

History of Marxism & Socialism: A Chart of Key Figures with Comments

Dr. Rodney G. Pepper

<p><u>SOCIALIST ANARCHISM IN EUROPE: 19th-Early 20th C.</u></p> <p>Pierre Proudhon Mikhail Bakunin Louis Blanqui Louise Michel Pietr Kropotkin Leo Tolstoy Luigi Fabbri</p>	<p><u>SOCIALIST ANARCHISM IN UK & USA: 19th-Early 20th C.</u></p> <p>William Godwin Johann Most Oscar Wilde James Connolly Big Bill Haywood; Mother Jones; Joe Hill; John Reed</p>		<p><u>CLASSICAL MARXISM: 19th Century</u></p> <p>Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Eleanor Marx Wilhelm Liebknecht August Bebel Karl Kautsky Georgi Plekhanov</p>	<p><u>UTOPIAN SOCIALISM: Late 18th Century-Mid 19th Century</u></p> <p>Gracchus Babeuf Saint-Simon Auguste Comte Charles Fourier Robert Owen</p>	<p><u>EVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM: Late 19th Century</u></p> <p>(Later) Fr. Engels Ferdinand Lassalle William Morris¹ Eduard Bernstein¹ Edward Bellamy; Charlotte Gilmore Perkins</p>	<p><u>PROTO-SOCIAL DEMOCRACY Late 19th Century</u></p> <p>Louis Blanc Daniel De Leon William Morris² Eduard Bernstein² Henry George Richard Ely Victor Berger</p>
<p><u>SOCIALIST ANARCHISM Early-Mid 20th C.</u></p> <p>Emma Goldman Alexander Berkman; Ricardo Flores Magón; Rudolf Rocker; Buenaventura Durruti Lucía Sánchez Saornil Herbert Read</p>	<p><u>HETEROODOX ECONOMISTS Early-Mid 20th C</u></p> <p>J.M. Keynes Michael Kalecki Nicholas Kaldor Gunnar Myrdal Joan Robinson Piero Sraffa Arthur Pigou</p>	<p><u>"LIBERAL" MARXISTS/ SOCIALISTS¹ Early-Mid 20th C.</u></p> <p>Eugene V. Debs; Helen Keller; Antonie Pannekoek; G.D.H. Cole; José Carlos Mariátegui; Victor Serge; Andres Nin; George Orwell; Carlo Rosselli</p>	<p><u>CLASSICAL MARXISM: Early-Mid 20th C.</u></p> <p>V.I. Lenin Leon Trotsky Rosa Luxemburg Karl Liebknecht Franz Mehring Antonio Gramsci Joseph P. Cannon</p>	<p><u>AUSTRO-MARXISM Early-Mid 20th C.</u></p> <p>Rudolph Hilferding Otto Bauer Max Adler Victor Adler Karl Renner Otto Neurath Friedrich Adler</p>	<p><u>IMPORTANT NON-MARXIST SOCIAL SCIENTISTS Early-Mid 20th C</u></p> <p>Emile Durkheim Thorsten Veblin Max Weber Joseph Schumpeter Talcott Parsons C. Wright Mill Leslie White</p>	<p><u>SOCIAL DEMOCRACY Early-Mid 20th C.</u></p> <p>Jean Jaurès; Sidney & Beatrice Webb; G.B. Shaw; Ramsay MacDonald; Leon Blum Norman Thomas Clement Attlee</p>
<p><u>MARXIST ARTISTS & HUMANISTS Early-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Diego Rivera Frida Kahlo Andre Breton; Raya Dunayevskaya; C.L.R. James; Jean-Paul Sartre; Maurice Merleau-Ponty; Adam Schaff</p>	<p><u>MARKET SOCIALIST ECONOMICS 19th-Mid-20th C.</u></p> <p>J.S. Mill (19th C.) Oscar Lange Fred M. Taylor H.D. Dickinson Abba Lerner Janos Kornai</p>	<p><u>MARXIST ECONOMICS: MONTHLY REVIEW Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Paul Sweezy Leo Huberman Paul Baron Harry Magdoff Ernest Mandel Charles Bettelheim John Bellamy Foster¹</p>	<p><u>MARXIST POLITICAL LEADERS: Early-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Farabundo Martí Chen Duxiu Mao Zedong Chou Enlai Ho Chi Minh Josip Broz Tito Fidel Castro Che Guevara Camillo Cienfuego</p>	<p><u>MARXIST SOCIAL SCIENTISTS Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Karl Polanyi Maurice Dobb Eric Hobsbawm E.P. Thompson Christopher Hill Isaac Deutscher Joseph Hanson</p>	<p><u>HEGELIAN MARXIST Φ 19th-Mid 20th C.</u></p> <p>Antonio Labriola Georg Lukács Karl Korsch Galvano Della Volpe Ernst Bloch Walter Benjamin¹ Alexandre Kojève</p>	<p><u>FRANKFURT SCHOOL CRITICAL THEORY Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Max Horkheimer Theodore Adorno Walter Benjamin² Herbert Marcuse Erich Fromm¹ Jurgen Habermas Axel Honneth</p>
