

Professor Sen looks East

The *bel esprit* of 'welfare economics' studying, earning and living since mid-fifties in the West, now puts a project for the 'people' here "Look East for Democracy."¹ No getting on your nerves please, as he has already declared in his *Autobiography*:

"What was at stake, it seemed to me, in political toleration was not just the liberal political arguments that had so clearly emerged in post-Enlightenment Europe and America, but also the traditional values of tolerance of plurality which had been championed over the centuries in many different cultures - not least in India. Indeed, as Ashoka had put it in the third century B.C.: 'For he who does reverence to his own sect while disparaging the sects of others wholly from attachment to his own, with intent to enhance the splendour of his own sect, in reality by such conduct inflicts the severest injury on his own sect..' To see political tolerance merely as a "Western liberal" inclination seemed to me to be a serious mistake."

"The Argumentative Indian" elaborates on the theme. While urging people to go back in history and reason for themselves the meaning of modern democracy, Prof. Sen says, "Silence is an enemy of social justice" and adds a word of advice – "Argumentative tradition is our heritage, but its effectiveness lies in how we use it." In addition, it has a "from time immemorial" tag by the politician Chief Minister Buddhadeb Bhattacharjee.²

Maybe, Mr. Bhattacharjee, once information minister, is destitute of the historical information that Prof. Sen's "tradition heritage" results from the *Rigveda* that counts *from time memorial* in that its composition by the Aryan tribes got going subsequently with their invasion through North-West India c1500 BC.

However, the "Argumentative" is conspicuous in "silence" about the most decisive fact that the history of all hitherto class societies including the ones evolved in India is "the history of class struggle".

Oriental Slavery

"The first prerequisite of [the] earliest form of landed property appears as a human community, such as emerges from spontaneous evolution (*naturwüchsig*): the family, the family expanded into a tribe, or the tribe created by inter-marriage of families or combination of tribes. We may take it for granted that pastoralism, or more generally a migratory life, is the first form of maintaining existence, the tribe not settling in a fixed place but using up what it finds locally and then passing on. Men are not settled by nature (unless perhaps in such fertile environments that they could subsist on a single tree like the monkeys; otherwise they would roam, like the wild animals). Hence the tribal community, the natural common body, appears not as a consequence, but as a precondition of the joint (temporary) appropriation and the use of the soil.

"Once men finally settles down, the way in which to a smaller degree this original community is modified will depend on various external, climatic, geographical, physical, etc., conditions as well as on their special natural make-up – their tribal character. The spontaneously evolved tribal community, or, if you will, the herd –

the common ties of blood, language, custom, etc. – is the first precondition of the appropriation of the objective conditions of life, and of the activity which reproduces and gives material expression to, or objectifies (*vergegenständlichenden*) it (activity as herds – men hunters, agriculturists, etc.). The earth is the great laboratory, the arsenal that provides both the means and the materials of labour, and also the location, the *basis* of the community. Men's relation to it is naïve; they regard themselves as the *communal proprietors*, and those of the community, which produces and reproduces itself by living labour. Only as far as the individual is a member – in the literal and figurative sense – of such a community, does he regard himself as an owner or possessor. In reality *appropriation* by means of the process of labour takes place under these *preconditions*, which are not the *product* of labour but appear as its natural or *divine* preconditions.

“Where the fundamental relationship is the same, this form can realize itself in a variety of ways. For instance, as is the case in most Asiatic fundamental forms it is quite compatible with the fact that the *all embracing unity* which stands above all these small common bodies may appear as the higher or *sole proprietor*, the real communities only as *hereditary* possessors.. Since the *unity* is the real owner, and the real precondition of common ownership, it is perfectly possible for it to appear as something separate and superior to the numerous real, particular communities. The individual is then in fact propertyless, or property – i.e. the relationship of the individual to the *natural* conditions of labour and reproduction, the inorganic nature which he finds and makes his own, the objective body of his subjectivity – appears to be mediated by means of a grant (*Ablassen*) from the total unity to the individual through the intermediary of the particular community. The despot here appears as the father of all numerous lesser communities, thus realizing the common unity of all. It therefore follows that the surplus product (which, incidentally, is legally determined in terms of [*infolge*] the real appropriation through labour) belongs to this higher unity. Oriental despotism therefore appears to lead to a legal absence of property. In fact, however, its foundation is tribal or common property, in most cases created through a combination of manufacture and agriculture within the small community, which thus becomes entirely self-sustaining and contains within itself all conditions of production and surplus production,

