

Table of contents

1. The Asiatic Mode of Production: A New Phoenix? (Part 1).....	1
---	---

The Asiatic Mode of Production: A New Phoenix? (Part 1)

Author: McFarlane, Bruce; Cooper, Steve; Jaksic, Miomir

[ProQuest document link](#)

Full text: The Journal of Contemporary Asia has run a number of articles and reviews about the Asiatic Mode of Production (AMP) in the past, mostly favourable to Marx's concept as a research tool for understanding Ancient Asia (and, through such an understanding, to evaluate more resolutely the nature of the contemporary social systems in Asia). Foremost were two articles by Hungarian academic, Ferenc Tokei, but also significant pieces by Marian Sawyer, S.N. Mukherjee, V.G. Kiernan, D. McEachern, Kate Currie, and J. Wanna, as well as the present authors of this article.' Our aim is to sum up the last 30 years of work on AMP for the guidance of new researchers or those just plain fascinated by Ancient Asia. We are mindful of what Eric Hobsbawm said in his interview with the New Left Review: "One can study the modus operandi, the ways in which a particular social system functions, and why it generates or fails to generate the focus of change. For example, in order to analyse the Chinese economy over a period of centuries, you need to understand what it was in that country which prevented and impeded change, which stabilised rather than destabilised that society, in spite of many elements of economic and technological progress." For an important question of World History is why Asian countries, which reached a high level of development and culture by the 17th Century, were unable to go on and further develop their social systems, and instead became a prey to Western colonialism. The idea that AMP also contained dynamic elements as well as ones that held back the division of labour and accelerated growth is worth exploring.

To launch this literature review² of work done on the ancient societies of Asia, let us go back to Marx's thoughts about the Asiatic Mode of Production. That corpus of knowledge had been largely built up from reports of colonial officials³ and from the "travelers' tales" of competent observers such as Dr F. Bernier Hegel, who died when Marx was 13 years of age and had written about the political "Spirit" in "Oriental Despotism."

The classical school of British political economy (James Mill, J.S. Mill, and Richard Jones) had followed the Physiocratic leader in France, F. Quesnay, in taking an interest in the economic base of Oriental society. However, it was the team of Marx and Engels that put the earlier literature to greatest use; they also put the information into the new framework of historical materialism.

The key point here was to see how, in Ancient Asia, an economic surplus was created and re-distributed in pre-capitalist societies. It made use of Marx's concept of a "mode of production." Such a procedure rested on a number of methodological props. First, that "social formations" (roughly, in contemporary terms, "socio-economic systems") spanning a whole era, might contain a number of modes of production.⁴ Second, that various modes of production are distinguishable by reference to the method of extraction of economic surplus. Third, that the "line of historical development" which unfolded in Asia could not, for many reasons, be identical with that of Western and Eastern Europe. Any ideas that Marx or Engels followed a model featuring a "unilinear" series of stages of development in history were rendered doubtful once researchers on India, China, Cambodia, and Ancient Latin America began to test Marx's remarks about the AMP. Marx was also fascinated by those transition processes and mechanisms that led on to a change in a particular mode of production. (The notion of "process" was an important part of the dialectical method of Hegel, Marx and Engels.) However, it has been shown by Soviet historian Ter-Akopian and by an Australian scholar, Marian Sawyer,⁵ that AMP was treated by Marx as a mode of production in its own right, following the break up of primitive communism, higher barbarism and/or slave society, the other branch of development being Western historical development were feudalism followed from Slave society and was itself transformed into capitalism. In 1848, Marx had not yet arrived at a specific theory of the capitalist mode of production - he used only a general model incorporating the forces of

production and the social relations of production. He needed further information about feudalism and other pre-capitalist modes of production in order to get a rounded picture of how the capitalist mode of production emerged. To this end, he studied a number of regions and cultures and became proficient in the Russian language.

Then, in preparation for writing his Grundrisse in 1857-8, he returned to Hegel's book *Logic* for inspiration when expanding his idea of the mode of production that remained underdeveloped in the *German Ideology* (see H. Uchida Marx's *Grundrisse and Hegel's Logic*, Routledge, London, 1985 pp 5-6.) Marx's earlier commentary on AMP had included three letters exchanged with Engels (2nd, 6th, and 14th June, 1853), a systematic attempt to examine the economic base of old Asia in an article, "The British Rule in India", (10th June, 1853) and in *Grundrisse*, (1853-8) (a series of manuscripts written by Marx for self-clarification as preparation for composing *Capital*, his major work). Next, in *Theories of Surplus Value* (Part 3, Ch.26) written in 1862, Marx made a number of comments on "Asiatic society." Almost 20 years later, Marx again returned to the AMP with a draft letter to Vera Zasulich,⁶ sketching the division of labour, the role of agrarian communes, and the centralised controls of earlier Asian society. What did all the materials of Marx mentioned above amount to?

In broad outline, Marx found the socio-economic essence of the Asiatic Mode of Production to lie in the following:

1. A network of rural communities, mainly agrarian communes, self-sufficient in food and handicraft and supplying some economic surplus to the central authorities. They were often asked to supply, when needed, corvée labour to build dams, water storage and other public works.⁷ The division of labour within villages was limited, as was generalised production for market ("commodity exchange") - the "natural economy" or production-for-use was dominant. In the earlier phases of the commune, there was no inner drive in the system to accumulate private property.

The dominance of collective working of the land was ensured by the system under which property was owned by the state - by the supreme commune personified by the Ruler. The other communes in AMP were essentially working the lands they had been allotted by the state. In Europe, at a higher stage of the development of communes, as in the German "Mark" or commune, common property existed only as a supplement to private land. Something similar could be seen in 19th Century Russia.

2. Despotism: A ruling Sovereign, bureaucratic Court or caste using centralised power and force to impose political and military goals. Hegel had said that under Oriental Despotism only one man is free. Marx added that in societies of the Asiatic Mode of Production type, two major sources of power were the Ministry of Public Works and the Ministry of Finance.

3. State of collective ownership of land, productive property, and "hydraulic" works rather than private ownership of such assets. In his letter to Engels in 1853, Marx made much of this point - that the absence of a generalised system of private ownership of the means of production was "the 'key' to the Oriental Heaven." Later scholars, including some Marxists or those strongly influenced by him, have disputed the accuracy of the implications of this striking remark.⁸

Apart from giving his list of specific features of AMP, Marx made a valuable contribution by encompassing much of the previous literature on Asiatic society and Oriental Despotism. Like Quesnay, he was able to sketch the "economic base" of AMP, as opposed to a concentration on its political structure or the "Spirit" prevailing in Oriental Society. It is no wonder that in his Preface to *Introduction to a Critique of Political Economy* he lists the Asiatic Mode of Production as an important stage in world history and of the experience of Mankind.

After the death of Engels, it was Georgi Plekhanov among the Marxists who strongly upheld the AMP as an actuality and as a research tool. He annoyed Lenin by expressing apprehension that nationalisation of land under state control might lead to a form of AMP in Soviet Russia. (Lenin had broadly agreed with Plekhanov's previous studies, without embracing their tinge of geographical determinism.)

At the close of the 1920s, the events of 1926-7 in China and the prospects of revolution there led to speculation

whether China was a "feudal" society or whether its social system contained substantial elements of "hangovers" of its period as an AMP. From about 1930, the opponents of AMP became stronger and more and more influential in the Academy and Party circles - a situation that did not change until the mid-1960s. These two instances of fierce debate will be discussed in detail below.