<p><u>SOCIALIST ANARCHISM & LIBERTARIAN SOCIALISM Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Noam Chomsky¹ Daniel Guerin Murray Bookchin¹ Colin Ward Hakim Bey Paul Goodman Germaine Greer</p>	<p><u>MARXIST HUMANISM/ SELF-MANAGING SOCIALISM Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Milovan Djilas Erich Fromm² Branco Horvat Mihaelo Markovic Svetozar Stojanovic Gajo Petrović Rudi Supek</p>	<p><u>ANGLOPHONE LEFT-LEANING POLITICAL Φ Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>John Rawls T.M. Scanlon Norman Daniels Joshua Cohen¹ Martha Nussbaum Allen E. Buchanan Richard Arneson Thomas Pogge¹</p>	<p><u>THIRD WORLD MARXIST & SOCIALIST LEADERS: Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Patrice Lumumba Amílcar Cabral; Hugo Blanco; Manuel Marulanda Vélez; Thomas Borge Daniel Ortega Nelson Mandela Stephen Biko</p>	<p><u>DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS Mid-Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Hans Singer; Raúl Prebisch; Theotonio dos Santos; Fernando Henrique Cardoso; Armatya Sen;¹ Pranab Bardham; Walden Bello; Ha-Joon Chang¹</p>	<p><u>HEGELIAN (& KANTIAN) MARXIST Φ Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Lucio Colletti Henri Lefebvre Herbert Marcuse Lucien Goldman István Mészáros; Guy Debord; Cornelius Castoriadis</p>	<p><u>SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LEADERS: Mid-Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Irving Howe Willy Brandt François Mitterand Jawaharlal Nehru Michael Harrington Salvador Allende; Olaf Palme; Gro Harlem Brundtland; Bernie Sanders</p>
<p><u>DEMOCRATIC COMMAND ECONOMY Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Ernest Mandel¹ Noam Chomsky² Bertall Ollman¹ Michael Albert¹ & Robin Hahnel¹ G.A. Cohen¹ Milton Fisk¹ Al Campbell</p>	<p><u>MARKET SOCIALISM THEORISTS Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Alec Nove János Kornai Branco Horvat Jaroslav Vanek Thomas Weiskopf John Roemer¹ David Schweickart¹ David Miller</p>	<p><u>ANALYTICAL MARXIST POLITICAL Φ Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Kai Nielsen Brian Barry Stephen Lukes George Brenkert Jeffrey Reiman John McMurtry William H. Shaw Rodney G. Pepper</p>	<p><u>ANALYTICAL MARXISTS: SEPTEMBER GROUP Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>G.A. Cohen² Jon Elster John Roemer² Pranab Bardham Adam Przeworski Erik Olin Wright Philippe Van Parijs Jan van der Veen</p>	<p><u>WORLD SYSTEMS THEORY Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Fernand Braudel Immanuel Wallerstein; Andre Gunder Frank; Samir Amin; Giovanni Arrighi; Christopher Chase-Dunn; Thomas Reifer</p>	<p><u>ANGLOPHONE CRITICAL THEORY Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Thomas McCarthy Richard Bernstein David Rasmussen Seyla Benhabib¹ Iris Marion Young¹ Nancy Fraser¹ Douglas Kellner David Ingram</p>	<p><u>REFORMIST COMMUNIST LEADERS: Late 20th C.</u></p> <p>Alexander Dubcek Noberto Bobbio Enrico Berlinguer Santiago Carillo Georges Marchais Vaclav Havel Mikhail Gorbachev Deng Xiaoping</p>