“Part of its surplus labour belongs to the higher community, which ultimately appears as a *person*. The surplus labour is rendered both as tribute and as common labour for the glory of the unity, in part that of the despot; in part that of the imagined tribal entity of the god. In so far as this type of common property is actually realized in labour, it can appear in two ways. The small communities may vegetate independently side by side, and within each, the individual labours independently with his family on the land allotted to him. (There will also be a certain amount for the common store – for instance as it were – on the one hand; and on the other for defraying the costs of the [higher] community as such, i.e. for war, religious worship, etc.. The dominion of lords, in its most primitive sense, arises only at this point, e.g. in the Slavonic and Rumanian communities. Here lies the transition to serfdom, etc.) Secondly, the unity can involve a common organization of labour itself, which in turn can constitute a veritable system as in Mexico, especially in Peru, among the ancient Celts, and some tribes in India. Furthermore, the community within the tribal body may tend to appear either as a representation of its unity through the head of the tribal kinship group, or as

relationship between the heads of families. Hence either a more despotic or a more democratic form of community.. The communal conditions for real appropriation through labour, such as irrigation systems (very important among the Asian peoples) means of communication, etc. will then appear as a work of the higher unity – the despotic government which is poised above the lesser communities. Cities in the proper sense arise by the side of these villages only where the location is particularly favourable to external trade, or where the head of the state and his satraps exchange their revenue (the surplus product) against labour, which they expend as labour-funds.”³

Collating Marx’s brilliant insight above with the latest discoveries about our “African evolution”, such as “Oldest known humans just got older”⁴ and other related articles we get to our “African origin” in Ethiopia about 195,000 years ago.

Aryans and Dravidians

This subcontinent not long called “India” provided home to a part of our “migratory” hunter-gatherer ancestors from “only a single dispersal from Africa most likely via a southern coastal route, through India and onward into southeast Asia and Australia”⁵ during probably the last Ice Age 30,000-40,000 years ago. The part that settled down was the ancestor of the *Dravidians*. The other part migrated through the Middle East and onward into the steppes of South East Europe and Siberia. Over time, they split again, some moved about Central Asia towards North East via Alaska entered North and South America, and others roaming behind in kinship groups naturally evolving into communities of nomadic pastoral tribes generally called the *Aryans* with their main source of wealth cattle and cows, which they used as medium of exchange with others who they met. Among the nomadic pastoral tribes the community always remained united – a travelling party, caravan, horde with forms of higher and lower ranks developing out of their mode of life. Their spread resulted in larger regroupings and warlike organizations for invasions against neighbouring tribes. Some went westward settling on lands beyond the Alps.

Nine Aryan tribes from Central Asian steppes under their respective leaders called *Rajas* federated under a *Maharaja* of the greater tribe – the *Bharata* – intruded through the Pamirs and the Hindu Kush Mountain passes into the Indus Valley annexing already raised civilizations of split-occupiers from among the previous “only single dispersal”, such as the Dravidians. Their civilization collapsed c. 1760 BC under *Aryan conquests* devastating their towns such as Mahenjo-Daro and Harappa. This civilization built up a kind of undifferentiated unity of town and country with manufacture and agriculture. The towns had broad avenues, two-storied houses built with fire burnt bricks, baths, water supply and drainages as discovered lately. Ruins of palaces, quarters for the nobility and for the ordinary bear out existence of state power and social difference comprising higher and lower classes, but *no* castes like the Aryans, anyway. Findings of writing also bear witness of their social advancement. These towns were auspicious to conduct external relations, whether of war or barter, “or where the head of the state and his satraps exchanged their revenue (the surplus product) against labour, which they expended as labour-funds”. Nevertheless, at that time this subcontinent was not an integrated empire, but split into a series of tiny kingdoms and principalities.