We should mention at this point the appearance of a work by an ex-Marxist, Karl Wittfogel, *Oriental Despotism*, which appeared in 1957. Among many other controversial assertions (to be reviewed in Part 2) he made the suggestion that there is also a psychological dimension to AMP and its cultural influence; that the centralised rituals and controls over the communes affected peoples attitudes after a long period of despotic rule, perhaps making them accept tyranny and totalitarianism. (This assertion we will also challenge below).

Debate on Oriental Society and AMP: The British Contribution

The British officials in India, Sir Thomas Roe, Sir William Jones and Sir George Campbell⁹ can be regarded as careful observers of colonial ruled societies and were also pioneers in research on Oriental society.¹⁰ James Mill's remarks on Indian history signalled a reawakening of interest in the East and how it had been governed in earlier times. Krader believes that among the British political economists of the 19th Century, John Stuart Mill may have been the first to consistently use the term "Oriental society."¹¹ Apart from J.S. Mill, Richard Jones in his *Textbook of Lectures on the Political Economy of Nations* played a role in bringing Marx's attention to the system that was labelled the "Asiatic Mode of Production."¹²

From the Marxist point of view, an English contribution to cherish is the work of Paul Fox who went to Moscow as a student in the mid-1920s and came out with a report strongly supportive of the AMP and Marx's interpretation of it.¹³ Also in this camp was the great archaeologist, V.G. Childe, in remarks on early society¹⁴ and on historical materialism as his method of reconstructing past society." For China's past as a social formation, the experts have long relied on the minute detail about technology (but also about social relations which Needham calls "civilisation") on Joseph Needham's magnum opus.¹⁵ Significantly, Needham became warmer to the AMP as research went on, although disapproving of Wittfogel's characterisation of the socio-political aspects of old China as "hydraulic society." To be included in this group, too, is the long and brilliant analytical essay on AMP in 1964 by Eric Hobsbawm serving as an introduction for Marx's *Writings on Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, the collection which he prepared for the Marxist publishing houses in Britain and America: Lawrence & Wishart (London) and International Publishers (New York). Another collection of these writings of Marx, especially on AMP (and in English), appeared in 1979 from Foreign Languages House, Moscow with a further introductory essay of worth by the noted academician, Ter-Akopian.

In the 1960s, a British journal, *Marxism Today*, focusing on socio-economic formations in the historical past, opened its pages for a vigorous debate about AMP and methodological issues relating to modes of production. Contributors included D. A. Griffiths,¹⁷ John Simon,¹⁸ China scholar G. Lewin,¹⁹ and an "outside" blast from Germany by Hoffman.²⁰ This discussion appears to have provoked further response elsewhere with Daniel Thorner in India²¹ and V.G. Kiernan in Scotland²² well to the fore. Another important author was Ernest Gellner, who, in 1964 in a book of essays, *Thought and Change* (London, Weidenfeld) made suggestive comments about the role of various regions in world development, including the place of Oriental Despotism. In 1980, Gellner returned to the topic of AMP with an edited book, *Soviet and Western Anthropology* (London, Duckworth) in which he drew attention to a Soviet controversy involving Yu and Semenov, an opponent of AMP.

In the *Marxism Today* discussions, a general consensus seemed to emerge, which, even when not endorsing AMP as such, opposed the idea that the Western European historical trajectory a line of development from primitive communism to slavery to feudalism to capitalism - had been universal. Some contributors pointed out that there had been a number of modes of production in a social formation, albeit one of them would be more dynamic and influential than the others, igniting a process of change and transition to new modes. Others denied that there were only five possible modes of production between primitive communism and socialism.

Their lists comprised of primitive communism, slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and socialism; the "reformers" list was primitive communism, AMP stagnation or primitive communism, AMP, slavery and feudalism. The idea that Asian countries, and specifically China, had experienced a different historical path was insisted on by G. Lewin, and that opinion had, of course, already been confirmed by the facts of Needham's research. From "outside," Huffman's article - translated from the original German-entered the pages of Marxism Today in an abrasive way. If Wittfogel's pen could be described as "an axe grinding from afar,"²³ then Hoffman's can be described as "Dinosauric." Swinging wildly against AMP and those who gave it credibility, Hoffman stated that his "reservations" in no uncertain terms, implying that AMP was being used as a "Trojan horse" to subvert Marxist historical materialism.²⁴

For the 1960s and early 1970s, we note that in a number of other journals in Britain, the AMP issues and the issues to which it gave rise to, also made their appearance: Past and Present (E. Leach);²⁵ St. Anthony's Papers (G. Lichteim);²⁶ Survey (S.H. Barron),²⁷ and Critique of Anthropology (Friedman).²⁸ This period of journal articles was followed by a decade of substantial British books and monographs on AMP, some of them quite critical. Of greatest interest were those written by B. Turner,²⁹ A. Bailey and J. Llobera,³⁰ J. Taylor,³¹ and P. Anderson in the first wave,³² whilst in the second wave (the 1980s) the most stimulating studies were by J. Rapp,³³ Bailey and S. Llobera, Dunn,³⁴ Brendan O'Leary³⁵ and Hindess & Hirst.³⁶ O'Leary made a thoughtful critique of Marx's writing on AMP. He held three main objections: (a) that AMP was too dependent on the idea of Oriental Despotism as inherited from Hegel; (b) that there was lack of clarity on the status of AMP in relation to primitive communism and other models of production; and, (c) there was a possibility that the other modes of production contained within themselves some AMP features, as "hangovers." An example is that AMP included some merchant capitalists and some slaves.

French Marxism and the AMP

In 1964, a group of French academics launched an audacious and most serious campaign to revive, use, and legitimise AMP. The many contributions were largely organised around the Marxist journal, La Pensee, and their availability was to have a long-term impact on historical thinking in many countries, including USSR. We began our account of these events by selecting three of the most influential pieces which set out the tone for the emergence over the next decade of a virtual French Marxist School of historians in Asia, together with ethnologists, archaeologists, anthropologists and, by no means least, political philosophers. The articles under review are those of Chesneaux,³⁷ Suret-Canale³⁸ and Godelier.³⁹ These were very significant figures in France - Godelier and Chesneaux were prominent Marxists - the anthropologist and the historian, and both were politically active, as was Suret-Canale who published a good think-piece in the Communist Party newspaper, L'Humanite 2 September, 1964, under the title "A propos l'MPA."

The aim of the French Marxian historians seems to have been to promote international debate by bringing in some non-French Marxists, such as F. Tokei and G. Lewin, to assist those in the Soviet Union who were still battling to have AMP fairly assessed. They used La Pensee to get such people to sum up their views on AMP. They were particularly asked to give an opinion on the use of AMP as a historical category - and partly as a way to understand modern bureaucracy and to clarify the nature of contemporary Asia. At first, the attempt to influence Soviet thinking about AMP did not have much success - probably not till 1968. As a result, Chesneaux's contempt for the conservative historians within the Soviet academy was evident in his wry comment that the search for AMP was akin to "the search for the Loch Ness monster - which kept reappearing, despite denials of its existence!"

The issue No. 114, 1964 of La Pensee was a "special" on AMP. There were essays by Chesneaux, Godelier, Suret-Canale, Parain, and other experts on Asia and Africa. Its impact was to prove enormous, especially in the heated debates in Russia, 1965-71.

Interest in France was not limited to issues of theory raised by acceptance of AMP; many "case-studies" appeared after the initial burst of theoretical interest. P. Boiteau wrote on Madagascar's part-AMP system,⁴⁰

and de Santis on the ancient Incas of Peru.⁴¹ In issue No. 129 of *La Pensee* in 1966, H. Bibicou raised issues about social arrangements within Turkey itself under the Sultanates and within the regions they ruled like Bosnia and South Serbia.