<p>SOCIALIST ANARCHISM & LIBERTARIAN SOCIALISM <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Michael Albert² David Graeber Andrej Grubačić Janet Biehl Michael Paraskos Arundhati Roy; Subcomandante Marcos/ESLN</p>	<p>HETERODOX ECONOMISTS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Amartya Sen² Albert Hirschman Herbert Simon Hyman Minsky Paul Krugman Joseph Stiglitz Jeffrey Sachs Ha-Joon Chang² Thomas Piketty</p>	<p>ANGLOPHONE MARXIST PHILOSOPHERS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>William McBride Allen W. Wood Richard Miller Andrew Levine Norman Geras Milton Fisk James Lawson Ellen Meiksins Wood Nancy Holmstrom¹</p>	<p>NEO-MARXIST POLITICAL THEORISTS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Roy Medvedev Ralph Miliband Perry Anderson Alexander Cockburn Antonio Negri¹ Alex Callinicos Tariq Ali Michael Parenti Mitchell Cohen²</p>	<p>NEO-MARXIST SOCIAL SCIENTISTS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Tom Bottomore Howard Zinn G. William Domhoff Robin Blackburn David Harvey Nicos Poulantzas Robert Brenner; Ernesto Laclau¹ & Chantal Mouffe¹</p>	<p>NEO-MARXIST CULTURAL THEORISTS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Fredric Jameson Terry Eagleton Raymond Williams Stuart Hall</p> <p>STRUCTURALIST MARXISM <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Louis Althusser Étienne Balibar</p>	<p>LATIN AMERICAN SOCIALIST POLITICAL LEADERS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Hugo Chávez; Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva; Néstor Kirchner; Cristina Fernández de Kirchner; Ricardo Lagos; Michelle Bachelet; Jose Mujica; Rafael Correa</p>
<p>SOCIAL ECOLOGY & ECOSOCIALISM <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Murray Bookchin² Rudolph Bahro Barry Commoner James O'Connor Martin O'Connor John Bellamy Foster² Ramachandra Guha Vandana Shiva; Joel Kovel & Michael Lowy; Derek Wall; Ariel Salleh</p>	<p>OTHER SOCIALIST ECONOMISTS <u>Mid 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Richard M. Gordon Robert Heilbroner Michio Morishima Benjamin N. Ward Michael Lebowitz; Richard D. Wolff & Stephen Resnick; Herbert Gintis & Samuel Bowles; Richard Edwards; Michael Hudson; Pat Devine</p>	<p>THEORISTS OF EGALITARIAN DEMOCRACY <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Robert Dahl C.B. Macpherson Frank Cunningham David Crocker; Amy Gutman & Dennis Thompson; Joshua Cohen² James Fishkin Carole Pateman¹ David Held¹ Chantal Mouffe² & Ernesto Laclau²</p>	<p>"THIRD COURSE" NEO-MARXIST POLITICAL THEORISTS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Hal Draper Andre Buzgalin Andre Kolganov Boris Kagerlitzky Savas Michael</p> <p>EUROPEAN ANALYTICAL MARXIST Φ <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Rainer Forst Lubos Blaha Nicholas Vrousalis</p>	<p>SOCIALIST FEMINISTS <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Alice Walker Angela Davis Barbara Ehrenreich Ann Ferguson Alison Jaggar Carole Pateman² Seyla Benhabib² Iris Marion Young² Nancy Fraser² Nancy Holmstrom² Rosemarie Tong Rita Manning</p>	<p>HEGELIAN MARXIST Φ <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Bertall Ollman² Tony Smith</p> <p>POST-STRUCTURALIST "MARXISM" <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Jacque Derrida; Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari</p> <p>POST-MARXISM <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Pierre Bourdieu Slavoj Žižek</p>	<p>COSMOPOLITAN POLITICAL Φ <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Henry Shue Charles Beitz Thomas Pogge² David Held² Darrel Moellendorf</p> <p>MULTI-CULTURALISM <u>Late 20th-21st C.</u></p> <p>Cornell West Charles Taylor Susan Moeller Okin Will Kymlicka Charles W. Mills</p>