“The difficulties encountered by the organized community can arise only from other communities which have either already occupied the land or disturb the community in its occupation of it. War is therefore the great all-embracing task, the great communal labour, and it is required either for the occupation of the objective conditions for living existence or for the protection and perpetuation of such occupation. The community, consisting of kinship groups, is therefore, in the first instance organized on military lines as a warlike, military force, and this is one of the conditions of its existence ... The nature of tribal structure leads to the differentiation of kinship groups into higher and lower, and this social differentiation is developed further by the mixing of conquering and the conquered tribes, etc.”⁶ “Among nomadic pastoral tribes the community is in fact always united, a travelling party, caravan, horde, and the forms of higher and lower develop out of the conditions of this mode of life. What is *appropriated* and *reproduced* is here only the herd and not the soil... [For] settled peoples, the only barrier, which the community can encounter in its relations to the natural conditions of production as its own – to the land – is some *other community*, which has already laid claim to them as its inorganic body. War is therefore one of the earliest tasks of every primitive community of this kind, both for the defiance of property and for its acquisition.”⁷

The Aryans annihilated some of the Dravidian population, captured, tortured, enslaved many and coerced the rest away down south beyond the *Vindhya*s. Eventually the land was divided into two segments: the Indo-Gangetic plains (*‘Sindhu-Ganga-Brahmaputra’* basin) as the *Aryavarta* or the land of the Aryans, while the southern mineral rich plateau with rivers and jungle regions was called the *Deccan* until later Aryan campaigns (*Ramayana*). All-encompassing war relations between the conquering Aryans (organized as a military force) and the conquered Dravidians (cultivating land, fishing, hunting, domesticating animals – sheep, pigs, buffalo, camels and elephants – and working crafts and scripts) gave rise to the typical form of slavery in India: “all embracing unity” above, and “the general slavery of the orient” below, widespread as rule of a domestic, patriarchal variety.

The belligerent organizational division of labour of the Aryans already rested on “higher and lower” classes having a four-caste system: the *Brahmin* or the priests, the *Kshatriya* or the warrior caste, the *Vasya* – commune peasants, artisans and traders, and at the bottom the *Sudra* – hired workmen, peasants and slaves. The first three called *‘Twice-born’* (*‘dwija’* or regenerated), the second birth via *‘purification’* and wearing the sacred or *holy thread*, formed covenanted Aryan racist nobility ranks that monopolized the Vedic religious rites reflecting *caste and social order*. The status between these upper castes was to an extent like that between the ‘masters’ and ‘free citizens’ in relatively younger ancient Grecian and Roman empires. The fundamental creed of *Brahminism* stood on three gods: *Brahma* – the creator of the world, *Vishnu* – the God of Good, and *Shiva* – the God of Evil, who mutually invented the grand accord – the *Trimurti*. Although the upper three castes could participate in religious rites, the authority of interpreting the Vedas rested only with the Brahmins. The castes were fenced with prohibition on inter-caste marriage and children out of an illicit marriage were treated as tainted and downgraded to lower castes. The most privileged were the *Brahmins* – free from taxation, conscription and corporal punishment. Legally, a nine-year-old Brahmin boy was regarded as a father of a ninety-year-old *Kshatriya*. In peace times, the *Kshatriya* caste enjoyed a secure life with wealthy gifts

and favours from the Rajas. In war times, however, they were the only division of the population required to fight. The *Vaisya* caste had to pay taxes: commune peasants up to one-sixth of their produce and merchants up to one-fifth of their income, but free from military service. The miserable was the *Sudra* caste having no right but obligation only. Members of the upper castes had only to pay a fine for murdering a *Sudra* equal to a fine for killing a dog. Notably, this caste with many subdivisions had at the bottom the *Namah Sudra* or *pariahs* or the *untouchables*, the prisoners of wars, the Dravidian ancestry, forced into *slavery*. Decipher mystic forms of various myths and legends, religious ceremonies, and idols worshipped in India, and you will see the long discord and resultant divisive accord among the warring peoples. This process eventually produced more and more complex relations stitching many faiths of those involved in the empire raising reconstitution of society.

Buddhism

Prof. Sen claims his “public reasoning in democracy” has “strong roots in India” with *Rigveda* that “doubted whether there is a God” as the creator, and “similar arguments going on in the *Upanishads*, *Ramayana* and *Mahabharat*”. According to him, “The rise of Buddhism in India is profoundly important culture of departure in the world in terms of public reasoning. Ashoka in his edicts praises the virtue of listening to others and that of public discussion. The Buddhists had the idea of holding religious councils – the largest of these was in the 3rd century BC hosted by Ashoka in Patliputra.”⁸