In 1965 and 1966, there were many new articles, two outstanding ones being Charles Parain's "Proto-histoire Mediteranien et Le Mode de Production Asiatique" (*La Pensee*, No. 127) and K. Deme's "Les Classes Sociales dans Le Senegal Pre-coloniale" *La Pensee*, No. 130, 1966. Godelier and Chesneaux also returned to review progress in AMP research and debates.⁴² These reviews were later put together, by a collective including Chesneaux and Garaudy with the 1964 *La Pensee* articles as a book, *Sur Le Mode de Production Asiatique* (Editions Sociales Paris, 1969).

More attention began to be paid to regions and to historical epochs: Byzantine, the Ottoman Empire, the Incas and Mayas, and even Black Africa. In *La Pensee*, No. 138, 1965 there had been pieces by K. Mannivane on Ancient Laos and by a critic of AMP, L. Sedov, who wrote on the Angkor Wat kingdom of Kampuchea. A Turkish writer, Divitcioglu, provided a highly analytical piece on AMP and feudalism as economic models with the emphasis on government's highly centralised intervention⁴³ which produced flak from the anti-AMP camp.⁴⁴ In No. 124 of *La Pensee*, the Mahgrebian area (North Africa) was discussed by R. Gallisot, a well known writer on Algeria, while No. 144 carried an article on Ancient Vietnam by M. A. Chekova which argued that centralised control and not class structure was the dominating feature. Two articles by Coquery-Vidovitch on pre-colonial Africa then appeared⁴⁵ and a theoretical essay on AMP by Dhoquois.⁴⁶

Finally, we may mention R. Garaudy's editing of a book on *The Chinese Question* which came out in French in 1969 and Saad's article on Ancient Egypt in *La Pensee*, No. 189, 1976. Marx's insights had by this time been extended by the French scholars to many parts of the globe.

Russian Research and AMP

Writings before the 1920s: Was Russia itself an AMP? Marx had written of Russia being a different kind of autocratic state compared to Europe's. Lenin had written about a state dominated by hierarchy and patriarchy under the Tsarist system. Plekhanov had expressed fears of an Asiatic Restoration or what he termed the "Chinese system" in Russia especially if the land became state-owned. The controversial author, Karl Wittfogel, an ex-Marxist, considered both Tsarist and Stalin's Russia as AMP. It was not till a French writer, P. Vidal-Naquet asked this question squarely in an article "La Rousse et Le Mode de Production Asiatique" in *Annales*, No.2, 1966 that the Soviet writers were stimulated to return to a topic that had been barred to them since 1931 - as explained below.

We now review some of the central issues of Russian socio-economic development to assist in answering Vidal's, and Wittfogel's questions about the roles of the communes, centralisation of power, and the growth of market economy, using both Marxist and non-Marxist works.

Marx and Engels referred to two sources usually when discussing Russian communes. The first was the study by a Prussian official, A.von Haxthausen in 1870 entitled *The Russian Empire, its People and Resources*; the other was Kovalevsky, an economist and social progressive in 1879. The former wrote empirically about the remnants of the Russian agrarian commune: the latter's work (which was much appreciated by Marx) was entitled *The Common Holding of Land: The Causes, Courses, and Consequences of Their Decline*. Close study of these two sources seems to have left an impression with Marx and Engels that the Russian communes could be revived and developed - that they had not disintegrated beyond redemption. Thus in 1882, in the introduction to Plekhanov's edition of the *Communist Manifesto* they wrote:

"In addition to rapidly developing capitalist swindle and bourgeois landed property, which is only just arising, we find that in Russia the largest part of the land is owned in common by peasants. The question is - can the Russian communes, a form of primitive ownership of land which is already rapidly disintegrating be transformed into a higher communist form of landed property?"⁴⁷

Three other sources may be cited for Marx and Engels' views on this question - (a) Engels' "Afterward" (written

in 1894) to Social Relations in Russia; (b) Marx's letter to the editorial board of the journal *Otchestvenniye Zapiski* (Fatherland Notes), November, 1877; and, (c) Marx's Draft Letter to Vera Zasulich (March, 1881). Engels' piece argued that the potential of the Russian communes to develop into a form of agrarian socialism depended "on aid from the Western working class after successful revolution there.... If that happened, it is possible that Russian landed property becomes the point of departure for a development towards communism."⁴⁸ Marx's letter to the editorial board of *Otechstvenniye Zapiski* praised N.G. Chernychevsky (who, due to his exile in Siberia never read Marx). He mentioned favourably the Russian writer's exploration of the theme whether Russia must experience destruction of village communities via capitalism or Russia can develop historical conditions specifically her own. In his letter to Vera Zasulich of 1882 Marx says that "the Russian commune belongs to a type usually called agricultural community. This was the first group of human beings not held together by ties of kinship." Marx went on to say that the commune form in Russia had become "dualistic" - on the one hand, vigorous from the common effort, but on the other hand, under threat from both internal disintegrating forces and destructive capitalist forces from outside.

In relation to the second main issue of centralisation of power in Russia, we have his comments which were scathing on the nature of the Russian autocratic state and its baleful influence in Western Europe.⁴⁹ Other Marxists at the turn of the century engaged in this discussion. There was the polemic between Plekhanov and Lenin (remembering that neither had access to Marx's *Formen* and after *Grundrisse*). As explained by Marian Sawyer in her *Marxism and the Question of the Asiatic Mode of Production*, Plekhanov warned at the Stockholm Congress of the Social Democrats in 1906 that if the land were to be nationalised and fall under state ownership in Russia, a sort of Oriental Despotism might emerge: "the history of Russia looks very like the history of India, Egypt, China, and other Eastern countries, rather than the history of Western Europe." Wittfogel also quotes Plekhanov as saying "We don't want, we won't have, the Chinese system," to which Lenin could only reply in general terms that 20th Century Russia was very different to 19th Century China, and in particular terms that Plekhanov's advocacy of the "municipalisation" of land was misguided.

In later study of Russian society in his article, *A Tax in Kind*, 1921, Lenin listed a number of features on the nature of the new Soviet state - state capitalism, hierarchy, patriarchy, commodity production, small concentrations of private capital, and "elements" of socialism. After 1921 and the experience of a socialist market economy, nationalisation of heavy industry continued under trusts; mines and forests were in the public sector; the economy contained socialists "commanding heights" as well as the smallish concentrations of private capital.

Two prominent Marxists should now be mentioned for their Russian studies, Ziber, Professor of Kiev and his pupil, M. I. Tugan-Baranovsky. In 1883 N. Ziber (Sieber) had written a relevant book, *Outlines of a Primitive Economic Culture*. Tugan criticised the Narodnik (populist) Party's overemphasis on the Commune⁵⁰ as did Lenin at this time.⁵¹ Other progressive or Marx-influenced social theorists were also writing in Russia in the 1880s, 1890s and 1910-2052 and many of their writings were reviewed by Plekhanov in a comprehensive fashion.⁵³ Plekhanov's geographical materialism was influenced by his reading of Montesquieu's *Esprit des Lois*, published in Geneva in 1748. This influence reminds us that there is a tie-up between Marxism and 18th Century writers: Engels spells this out clearly in his *Ludwig Feurbach and the Close of Classical German Philosophy* (1886). The main difference was that Marx and Engels were aware that the geographical and environmental aspects of any society could, if mishandled, become a hindrance to Man whereas the 18th Century writers erred on the side of optimism about human progress.