Key:

Φ = Philosophy or Philosophers

Bold Scoring and Progressively Larger Type indicates levels of Importance (in my opinion)

Red Type = Marxist/Marxian Political Figures & Social Scientists (13 categories)

Pink Type = Analytical Marxist/Marxian Philosophersⁱⁱ (4 categories)

Brown Type = Continental-Style Marxist/Marxian Philosophersⁱⁱⁱ (9 categories)

Purple Type = Socialist – but not necessarily Marxist – Figures (4 categories)

Green Type = Socialist Anarchist (or Quasi-Anarchist) Figures (6 categories)

Blue Type = Social Democratic & Reformist Communist Figures (6 categories)

Light Blue Type = Utopian Socialists (1 category)

Black Type = Important Non-Marxist Figures (Many of Whom are Quasi-Marxist, and All of Whom are Important to Take into Consideration) (9 categories)

Roman numerals such as i, ii, iii indicate endnotes.

Arabic numerals such as 1, 2, 3 indicate the number of times a figure is mentioned in the chart. However, this does not necessarily indicate greater importance.

Comments on History of Marxism & Socialism: A Chart of Key Figures with Comments

1. This chart is meant to help illustrate the history of Marxism and socialism, primarily in the West (that is, primarily in Europe, the U.S., Canada). It does, however, include such important Non-Western Marxist/Communist political leaders as Mao Zedong, Chou Elai, and Ho Chi Minh.

2. It includes both theorists, on the one hand, and political leaders (and activists) in the Marxist and socialist traditions, on the other. Of course, many Marxist and socialist political leaders have also been theorists, and vice versa.

3. It is organized chronologically, going down, and each cell represents a particular group or type of theorists and/or political leaders.

4. In order to properly understand the Marxist tradition it is necessary to also understand the Socialist Anarchist/Liberal Socialist tradition,^{iv} on the one hand, and Evolutionary Socialism/Social Democracy, on the other, since these three general traditions developed in conjunction and contention with each other, and each importantly impacted the development of the others. However, all three of these traditions accept the basic political positions that (1) some kind of socialism is historically possible and (2) a genuinely socialist society is better than any feasible kind of capitalism.

Political leaders and social-scientific theorists in the Marxist tradition are in **Red Type**, and mainly occupy the center columns. Thus, if one wants to view the history and evolution of core Marxism one need only follow the red columns from the top of the chart to the bottom.

5. This chart also includes philosophical schools of Marxism. In fact, it includes two general types of Marxist philosophical schools of thought: (A) Marxist theorists that are based on Continental Schools of philosophy (such as Hegelianism, Existentialism, structuralism, and post-structuralism) and Marxist theories that are based on Analytical Philosophy (particularly, Analytical Marxism). The former theorists are in **Brown Type** and the latter are in **Pink Type**.

Thus, if one wants to view the history and evolution of the Marxist tradition as a whole, including its political leaders and theorists, its social-scientific theorists (in the fields of sociology, economics, anthropology, political science, human geography, etc.), and its philosophers, one should follow **Red, Brown, and Pink** colored cells from the top of the chart to the bottom.

6. But if one really wants to understand the history and evolution of the Marxist tradition one also needs to understand the history and evolution of the other major socialist traditions with which it has always been intricately entwined. Thus, **Socialist Anarchist** figures are in **Green Type**, and **Liberal Socialist** figures are in **Purple Type**, and their cells are in the columns to the left. On the other hand, **Evolutionary Socialists** and **Social Democratic** figures (which overlap to a considerable degree) are mainly in the right hand columns and are in **Blue Type**.