The *Rigveda*, the oldest religious and sacred scripture in the world composed by the Aryans in the period from 1500–1200 BC comprises more than 1000 hymns addressed to Dev-Devis or God-Goddesses, reflecting polytheism. *Upanishads*, composed since 500 BC based on preaching since 1000 BC espouse the tradition of the *Vedas*, which were products of perception and intent in establishing greatness of the name *Aryan*, escalating economic interests by annexing pre-occupied land as the natural conditions of reproduction. *Ramayana* (c. 300 BC), consisting of 24,000 couplets in seven books, describes the life of the legendary hero Rama and his 14-year long campaign and exploits through the Deccan far into Lanka (the island kingdom off the SE coast of India, a republic since 1972 taking the name of Sri Lanka). *Mahabharata*, full of philosophical and religious legends including almost 100,000 stanzas evolving over centuries to attain its current form c. AD 400, tells the stories of the civil war fought between the sons of Bharata – the five *Pandava* brothers and their hundred *Kuru* stepbrothers at *Kuruksetra* near modern Delhi.

To get at the cause let us apply Marx’s method:

“At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production. ...From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters.”⁹

“The community itself appears as the first great force of production; special kinds of conditions of production (e.g. animal husbandry, agriculture) lead to evolution of a special mode of production and special forces of production, both objective and subjective, the latter appearing as qualities of the individuals. ...Up to a certain point reproduction. Thereafter, it turns into dissolution.”¹⁰

Thus, we see, eventually, the stage had arrived when most of the Asian communities turned into dissolution during c. 1000 BC and c. 500 BC. As their relations of production turned into fetters of the developing productive forces, constant peasant revolts for survival and immense rise in state expenses, etc. exhausted state treasuries giving rise to politico-religious conflicts and forcing kingdoms wage plundering wars against one another. Thus, the geological limits of the kingdoms to expand their territories showed that society's development in accordance with the tribal territorial relations had ended leading to an era of great empire building conquests elevating an emperor upon subdued kingdoms. As it happened, we saw Magadha on the central reaches of the Ganges and Kosala on the north-west (c. 6th – 5th BC), Alexander's conquest (c. 4th BC), Chandragupta Maurya (c. 322-297 BC) and then his grand son Ashoka (c. 304-232 BC), the last major emperor of the Mauryan Empire consolidating India first under Buddhism.

Already, politico-religious conflicts had given rise to *Buddhism* against the sacrificial and discriminatory religion of Brahminism. This religion and philosophy developed in northeastern India based on the teachings of Siddhartha Goutama, born a prince of the *Shakyas* on the India-Nepal border (usually c. 563 BC – 483 BC).¹¹ He left the palace, encountered an old man, a sick man, and a corpse, spent seven years seeking out teachers and trying various ascetic practices, including fasting, to gain *enlightenment*, the meaning of life. Unsatisfied with the results, he meditated beneath a fig or *Bodhi Tree* and after temptation by *Mara*, grasped *Four Noble Truths*: all existence is *suffering* or *dukha*; the cause of suffering is desire; to escape from *dukha* (suffering) within the endless cycles of *birth, death and rebirth* (a faith taken from Hinduism) is to attain *Nirvana* (liberation). Thus he became the *Buddha* (Sanskrit: 'Enlightened One') or *Shakya Muni*. His first sermon, the *Eightfold Path* offered a middle way between self-indulgence and self-mortification leading to the *Nirvana* or *Nibbana*. Central to this faith is the doctrine 'no-self' (*anatman*) and the practice of meditation. Its first *Truth* is: nothing lasts – everything changes. There is no rest until *Nirvana* – a contradiction in itself since lastly *Nirvana* lasts.

The three 'jewels' of Buddhism are the *Buddha*, the doctrine or *Dharma*, and the monastic order, i.e. *Sangha*, customarily comprising groups: monks, nuns, laymen, laywomen, so-called celibate clerics divided into *Bhikhu* sangha for men and *Bhikhuni* sangha for women involved in *Dharma*, living on elm, since engaging in commerce or agriculture was discouraged. They also adopted the doctrine of '*karma*' from Hinduism but rejected many of its doctrines and all of its gods.

Interestingly, 'celibacy' being the ideal, once the humanity as a whole turns 'celibate' just one generation would end the endless cycles of *birth, death and rebirth* of human species forever. Having so simple a solution to *suffering* at hand why suffer with so difficult spiritual belongings about '*enlightenment*' at all?

Buddhists opposed the monopoly of the Brahmins, sought to abolish caste-based inequality, and stimulated aspirations amid the *Vaisya* caste for *equality*, obviously in individual's spiritual life and *not* in real life. It was out of question, because at that stage of evolution of society when facts appeared mysterious emergence of economic class interests from within its material substratum had to remain an insurmountable obstacle.

