaret. "Mechanism and Historical Materialism in Semantic Studies" dalam *Science & Society*, Vol. 11, No. 2. 1947, hlm. 144-167.
- Schwartzman, David W. "Althusser, Dialectical Materialism and the Philosophy of Science" , dalam *Science & Society*, Vol. 39, No. 3., 1975, hlm. 318-330
- Smith, A. Anthony. "Two Theories of Historical Materialism: G. A. Cohen and Jürgen Habermas" dalam *Theory and Society*, Vol. 13, No. 4, Jul., 1984, hlm. 513-540.
- Smith, Hazel. "The Silence of the Academics: International Social Theory, Historical Materialism and Political" dalam *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 2. Apr., 1996, hlm. 191-212
- Thomsen, Hans Jørgen. Epistemology and the Problem of Materialism, dalam *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 20, No. 4, *The Critique of Political Economy*, 1977, hlm. 349-367
- Washbourne, R. Kelly, Greg Horvath and Fernando Haddad. "Toward the Redialectization of Historical Materialism: Labor and Language" dalam *Cultural Critique: Critical Theory in Latin America*, No. 49, 2001, hlm. 111-138.

Online Resources:

www.marxists.org/indonesia/archive/marx-engels/1886/ludwig-feuerbach/ch02.htm

www.marxists.org/indonesia/archive/marx-engels/1845/tesis-feuerbach.htm

www.marxists.org/indonesia/archive/marx-engels/1844/Pendahuluan_Sumbangan.htm

www.marxists.org/indonesia/archive/lenin/1913/tigasumb.htm

Author Yassin Ahmed Al-Qudah Information

Resa Dandirwalu

Faculty of Theology, Christian University of Indonesia, Maluku
Ot Pattimaipauw Talake Street, Nusaniwe Subdistrict, Ambon City, Maluku, Indonesia

Johan Saimima

Faculty of Theology, Christian University of Indonesia, Maluku
Ot Pattimaipauw Talake Street, Nusaniwe Subdistrict, Ambon City, Maluku, Indonesia

Dedi Irwanto

Faculty of Humanities, Sriwijaya University
Al Gazali Mosque Street, Bukit Lama, Hilir Bar I Subdistrict, Palembang City, South Sumatera 30128, Indonesia