7. The Marxist/Socialist tradition as a whole stands against the anti-socialist traditions that defend capitalism as preferable to any kind of socialism or communism. This includes various egalitarian liberal theories, moderate liberal theories, neoliberalism, right-libertarianism (which defends a more or less laissez faire capitalist economy and a more or less minimal state), as well as various conservative theories,^v and even fascism.

8. It should be noted, however, that many political philosophers and theorists who have expressed a view on this issue, especially over the past 50 years, are neutral between egalitarian liberal capitalist societies and various kinds of socialist societies, perhaps depending on a particular country's level of economic development and political culture. Such figures as John Rawls argue that the choice between these types of society depends upon empirical, historical facts and the practical judgment as to which kind of socioeconomic and political systems (of those feasible) can best meet the correct principles of social justice or the correct set of moral principles.

9. It should also be noted that some non-Marxist and non-Socialist theoretical traditions have importantly influenced the Marxist and broader Socialist traditions and, in turn, have often been importantly influenced by these traditions. I have included the most important of these philosophical and social-scientific traditions in **Black Type** on the chart.

10. However, in order to understand this chart and the claims I am making about it in my analysis, we must define the main terms we are using. In particular, we must define the following terms.

Main Types of Socioeconomic Systems

Capitalism

Capitalism is a socioeconomic system that has a market economy and (primarily) private ownership and control of large-scale economic enterprises and assets, and thus investment capital and its flow. Its main "law of motion" is the drive for private profit and capital accumulation. As such, capitalism as a socioeconomic system is compatible with any form of government from the most democratic to the least democratic, and from the most repressive to the least repressive. And, in fact, while some capitalist societies have had very democratic and liberal governments, others have had military dictatorships and even fascist dictatorships (such as Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy).

Socialism

A socialist economy is one that is characterized by (primarily) public ownership and control of large-scale economic enterprises and assets, and thus investment capital and its flow. However, on this definition a socialist economy, it can have either a market socialist economy or a command socialist economy. In any case, its main "law of motion" is supposed to be acting for the long-term public good. And, just as in the case of capitalism, a socialist economy is compatible with any form of government, from extremely democratic and non-repressive to extremely undemocratic and repressive. We can take socialism in this sense to be what Marx called the "first stage of communism."

However, it must be pointed out that whether a country (or society) is socialist is not determined by the degree of government intervention in the economy (in terms of fiscal policy, monetary policy, etc.), the degree to which it provides public goods (such as the basic economic infrastructure, health care, public parks, etc.), how high its taxes are, or how extensive its social transfer (welfare) programs are.

On this analysis, the so-called social-democratic Nordic countries (Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland) have capitalist economic systems rather than socialist economic systems because they are still characterized by (primarily) private ownership of their large-scale economic enterprises and assets as well as by the drive for private profit. (I am not making any sort of normative judgments about these societies at this point; I'm just categorizing them.) However, since the economies of these societies have greater government intervention and a higher degree of public (government) ownership of large-scale economic enterprises and assets than other capitalist societies, these economies are sometimes referred to as "mixed economies." But these economies are not even close to having public ownership of half of the large-scale economic enterprises and assets; thus it is somewhat misleading to refer to them as "mixed economies." They are fundamentally capitalist economies.

However, if an economy really has more or less equal public and private ownership of large-scale economic enterprises – say, even a 60%-40% or 65%-35% split – then it would be convenient to classify it as an Intermediate economy or Intermediate socioeconomic system. While some analysts argue that contemporary China has a capitalist economy and others argue that it has a market socialist economy, it might be the case that it presently has an Intermediate economy at this stage of its development. (Whether or not such an Intermediate economy is stable over the long run or whether it will inevitably develop into a more pure form of capitalism or more pure form of socialism is a matter of much debate.)