Due to the reified constitution of consciousness, a thorough change on viewpoint was

impossible. In pre-capitalist epochs, class-consciousness was inept to attain complete clarity to control the course of history consciously. Since interests of classes in pre-capitalist societies could never realize full economic expression.

“Hence the structuring of society into castes and estates means the economic elements are *inextricably* joined to political and religious factors. ... The division of society into estates or castes means in effect conceptually and organizationally these ‘natural’ forms are established without their economic basis ever being conscious. It means that there is no mediation between the pure traditionalism of natural growth and the legal institutions it assumes.”¹²

Not castes – but estates, and no escape

Ashoka, the emperor (c.269-232 BC) adopted *Buddhism* after his bloody conquest of Kalinga, roughly present-day Orissa, furthered the expansion of that religion throughout India, and sent out missionaries as far afield as Ceylon and Syria. He stood against casteism and cruelty on animals too, extended public utility works, but still had to rule over an empire or estate with division of society into classes *en rapport* with *oriental slavery*. After his death with the disintegration of the *Maurya Empire* and discontinuation of state patronage, Buddhism declined in the succeeding centuries and was nearly extinct by the 13th century in India succumbing to the onslaught of the Hinduism with social division of labour based on predominantly caste-guild system with *untouchables* as dehumanized slaves at the bottom line. On the other hand, it flourished in Ceylon (since 1972 Sri Lanka) and Southeast Asia and spreading through Central Asia and Tibet in China, Korea, and Japan. Various traditions taken together it has about 400 million followers.. Notably, these states had no castes nor untouchables, but only estates or kingdoms with prevalent *slavery* of a household, patriarchal variety that could well absorb with Buddhism.

The Buddhists held “religious councils” on doctrine and practice, repeatedly at Rajagriha (modern Rajgir) to compile Buddha’s remembered words, including *Sutras* and monastic rules, second at Vaishali to dissolve disputes within the monastic communities with two major traditions or ‘vehicles’ *Mahayana* (or emerging as *Vajrayana*) and *Theraveda* (often called *Hinayana*) having distinctive practices. A third council, called by Ashoka resolved doctrinal disputes in favour of *Theraveda*.. Others continued up to the mid-20th century.. Actually, Buddhism rested on *distinction of ranks* instead of discrimination between castes in Hinduism. Such “virtue of listening to others and that of public discussion” through “religious councils” has nothing to do with the task which history has conferred upon the working class today.

Nevertheless, there is still no escape in sight from *Dukha* (sufferings) – “poverty and famines”, bloody wars and senseless destruction of provisions of life, crime and killing, no ‘enlightenment’ about how we live and how we could live, and no Nirvana either. Religious councils wanted to resolve disputes over a manifest nonsense about life after death, a never-resolved dispute in all religions around us. Nobody disputes that suffering of one ends with one’s death, but the suffering of the living exists with the existence of classes in society up until today. So much of “public discussion” in religious councils.

Banish Gods from Skies and Capitalists from Earth

The working class will also hold councils, i.e. revocably delegated working bodies that will begin resolving disputes via criticism of the world beyond truth and action to establish the truth of this world, as advised Marx:

“Man makes religion, religion does not make man. ...The struggle against religion is therefore indirectly a fight against the world of which religion is the spiritual aroma. Religious distress is at the same time the expression of real distress and also the protest against real distress. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of the heartless world, just as it is the spirit of the spiritless conditions. It is opium of the people. To abolish religion as the illusory happiness is to demand their real happiness. The demand to give up illusions about the existing state of affairs is the demand to give up a state of affairs which needs illusions. The criticism of religion is therefore in embryo the criticism of the vale of tears, the halo of which is religion. ...Religion is the only illusory sun which revolves round the man as long as he does not resolve round himself. The task of history, therefore, once the world beyond truth has disappeared, is to establish the truth of this world. ... Thus the criticism of heaven turns into the criticism of the earth, the criticism of religion into criticism of law and the criticism of theology into the criticism of politics. ... Criticism no longer appears as an end in itself, but only as a means. Its essential sentiment is indignation; its essential activity is denunciation. ... The weapon of criticism cannot of course, replace criticism by weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force. ...The criticism of religion ends with the teaching that man is the highest being for man, hence with categorical imperative to overthrow all relations in which man is debased, enslaved, forsaken, despicable being, relations which cannot be better described than by the exclamation of a Frenchman when it was planned to introduce a tax on dogs: Poor dogs! They want to treat you like human beings!”¹³