In 1916, in a significant but little known book, Tugan studied the history and potential of the communal units in *Socialnie Osnovi Kooperaciii* (The Social Basis of Cooperation). He supported their enriching and further development denying that the slate or collective farms were a "higher" form of socialist property than the cooperatives and communes such as the Serbian "Zadruga" or the co-ops of Eastern Europe. By this time Tugan's attacks on the Narodnik position had ceased and he was about to launch a series of practical

measures to strengthen the communes and peasant associations of his native Ukraine - this time as a Ukrainian government official and not only as a member of the Academy of Sciences.

Non-Marxist Historians

Russians have generally shown a keen interest in the history of the Russian Tsarist state and of the social system which existed under Prince Nevsky, Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, and the Empress Catherine.⁵⁴ This interest was only heightened by the action of the Tsar in formally freeing the serfs in 1861 by autocratic decree.⁵⁵

Among the earliest studies of state control and agrarian social relations in Russia had been the book of Mercantilist writer John Possokhoff (born 1665) entitled *On Theory and Riches*. A political dissident, Radichtsheff, in 1775 attacked serfdom and called for agrarian communes to be set up. We note that Quesnay's works were translated in Russia in 1817 so that Court circles and academics were probably aware of his book, *Chinese Despotism*, with its criticism of centralised autocracy.

In 1879, Kovalevsky published his studies supporting Russian communes; in the same year, the founder of the Statistical Bureau of the Government of Moscow, V. Orloff published his *Forms of Peasant Landholding in the Government of Moscow*. It contained a great deal of information on the historical development of various kinds of landholdings (and hence on agrarian social relations). The historian, Levoff, of the University of Kazan produced in 1892 an enormous work with plentiful statistics: *The State Economy of Russia During the Eighteenth Century*. Professor Lebedev, at about the same time, published in Petersburg *The Organisation of Direct Taxation in the Government of Moscow in the Seventeenth Century*. These two books were distinguished by their immense use of the official archives. They gave an unrivalled picture of the degree of state control and the mechanisms the State used.

Supplementary information on State centralisation was available in Aristoff, *The Industry of Ancient Russia* (1866) and from Ivan Miklashevsky in his *Investigation into the Rural Economy and the Colonisation of South Russia* (1894). Financial mechanisms used by the centralised state in its economic control were also discussed in Bloch's four-volume *History of the Finances of Russia in the Nineteenth Century*.

Moving into the 20th Century we note that in 1904 P. Milyukov wrote essays on the history of Russian culture⁵⁶ and a 5th edition of this work came out in 1908. In 1907, there appeared in Petersburg *Feudalism in Asiatic Russia* by Pavlov-Silyvanski which touches on AMP type issues while upholding feudalism as a useful description. In 1908, a review of the earlier writer, Perestvedov, was written by an academic admirer, V.F. Rziga.⁵⁷ In 1911 an author, LV. Kiryeyevskii, in *Devetnadsatii Vek* (Nineteenth Century) wrote that in Russia, the private property domination seen in most Western societies was lacking - that landed property was in fact state property - an opinion which brought him closer to an AMP position.

Skipping now to the 1920s, we have Grekov's study of the old Kiev kingdom and its method of controlling society,⁵⁸ followed in 1930 by a history of Russia by V.O. Klyuchevstvi.⁵⁹ In the next section of our article we will deal with the 1920s and 1930s in more detail. Essentially there was an ongoing discussion about whether Russia had been AMP or feudal - an example (aside from the Leningrad and Moscow conferences called on these issues by Party historians) was a study published in *Istoriya Marksizma* No.20, 1930 by M. Zelenski, "O Dvuchnovykh Teoriyach Proizvodeniye v Sutschnosti Krepnostnogo Chozuaystva v Russii" ("The New Theory of Production Modes and the Essence of Slavery in Russia").

The year 1948 saw the publication of a work illustrating many aspects of social life in Asiatic Russia by Ribakov.⁶⁰

Centralisation of power in the State was always at the centre of attention of scholars of Russian history including the Marxist school which by the 1950s was publishing on this topic. Sakharov raised a series of problems about how Soviet writers were handling the issue⁶¹ as did a writer of Russian origin publishing in the west, Shetepa, in *Russian Historians and the Soviet State* (Rutgers University Press, 1962). An important event too, was the re-publication of a classic work by S.M. Solovyev⁶² who saw a positive role for geographical

determinism in Russian history.

The rise and fall of the influence of the distinguished leftist historian, M.V. Pokrovsky also needs to be told, and has been best revealed by Keep,⁶³ not least because this Russian historian had a wide following in the Western Left after his *History of Russia* in an abridged edition was published in London in 1937 by Martin-Lawrence.⁶⁴

This section now concludes with a reference to two controversial authors in the field - Wittfogel and Alexander Gerschenkron. Wittfogel's studies on AMP became increasingly anti-Marx⁶⁵ once he had departed permanently from the Soviet scene in 1931. His major work, *Oriental Despotism* (1957) retains some of the insights of the young Wittfogel on Chinese history.⁶⁶ As is now well-known, he later likened *Oriental Despotism* to Stalin's rule. However, not all the other experts on AMP agreed with his methods and conclusions not to speak of his treatment of Russian history⁶⁷ and of *Oriental Despotism* itself.⁶⁸ By 1970, Wittfogel appeared to be bent on making wilder and wilder claims for his theories.⁶⁹

Yet we all owe Wittfogel a debt in that, like Marx, he asked penetrating questions about AMP societies and raised a series of critical propositions about social development, viz.: (a) does use of the AMP concept assist in explaining historical change and transformation in Asia?; (b) does a study of AMP and *Oriental Despotism* help us to understand more clearly why European feudalism evolved into classical capitalism while in Asia, "modernity" had to come from outside via colonialism; and, (c) is movement towards industrialisation dependent on the dissolution of the communal forms of property in favour of private property or did AMP help the non-European world to resist the on-rush of capitalist colonialism (as suggested for China by Madiar)?

This third point was in fact tackled by Gerschenkron, one of a group of experts on communism (Nicolovsky, W. W. Rostow, H. Rosovsky, A. Erlich, A. Eckstein) who have something Russian or even Menshevik in their family backgrounds. He wrote a long survey of Russian social thought in the 19th Century in the book *Europe in the Russian Mirror*, (Cambridge, 1970). His essay purported to analyse, comprehensively, Russian "social" thought over the 19th Century; it did not, however, discuss the Left trend - Isaev, Ziber or Tugan-Baranovskii to mention just three. Yet Gerschenkron himself had earlier made a special study of Tugan⁷⁰ and knew all about him. Hence the absence of these significant socialist figures in the essay is perplexing, to say the least.

Comintern and the Eastern Question: Both International events and the ordinary processes of scholarship within the Soviet Academies operated in the 1920s to influence the thinking of "Bolsheviks" on the "Eastern Question." The Comintern leaders in particular knew that they had to get their diagnosis of the history and contemporary politics of Asia correct if they were to make a successful intervention in the national liberation struggles that they expected to sweep through China and former colonies. In 1928, the Comintern Program referred to AMP explicitly along semi-feudalism characteristics of many colonies and China. This led to many later conflicts among Communists.

Documents republished in the volume edited by S. Schram and Helene D'Encausse show that there took place a series of earnest debates. This collection, *Marxism and Asia* is comprehensive and need not be repeated here; nevertheless we will highlight some authors who published their work both within the Comintern debate and outside it.

We may refer, in the first place to a review of such contributors by M. A. Cheskov, "Analiz Struktury Kolonial'nykh Obshchestvo v Dokumentach Kominterna, 1920-27" (Analysis of the Structure of Colonial Society in the Documents of the Comintern, 1920-27) which formed a centerpiece of the 1969 collection of further material on the Comintern under the title *Komintern i Vostok* (Comintern and the East), Moscow, 1969. In the same collection there appeared the following articles: V.I. Glunin on the Standpoint of the Comintern towards China; O. V. Martyshin on the Comintern and the United Front in India; M.A. Persich on "The Eastern Internationalists in Russia" and A.B. Reznikov on the Strategy and Tactics of the Comintern Towards Colonialism.