Communism (in the Classical Marxist sense of the term) is not only a classless society but also a stateless society. In the words of Marx, after the transitional phase of the first stage of communism – which today is normally referred to as socialism – comes the "higher stage of communism" in which the state has "withered away." Thus, on the issue of the "final" type of society they are aiming at – and thought could and would come about – Classical Marxists and Left-Wing Anarchists are in complete agreement. However, many socialists and Marxists today – including myself – view this "higher stage of communism" or "full-fledged communism" as a utopian impossibility (at least for large-scale societies as opposed to small communities). This is because we do not believe that the two necessary (and jointly sufficient) conditions for the evolution of such a stateless society will (or can) ever be fulfilled in the real world. These two conditions are (1)

material super-abundance (a condition in which anyone can have any material good or service they desire) and (2) the complete transformation of human nature (or psychology) such that everyone will be completely peaceful, cooperative, and altruistic such that a state is not needed either to enforce criminal (or civil) law or to coordinate economic and other human activities (which is supposedly accomplished by the spontaneous cooperation of everyone). The first condition – material super-abundance – is not possible in the real world not only because, as we now know, the natural environment puts limits on how many goods and services can be produced (while still having a livable environment) but also because people's time, itself, is a scarce commodity whose scarcity can never be eliminated. The second condition – the complete transformation of human nature – is not possible in the real world because, as we now know, human nature (or psychology) is not infinitely or indefinitely malleable (as was assumed by Classical Marxists, who accepted the Enlightenment doctrine of the "Perfectibility of Man." Human beings are – among many other true descriptions – animals and, more specifically, primates who are sometimes prone to uncooperative and even violent thoughts and actions, as well as capable of cooperation, non-violence, and altruism. Although better social circumstances can quite likely significantly reduce the frequency of uncooperative and violent thoughts and actions, it is unrealistic to believe that all such thoughts and actions can be eliminated from human populations in the real world. For these reasons it is virtually certain that large-scale societies will always need a state (government) to enforce criminal (and civil) law and (at least partially) coordinate economic and other types of activities.

If this analysis is correct then there is no point to arguing for full-fledged communism. But this is really irrelevant since the only really important issue at this point in history that Marxists and socialists should be concerned with is whether we can develop genuinely socialist societies that will solve the terrible social problems of capitalism.

ⁱ The figures in this category are more often referred to as "Libertarian Socialists." However, in contemporary political philosophy – at least in English-speaking countries – the terms "libertarian" and "libertarianism" have come to be primarily associated with *right-libertarianism* as elaborated by such thinkers as Robert Nozick, Milton Friedman, and Friedrich von Hayek, which promotes (more or less) laissez faire capitalism and a (more or less) minimal state. Thus, I believe it is better (more perspicuous) to refer to this kind of socialism as "Liberal Socialism." As I am using the term, "Liberal" Socialism refers to the views accepted by socialists who are more concerned with emphasizing decentralism and participatory democracy, and with ensuring "liberal" rights and liberties (such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of association, etc.) in any kind of society at any level of development, than are most orthodox Marxists. While Orthodox Marxists have always believed that both socialist and future communist societies would be free and democratic, they tended to be less concerned with emphasizing "liberal" rights and liberties.

But this appellation ("Liberal Socialist") does not necessarily indicate that they are not revolutionaries. Indeed, most of those I list here were revolutionary socialists, although they were willing to also engage in reformist tactics such as contesting elections in capitalist societies.

ⁱⁱ By "Analytical" philosophy I only mean to indicate a type of philosophy that is devoted to the methodological standards of (1) conceptual clarity and (2) rigorous argumentation. These are the only two methodological commitments that characterize Analytical Philosophy; and there are no substantive views in any area of philosophy that all Analytical Philosophers share. However, another characteristic shared by almost all Analytical Philosophers is that while they feel free to help scientists and scientific theories achieve greater clarity and logical rigor, they do not believe that it is within the province or authority of Philosophy to contradict or correct established Science, especially the Natural Sciences. But, of course, some Analytical Philosophers – especially those in the area of the Philosophy of Science – sometimes make theoretical contributions to scientific theories but when they do so they are acting as scientists, not philosophers per se. (And, of course, some scientists – such as Darwin, Einstein, Nils Bohr, and Heisenberg – sometimes make philosophical claims, as well as scientific ones. But when they do so they are acting as philosophers, not scientists per se.)