The “Argumentative Indian” enjoys his hyped ‘eminence’ telling “people” to look backward to an antiquated social system with classes elevating one ‘great’ emperor above many kings and rank estates top-down resting on slavery underneath. The entire he refers us to with “tradition heritage” is merely ‘past is golden’ dose viciously pseudo-tolerant politico-religious opium that belonged in the *pre-capitalist economic formations* with prevalent *slavery* of a household, patriarchal variety.

What kind of “traditional values of tolerance and plurality” do we see in the violent idols of *Devi Durga* (Goddess) with her sons and daughters killing the *Asura* (Demon) and his buffalo as derived from the 25th poem of Ch. 10 of the *Rigveda* and subsequently incorporated into *Devi Bhagbat Puran* (one of the ancient mythologies of the *Hindus*)? The worship of the idol clearly demonstrates the worldly interests of the *Suras* (Aryans) that lurks behind an unworldly myth. Historically, these 'pujas' here relate to the Vedic religion of the Aryan tribes who entered NW India c. 1500 BC. It demonstrates the violent and horrific executions perpetrated by the intruder Aryans (the 'Suras' - distinctly divided into four classes) over the inhabiting non-Aryans (the 'Asuras' - as called by the Aryans) who, after the Aryan 'bijoy' (conquest), were dehumanized as the oriental slave class called 'namah-sudras' [the untouchables] as the end part of society at the bottom line below even their [the Aryan's] own slave class the 'sudras'. And in Bengal the 'pujas' began to spread with

Raja Nabakrishna Deb organising 'Durga Puja' in 1757 to celebrate his victory in collaboration with the East India Company over Nawab Shiraj in the Battle of Plassey. His guests of honour were Robert Clive and his wife, and Clive was later tried by the British Parliament on charges of 'colossal corruption'.

Why worship a murderous picture at all? Does anybody like a killing anyway? Because capitalism needs it.

Socialists understand that all these rituals will become irrelevant with the advent of Socialism.

What kind of “traditional values of tolerance and plurality” did we witness in the cruel discriminating relations between the castes, and in the Brahmins falling out against *Sankhya* philosophy (founded by Kapil Muni, c.7th BC) that countered other philosophies? The *Sankhya* defined ‘reality’ having ‘cause and effect’ relation placing ‘cause’, however, outside the ‘effect’, the ‘real self’ as the interaction between ‘*purush*’ (consciousness) and ‘*prakiti*’ (eternal unconscious and unchanging principle), hence unable to cross the idealist limit. What kind of “traditional values of tolerance and plurality” did we witness when the Brahmins burnt up all writings and records of their dissident skeptic *Charvaka* Philosophy, early oriental materialism, like Epicureanism of Epicurus (341-270 BC) in Greece?

All we humans belong to the one and the same human species – *homo sapiens sapiens* – which, according to the two fossil findings in Ethiopia, made its appearance about 195,000 years ago and in course of time evolved and spread out of that original habitat under various circumstances to survive and populate their mother Earth's lands. We will have to celebrate some day – the sooner the better – our achievement of the great social reunion as against the great social divisions into religions, races, classes, nation states and all other anti-human – hence anti-social prejudices.

Notes:

- ¹ “Look East for Democracy: Sen”, New Delhi, *The Statesman*, Aug. 2, 2005
- ² *The Statesman*, Kolkata, July 31, 2005
- ³ Marx, *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, International Publishers, New York, 1975, pp.68-71)
- ⁴ Jeff Hecht, 16 February 2005, *NewScientist.com news service*
- ⁵ *CSE/Down to Earth Feature Service*
- ⁶ Marx, *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, pp.71-2
- ⁷ *Ibid.* p.89
- ⁸ *The Sunday Statesman*, Aug 7, 2005
- ⁹ Marx, Preface, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Moscow, p.21
- ¹⁰ Marx, *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, p.94-5
- ¹¹ Simon Blackburn, *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, 1996
- ¹² Lukács, *History and Class Consciousness*, pp.55, 56-7
- ¹³ Marx, *Contribution to the Critique Hegel's Philosophy of Law [Right]*, CW. 3, pp. 175-82