Subsequent events in the late 1920s and the 1930s were to embroil the Comintern in severe differences of

opinion over peasant wars in the East, especially over China. (The Chinese Communist Party had joined the Comintern in 1922). Nikolai Bukharin headed the key Comintern committees from late 1926 to late 1928. He inherited the earlier Comintern view of China as a pre-capitalist mode of production with feudal and "semifeudal" characteristics. As well, in these earlier pronouncements, the national bourgeoisie was seen to have a dual characteristic - it did seek more industry for China but was unreliable when it came to fighting foreign interference in Chinese affairs.

The 6th Congress of the Comintern contained a few non-Stalinist personnel and sentiments, but the 7th Congress met in 1935 under the shadow of the rise of Stalin and its pronouncements carried less a "sectarian" assessment of the national bourgeoisie in China. Other previous policies of Stalin were overturned.

In 1935-36, Dimitrev rebuilt a united-front approach towards progressive bourgeoisie governments which was reflected in some of the Comintern's pronouncements about China. Some activists in the Comintern favoured a leading role for the working class in China's pending Revolution, including the setting up of worker-peasant soviets - even at the risk of ending the tactical alliance between the Left and the Kuomintang movement. The patient work of Dimitiev and others in re-building the alliance with Left group culminated in the December 1936 decision of the Chinese Communist Party and Chiang's Nationalists to form the anti-Japanese United Front. Yet the issues of the 1930s were still rooted in the rival 1928 assessment of Madiar who saw the Chinese system as an AMP under attack from outside capitalist colonialism, much as Marx has described India in the 18th Century, as against the Trotskyites who saw China as already largely capitalist especially concerning mercantile capital, and, finally, those who wanted to fight an anti-feudal revolution.

Western historians and political scientists also made hefty contributions to this whole topic. First, the American economic historians may be noted; Robert Vorth studied the early concerns about the East held by the Bolsheviks in the 1920s, publishing both *The Soviet Union and the East, 1920-27* and *Moscow and Chinese Communism* (Stanford, 1953). A. Doak Barnett was to the fore with *Communist Strategies in Asia* (New York, Praeger, 1963). Among the non-Americans, S. Avineri collected Marx's writings on Colonialism and the East and wrote a perceptive introduction to the papers; Ian Cummings contributed *Marx, Engels and National Movements* (London, CroomHelm, 1980) which showed implications for Marxists of the National Liberation movements, while a German author, P. Erschwelle returned to the Bolsheviks of the 1920s and the Eastern question in his *Zur Kommunistische Interpretation der Kapitalistische Welt, 1921-25* (Cologne and Vienna, 1971).

Soviet Scholars and AMP in the 1920s: In 1923 a Marx-influenced scholar, A. Chayanov published a book that was later taken up in the West as a minor classic: this was A. Chayanov's *Theory of Peasant Economy* (issued in English in the edition of D. Thorner, 1966). From the mid- 1920s, many books and articles about China began to appear in the USSR, including K. Charnski's, *China: from Ancient Times to the Present* in 1926 which was given a substantial review by Reysberger in *Istoričeskij Marksizm*, No. 6-7, 1927. There was the beginning of studies on neighbouring countries and their social formations Sinkiang, Tartary, and Turkestan as well. Notable here was I. Chodorov's, "K Voprosy o Istoricheskoj Evolucii Zemlyevladseniya v Turkestan" ("On the Historical Evolution of Land Use in Turkestan") which appeared in *Istoričeskij Marksizm*, No. 10, 1928.

In 1925, legendary curator of the Marx-Engels archives, David Ryazanoff, had drawn attention to the importance of the category "Asiatic Mode of Production" in Marx's writings. Two of his articles which elaborated his advocacy were "Revolution in China and Europe," in *Pravda*, 14 January, 1925 and a longer piece, "Karl Marx on China and India," in *Pod Znamenom Marksizma* (Under the Banner of Marxism), Vol. 1, No.2, 1925. In the midst of growing concern of the economic and political situation in China, Eugene Varga, later to become somewhat of a dissident on some economic questions, wrote an article on similar lines to Ryazanoff that became influential in the Comintern as a whole: "Problems of the Revolution in China," originally published in *Planovoe khozyaystvo* (Planned Economy), No. 12, 1925. Versions of this paper appeared in *Bolshevik* (No.8, 1928) and in the *Bulletin of the Comintern, La Correspondence Internationale*, (Vol.5, No.68, 8 July, 1925).

When the article was republished in the USSR in 1964 it was instrumental in persuading a number of scholars and activists to take the AMP seriously. Varga drew attention to the peculiarities of what Marxists in Russia had hitherto called "Chinese feudalism," especially the exceptionally strong role of the state elite which "formed a class unknown in the history of Europe." Some of the Comintern's own experts agreed, recalling, too, that Marx had written on the economic base of Eastern despotism. Among those taking this position were B. Lominadze⁷¹ and L. Madiar⁷² while Varga wrote a favourable review of Madiar's book, *Agrarian Economy of China*, in *Pravda*, 1928. All three writers questioned the "feudal" character of the Chinese social formation as it appeared in the 20th Century and wrote instead about AMP-type "hangovers" and residuals.

In his book, Madiar stated that we know from Marx in 1853 that when the British invaded India they found an AMP society in operation. Later, as commodity production and the division of labour were extended and deepened, the base of AMP was undermined; the same thing was happening in China with the colonial penetration. Significantly, in his introductory chapter, he remarked that not much analytical progress had been made since Marx's *British Rule in India* and Luxemburg's exposure of French imperialism in her *Accumulation of Capital*. Marx's suggestions for further investigation and development of the AMP concept had been largely ignored, while Marxists had failed to analyse the impact of the foreign investment that had poured into Asia in the 20th Century. The favourable reviews of Madiar's book by Varga in *Pravda* and by Dallin in *Izvestia* (4 October, 1928) described the work as a classical piece of Marxist analysis in the economic history and political economy of China.

Now, in 1928-1929 there occurred a turning point, associated in part with the rise of Stalin to power. It became increasingly unfashionable, and then dangerous, to uphold the views of Ryazanoff, Lominadze, Madiar, and Varga. "Traditionalists" in the Party and the Academy turned sharply against the formulation and use of AMP, insisting instead that there were only five modes of production, and that they formed a linear historical line of development from primitive communism to slavery, to feudalism to capitalism to socialism. With the news of the suppression of the Chinese workers' uprising in China, 1927-8, stronger criticism of the pro-AMP writers was undertaken. In the year 1928, apart from Madiar and Varga, there was published a work by G. Sakharov entitled *Klassnovoya Borbi v Kitaisky Istorii* (*Classes and Class Struggle in Chinese History*) which was a worthy, if orthodox presentation. At this time too the youthful Wittfogel was writing in Russia a series of articles, chiefly in *Pod Znamenom Marksizama*, in which he elaborated the AMP issue and referred to the views of Quesnay and Hegel on Oriental Despotism.