By way of contrast, Analytical Philosophers often view the writings and theories of Continentally-Oriented Philosophers to be overly vague and imprecise and, when this is taken to an extreme, to even be nonsensical; and they also object to Continentally-Oriented Philosophers when they attempt to undermine the validity of the sciences.

But not all philosophers in this Continental Tradition (or Continentally-Oriented Tradition) are viewed by Analytical Philosophers as being objectionably vague and imprecise or as implausibly contradicting established science. For example, Maurice Merleau-Ponty as well as Michel Foucault are held in high regard by many Analytical Philosophers, as is Jurgen

Habermas and other Critical Theorists who have eschewed the Hegelian and/or Post-Hegelian leanings and terminologies of their earlier colleagues.

In any case, Analytical Marxists are simply those theorists who believe that important parts of Marxist empirical theory as well as the Marxist normative perspective are correct, but who also believe that these views can best be understood, elaborated, analyzed, and defended by utilizing the clear-headed methodology characteristic of Analytical Philosophy.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Continentally-Oriented Philosophical Tradition stems from Hegelian and Post-Hegelian Philosophy, most commonly found in Continental Europe but, by stipulative definition, does not include European Philosophers prior to Hegel (such as Spinoza, Leibnitz, Malebranche, and Kant) nor more recent philosophers from Continental Europe who were not influenced by the Hegelian and Post-Hegelian Continental Traditions. A particularly notable example of a philosopher in the latter category is Gottlob Frege who, although a 19th Century German philosopher, was actually one of the great influences on the origin and development of Analytical Philosophy (which began with the work of British philosophers Bertrand Russell and G.E. Moore in the very early 20th Century).

Defined in this way, the Continentally-Oriented Philosophical Tradition includes such figures and schools of philosophy as Hegel, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, Feuerbach, the early Marx, the later Engels' "dialectical" views, Nietzsche, Bergson, 20th Century Hegelianism (Hyppolite), Hegelian Marxism (Lukacs, Korsch), Phenomenology (Husserl), Anti-Humanistic Phenomenological Existentialism (Heidegger), Humanistic Phenomenological Existentialism (Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Camus, de Beauvoir), Religious Existentialism (Buber, Jaspers, Marcel), Structuralism (de Saussure, Levi-Strauss, Althusser), Critical Theory (Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Habermas, Richard Bernstein, Thomas McCarthy, et al.), Semiotics (Barthe, Eco), Hermeneutics (Gadamer, Ricour), and Post-Structuralism & Postmodernism (Foucault, Lyotard, Derrida, Deleuze & Guattari, Kristeva, Judith Butler, et al.).

^{iv} I have lumped Socialist Anarchist and Liberal Socialist traditions together since they both have always put a premium of democracy. They differ, of course, in that Socialist Anarchists believe that the State is as evil as the Capitalist economic system and that both must be done away with, while Liberal Socialists believe that it is not possible to completely get rid of the State and propose, instead, that we make the government and society in general as democratic as possible. The socialist tradition I refer to as "Quasi-Anarchism" at least implicitly accepts the existence of the State as necessary in large-scale societies at least for the foreseeable future, even if they think that eventually such societies could evolve to the point at which the existence of a State would no longer be necessary. But these theorists also insist that governments and societies in general be made as democratic as possible, and often are proponents of Parecon (Participatory Economics) and Parpolity (Participatory Politics). On this definition, I suspect that such Social Ecologists as Murray Bookchin as well as many theorists associated with Zcom, Znet, and Zmagazine are proponents of Quasi-Anarchism including Noam Chomsky, Edward Herman, Michael Albert, and Robin Hahnel.

^v I don't include neoconservatism here because it is not a general political vision of what kind of societies are justified but, rather, a vision of using naked power by states and, in particular, the U.S.