The year 1929 proved eventful with the publication of Dubrovsky's controversial book, *K Voprosu o Sushnosti Aziatskogo Sposobe* (*On the Essence of the Asiatic Mode of Production*). While elaborating the slave and feudal modes of production in a new way, Dubrovsky was also willing to render many quotations from Marx and Engels on the AMP itself, thereby implicitly criticising the "only five modes" approach. At first the criticisms of Dubrovsky ran along scholarly lines- suggestions, for example, that AMP was a special form of Asian feudalism or that AMP shared many characteristics of the slave mode of production and did not need to be treated as a mode of production in its own right. This sort of academic criticism was canvassed, for example, in the review of Dubrovsky by A.P. Rivera, "Problems of Social Formations," in *Pod Znamenom Marksizama*, Nos 7-8, 1930. Increasingly though, the criticism of Dubrovsky became much more severe from Party circles and from academics alike. For example, a historian, M.N. Pokrovsky, so well known in the West subsequently weighed in against Dubrovsky, criticising him in a paper at the Institute of Red Professors in 1930 called "Protiv mekhanisticheskikh tendencii v istoricheskoi nauke" (*Against the Mechanistic Tendency in Historical Science*) and in his review of Dubrovsky's book in *Istoriya Marksizma*, No. 16, 1930.

This comment about stepped-up criticism of AMP supporters does not cover the pro-AMP enthusiast A. Efimov, an eminent economist and historian who produced the suggestively titled article "Concepts of Economic Formations in the Work of Marx and Engels and their Use in Clarifying the Structure of Eastern Societies" in *Istoriya Marksizma*, No 16, 1930. He wrote that the many references in Marx to AMP meant that it had to be taken

seriously. He referred to Capital, Vois. 1 and 3 and to Theories of Surplus Value, the de facto fourth volume of Capital. He also mentioned approvingly George Lukacs' idea of the distinction between production for use and production for exchange and his calling the AMP primarily a "natural" economy. Efimov rejected the idea that Marx and Engels had abandoned AMP later in life pointing in particular to their interest in explaining why the communes had disintegrated in Mesopotamia and China and how it had come about that money rent had appeared in some areas of Asia that had experienced AMP-type structures. In his own work, Efimov treated Azerbaijan and some other parts of Greater Russia as resembling AMP as late as the 18th Century, though they did also feature some elements of feudalism and merchant capitalism during their transition.

The problem for the traditionalists who had set their face against AMP was that Dubrovsky's book and the polemic of Efimov were powerful in their impact. The former's work was so well written and documented that leading Party academics were forced to wheel out some very big guns to denounce it.

The 1931 Leningrad Controversies on AMP: Party-minded academics called a major conference in 1931 to deal with issues raised by AMP, although the proceedings were edited by a moderate, M. Godes. This event and its significant results will be reviewed only briefly here and in any case have been splendidly covered in Marian Sawyer's book, *Marxism and the Question of the Asiatic Mode Of Production*, published in 1977. A leading spokesman for the traditionalists was M. Kokin. Despite stated misgivings about his approach vented in the introduction by Madiar, Kokin and Papayna's work on Sinkiang was enthusiastically backed, some as being in the traditionalist mode. As far as the Leningrad conference was concerned⁷⁵ Kokin attacked the use of AMP as a "political mistake", the mistake consisting of a failure to see that the Chinese problem was one of the struggle of landless peasants and poor tenant farmers against the big private landholders. Others in the Kokin group falsely linked pro-AMP views to "Trotskyism."⁷⁶ Criticism of Plekhanov's line on Oriental Despotism were thrown about and people were reminded that Plekhanov had disagreed with Lenin. Some dark references were made to Plekhanov's later closeness to some of the Menshevik leaders. A. G. Prigozin made ambiguous remarks suggesting, perhaps ironically, that "in so far as Marx and Engels thought that in Russia there existed an AMP then Lenin was incorrect and Plekhanov and the Mensheviks were correct."⁷⁷ One participant, E. Gasganov, had once written critically of Plekhanov in "Istoricheskie vzglyady G.V. Plekhanova" (Historical Viewpoint of G. V. Plekhanov) in *Istoriya Marksizma*, No.7, 1929. Now the same author wrote a spiteful article at the end of the Leningrad conference which came out as "Protiv Revizii MarxLeninaskogo v Chleniya o Feodalizma i Kreptonichestve" (Against the Revision of Marxist-Leninist Treatment of Feudalism and Slavery), *Istoriya Marksizma*, No. 11, 1931.

However, the 1931 Leningrad conference was not without positive features:

- (i) It aroused an interest in designating certain areas of the USSR and adjacent regions as characterising different social formations. Studies were stimulated about neighbouring regions like Turkestan, Tartary, Sinkiang, and Iran. It was even recalled that there had once existed a popular democratic "Far Eastern Republic" from 1920 to 1922.
- (ii) Clarification was achieved about the role of social formations and modes of production respectively in historical development. The possibility of "mixed modes" was raised,
- (iii) Cadres and younger members of the Party were exposed to many hitherto unknown writings of Marx and Engels, so that their previous perspectives were challenged and possibly enriched.

One might add that the surfacing of AMP as Marx's lost mode helped in the later process of de-demonisation of Marx that was achieved in the West, and to a lesser degree in Eastern Europe in the 1960s and 1970s.

Work on Asia Among Soviet Scholars, 1931-63: With the debates in the USSR academies and Party firmly closed by the end of 1931 with the ascendancy of the opponents of AMP, there was a period of inaction on the pre-capitalist economic formations concerning anything but material that was consistent with the new orthodox. However some solid studies in the empirical style were prepared, even if some were written, temporarily, for the desk drawer rather than publication in some censored form.

The 1930's publication that are still of some interest include a group of three from the year 1934: Struve (a critic of AMP);⁷⁸ Avidiev⁷⁹ and Kovalyev.⁸⁰ Struve's book was History of the Ancient East, Avidiev's Study of Ancient Egypt and Kovalyev wrote on problems of studying the slave mode of production. In 1936 there was an interesting offshoot of the AMP debates with the translation into Russian and publication of the ideas of one of the original upholders of Oriental Despotism and AMP, the respected traveler Francois Bernier whose reports had been much used by Marx. It was Bernier who had insisted from the beginning on absence of private property in land as a key feature of the AMP he observed - the society of the Mushal rules.

Moving on to 1940, we encounter Struve again,⁸¹ this time writing on slave society; but more important was the intervention in 1948 by the very eminent expert on Western feudalism, E. A. Kosminsky, in a largely unexplained - possibly "Aesopian" - article.⁸²

In 1949, a piece appeared by an arch-critic of AMP, Yakanov, on the ancient society of Sumeria⁸³ which was a scholarly contribution to the field of pre-capitalist social formations. The following year Stepugina⁸⁴ wrote a thoughtful work on social relations in China between the 12th and 14th Centuries.

For the year 1956, we note that Tumenov, a very distinguished party worker and researcher who wrote on the centralised state in the history of 'Sumeria⁸⁵ and Afanasayeb⁸⁶ revealed that some re-thinking had been going on within the academy about AMP, and that a more sympathetic view was being taken of its use in historical work. In 1957, two books appeared, pieces on agrarian social relation of old China by authors more favourable to AMP - Vasilyev⁸⁷ and Duman.⁸⁸ At the other end of the spectrum an ultraorthodox Chinese scholar, Van Janan, spending time in Moscow, in 1958-59 completed an excellent study of feudal rent in China,⁸⁹ but in a book on the economics of Chinese development over centuries, no mention of AMP was made. This fitted with the pattern favoured by Mao Zedong and Kuo Mo Jo. In 1959 was also published A. M. Sakharov's book, Ancient Towns of Russia in the 14th and 15th Centuries.

On another track, there was a strong statement in his Theoretical Problems of Geography by a leading geographer, V. Anuchin, against some elements in the orthodox Marxist-Leninist position on the role of geography in the study of modes of production.⁹⁰ The same author was later to reveal details about the struggle to defend objectivity and logic within the various branches of Soviet academic geography.⁹¹ In 1960, too, well-known author, I. Stuchevski, defended his ideas on the use of slavery in Ancient Egypt with an article "O Specificheskikh Formakh Rabstva v Drevnem Egipte" (On the Specific of Slavery in Ancient Egypt) in the journal, Vestnik Drevnei Istorii, No.1. 1960.⁹²

The first years of the 1960s saw publications on Ancient China - Vassilyev (proAMP) entitled Ancient China in the 11th and 12th Centuries (with an introduction by Duman, Moscow, 1962); T. Savileyeva on Ancient Egypt⁹³ and a think piece by Sakarov⁹⁴ on how Soviet historians had handled the issue of the role of the centralised state apparatus in Russian history. Finally we point out that in 1962, an academic, V. Kolganov, published a book with the very significant title Pre-capitalist Economic Formations which predated by two or three years the big debates that were to break out on the topic and also predated both the Russian (1979) and Hobsbawm (1964) collection in English of Marx and Engels on pre-capitalist economic formation.

Soviet Work and Debates on Asia, 1964-71: In 1964-65, apparently unrelated to the coming theoretical debates about AMP, two works on Asia appeared, both of first class standard. The first to consider was on India, the second on China. We refer to the book on India by K.Z. Ashrafyan, Agrarno stroi severnoy Indii (Moscow 1965). The study on old China was M. Krykvokov, "Rod i gosudarstvo v Yinskoy Kitae" (People and Government in the Jin Dynasty of China), Vestnik Drevnoy-Istorii, No.2, 1965.

At about this time (as already noted) Marxist academics in France, Hungary, and Britain had begun their promotion of AMP as a vital part of Marxist social science and historiography. A number of reactions in Russia followed, ending with a major assault on the Westerners by Kachanovski in 1970. Among the more immediate reactions were the following: the hostile piece by A. I. Pavlovskaya, "PoNavidu Diskusii obAziatskom Sposome Proizvodstva na Straniceah Zhurlana La Pensee I Eirene" (Concerning the Opening of Discussion About the

Asiatic Mode of Production) in the journals *La Pensee* and *Eirene* in *Vesnik drevnoy istorii*, No.3, 1965; the article by Garushchan "Ob aziatskoy sposobe proizvodstva" (On the AMP), (*Voprosy Istorii*, No.2, 1966); and the more measured response by Porsnev, "Periodaciya I vsemirnoistoricheskogo progressa v Godelu v Marksa" (Periodisation and the Historical Project in Godelier and Marx), *Filofijkie Nauki* (Philosophical Sciences), No. 2, 1969.

However, the article we see as marking a turning point was the one by L. Danilova in 1965 embracing the French initiative and challenging her Soviet colleagues to respond positively to the ideas of the Western counterparts.⁹⁵ This piece was Danilova, "Discussion on Various Problems" in the journal *Questions of Philosophy*, No. 12, 1965 soon to be followed by others of her scholarly works. But the original 1965 article marks a cut-off point, representing as it did a kind of "opening shot" in a campaign by a group of historians now strongly in favour of AMP. The consequent debate covered many fields like anthropology, history, ethnography, political theory, sociology, archaeology, and geography. The challenge to orthodoxy was taken up in the form of a conference in 1966 with the papers and proceedings by G.F. Kim.⁹⁶ This initiative was followed in turn by a counter conference two years later (in 1968) organised by Academician Ter-Akopian and Danilova herself. Kim's 1966 volume reflected deep concern within the Academy and particularly within the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow, about which direction the research and publishing on Asia might go if more people joined Danilova and Ter-Akopian in their strong support for AMP. Many diehard critics of AMP were invited to the 1966 conference and read papers - Krimov, Dubrovski, and Stuchevski. There was relatively open discussion though, with Nikiforov and Ter-Akopian among the moderates; this reflected a period of relaxation during the Brezhnev leadership of the CPSU (roughly it lasted from 1964 to 1969: Kim called for new initiatives to counter both "Thirdworldism" and "bourgeois historians." Others criticised the initiative of the French and British Marxists in raising the issue of AMP in open challenge to previous views about pre-capitalist social formation.

In his article, Perelemov argued that archaeology revealed daily life in the communes of China in the period of the 3rd to the 5th Centuries. He added that it was possible to say a lot about the culture of that time using such sources. A pro-AMP paper emerged with A. Andeyev praising Godelier and stating that AMP was a genuine category of social formation. A high caliber talk was given and published in the Kim volume by L. Alayev, "Development Trends in the Agrarian Regions of South India of the 8th and 9th Centuries."

The second "Kim" conference opened in 1971 with the same Kim doing the editing.⁹⁷ This time the critics attacked AMP and its supporters directly - with the strongest words coming from Krilov, Sedov, Kim and Kachanovski. Djakanov repeated that no communes existed in agriculture of the old society of Ancient Mesopotamia and there was no highly centralised control by the state - hence AMP was a fiction. He criticised in particular, the pro-AMP geographer, Melekishvili, Struve and O. K. Kringcr insisted that Ancient Egypt was a slave mode of production and not an AMP. The aim here seems to have been to undermine not only Ter-Akopian and Danilova but the work of authors who had designated Ancient Kampuchea, Vietnam, and Laos as "classical" AMP societies, Dubrovski, M.A. Korostova, and K.Z. Ashrafyan all attacked AMP more indirectly by reiterating support for the "five modes only" formula.

After the "peak" of criticism of AMP had been reached in the second 1971 Kim Conference and with the Kachanovski book, things settled down. The "sting" of the counter-attack was absorbed by the actions of Danilova, Ter-Akopian and Nikiforov. Both sides now had free access to the scholarly journals. There followed in 1972 an article by Melekechvili⁹⁸ and a new study by Yitkin,⁹⁹ and the results of research on China by Volkova.¹⁰⁰ A. Platanov's article on "Problems of the AMP" was useful summary of where the debate had arrived.¹⁰¹

We conclude this section with a mention of Ter-Akopian's summary of his views and a moderate book that, in 1980, looked for consensus Kh. Monyam's *Landmarks in History: The Marxist Doctrine of Socio-Economic Formations* (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1980). This closed the decade of the 1970s, ten years of politics (as Brezhnev aged), and years of little movement in the Academe. The main event for our purposes was the

publication of Nikiforov's History of the Far East by a writer who saw the great importance of AMP, while not fully endorsing use of the concept as a research tool. In China in the 1970s, post-Mao historians increasingly went over to the AMP "side," opening up new ways of discovering China's past. It is highly significant that the edition of GRANAT for the 1975-8 Volumes chose the pro-AMP author N. Ter-Akopian to write the item on AMP for the encyclopedia.

In summing up this section, we have presented three kinds of articles and research thrown up by the study of pre-capitalist economic formations:

1. "Marxological" works-what Marxist and Party experts had written about Marxist-Leninist theory and its role in assessing the "Ancient East;"
2. Articles about AMP illustrating the Marxist concern to use and develop historical materialism, to explain how modes of production should be specified - by reference to the role of surplus-extraction and its shape and the social-existence form of labour in the different modes of production;
3. Studies showing the use of AMP to bring up issues likely to be found today in Asia and Africa such as communal society, and centralised state controls.

The younger scholars in Russia fulfilled their tasks by building up case studies. They could then show which region and for what period, the AMP model can show good results; also what are some of the limitations on the examples given. Some of the cases may well turn out to be rather complex mixes of modes of production.

Central European Studies: German and Hungarian Contributions on AMP

With Marx, Engels, and Kautsky all being native German speakers, and with Engels writing numerous articles on Germany's history, *Der Weg Zur Macht*; in the 1930s, Wittfogel's articles on hydraulic societies and AMP structures began to appear in German journals as well as in a book.¹⁰³ In the 1950's, studies on periodisation issues in relation to the history of the Orient appeared, the chief example being Sellnow and Weiskopf's piece,¹⁰⁴ while ancient China received attention in the book of Erke.¹⁰⁵ In the German Democratic Republic in the 1960s, a group studied both periodisation and the issue of slavery versus AMP.¹⁰⁶

The 1960s proved fruitful - the main effort on case study lines was B. Hayit's *Sowjetrussische Orientpolitik am Biespel Turkestan* (Cologne and Berlin, 1962), while in 1964 Marx's *Ethnological Notebooks* were revived in German by E. Lucas;¹⁰⁷ later L. Krader did a similar exercise in the English language. In 1967 Buttner questioned whether AMP and Oriental Despotism were categories that were really applicable outside Asia, for example, to African societies.¹⁰⁸ A detailed study of the specifics of despotism in old China was by H. Franke and R. Tranzetel, *Das Chinesische Kaiserreich* (Hamburg, "Fischen," 1968.) In 1969, the *Grundrisse* of Marx was re-examined for its historical merit, which included many passages on AMP, by F. Tomberg in *Das Argument*, Vol. 52, June, 1969.

The 1970s opened with Felder posing the issue of whether China had gone through an AMP stage¹⁰⁹ and we can end this section about German studies by pointing to an article on AMP and the theoretical issue it raises which was published in 1974 by the historian-political scientist, Engelberg.¹¹⁰

Hungarian academic study of AMP is virtually synonymous with one name -Ferenc Tokei, an expert on the early Chinese Chou dynasty. As can be seen from two of his articles in the *Journal of Contemporary Asia*¹¹¹ and elsewhere, he consistently upheld a pro-AMP stance. His studies on AMP began in 1958 with the book on the Chou dynasty¹¹² and he subsequently explored what Marx and Engels had written about AMP in more detail suggesting the two had never abandoned the concept.¹¹³ New essays by Tokei in 1966 and again in 1975 reiterated this position¹¹⁴ as did a collection of essays in Hungarian.¹¹⁵ However, he did not always agree with those who wanted to insert AMP in a particular stage of societal development.¹¹⁶

A number of Hungarians wrote generally about pre-capitalist economic formations and the role of the strong state, including Agh¹¹⁷ and Balasz, a long-time scholar of China.¹¹⁸ In 1982, a book was published in Hungary in the English language by G. R. Berent which made an important argument - that old power structures in any mode of production incorporated many social and economic elements which would otherwise disappear with

social change. This was the equivalent of suggesting that "hangover" from such modes as AMP and Bureaucratic Feudalism would be possible - a point we will explore in more detail in a later section.

The Australian Contribution

Born in England, lived in China for more than 20 years, and became an Australian - that was the life of C.P. Fitzgerald, who became Professor of Far Eastern History at the Australian National University in the 1950s. Fitzgerald was the author of a number of books which touched on the issues of Chinese despotism and the social relations accompanying that system. Some publications included *From Manchu to Mao Tse Tung*, *Flood Tide in China*; etc. One book, *Barbarian Beds*, allowed for many social and sexual inferences to be made from the structure of such beds. Fitzgerald was a towering figure in China Studies, though a modest person himself. He held leftist views, but when Mao's "Little Red Book" was published in millions of copies in 1966-7, he countered with a "Little Yellow book" of quotations from Liu Shao-chi, the target of Mao and a politician that Fitzgerald obviously respected.

In 1966, two Sydney researchers, Cooper & McFarlane, introduced readers of the *Australian Quarterly* to the AMP debate with an article "AMP- Economic Phoenix?" The interest in AMP was then taken up enthusiastically by Canberra scholar, Marian Sawer, who turned her Phd thesis into a challenging and well-received book, *Marxism and the Question of the Asiatic Mode of Production*. (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff 1977). As a byproduct of her research, she produced a number of articles that proved to be usefully related to the main AMP debates. In 1974 she published "The Sources of Marx's Concept of Oriental Despotism in British Political Economy" (mainly commenting on Richard Jones and Mill) (*Etudes du Marxology*, Series S). Two articles were on AMP in Marx's vision of pre-capitalist economic formations: first, "Asiatic mode of Production and Marx's Analysis of Progress and Modernization" in *Opredelejenje*, 2-3, 1981 and also "Marx's Concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production," *Dialogue*, 3-4, 1983. In her major book, Sawer devoted a lot of space to the Comintern debates and the Leningrad conference of 1931. The works of Madiar and Lominadze were particularly singled out for their open support the idea that China went through an AMP stage, and that in the 1920s still retained "hangovers" of AMP that affected the strategy for communist revolution in China. Sawer's analysis of the split between Lenin and Plekanov over state ownership of land and centralised control in Russia arose because of the latter's knowledge of Chinese despotism.¹⁰⁹ With the supervisor E. Kamenka exercising his belief that Marx was more interested in modernisation than Asian history,¹²⁰ the road to the book must have been difficult. That a major center in Paris encouraged her work shows that it was well thought of abroad.¹²¹

Finally, mention should be made of the detailed study of the history of peasant societies by economic anthropologist Raymond Firth - studies which threw light on the division of labour on agricultural communities in old societies. He wrote many articles in areas where economy and anthropology met at the margin, an example being "Social Anthropology and the Marxist Views on Society" in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol 58 (1972). A manuscript in mimeo form was prepared by him at the Wenner-Gren Center in Stockholm in 1960 on *Problems of Economic Anthropology: Formation and Maintenance of Capital in Peasant Societies and the Elements of Social Organization*. It was later published in London. Firth had pointed out that that the economic history and anthropology of the ancient societies criss-crossed often when studying the history of such societies.

Vietnamese Studies on AMP

It is important to remember that Vietnam is a country more open to outside cross-currents of influence than China. Ideas from India made an impact - in olden days Hinduism and Buddhism and in the 1960s data on science and technology. Also important in this regard have been the USSR and the ex-colonial power, France. Vietnamese historians, as a result, have been exposed to many "new" ideas, including Marxist ones, and those studying in Paris in the 1960s, may have been reinforced in any pro-AMP stance by the debates in *La Pensee*. We note that historian Nguyen Long Bich wrote on the usefulness of AMP in interpreting Vietnamese history in both 1963¹²² and 1967¹²³ - the period of the debates in Paris on AMP. Khoi Le Tran published a piece in

French in *La Pensee*, No.171 entitled "Contribution to the Study of AMP: Ancient Vietnam." Then there came the article, also in French, of Tran Viet, "Epistemological Obstacles in the Approach to AMP."¹²⁴ Khoi Le Tran wrote again in 1981, this time a chapter in a volume on AMP edited by Bailey and Llobera.¹²⁵ Khoi's essay argued that Vietnamese society from the 10th to the 19th Century was an early class-based social formation. A Russian scholar on Vietnam, Thetchkov, contributed a slightly skeptical article on the ruling elite in old Vietnam.¹²⁶

The next Vietnamese scholar of note to be considered is Nguyen Khac Vien. ¹²⁷He described the ruins at Co Lau and reviewed the AMP issues in a most judicial way, giving some space also to the critics of AMP. His book in English of 1986, *Vietnam Long Journey*, seems to describe an AMP in Vietnamese history without emphasising the term "AMP."

Discussions on AMP in P.R. China

A leading figure in the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Kuo Mo Jo, published two works in the 1950s which were quickly translated into the Russian language. Both contributions impinged directly on the issue of whether China had experienced AMP or only slavery followed by feudalism. The first was an article, "Istorikdrevnogo Kitaya" (History of Ancient China) in the journal *Vestnik drevnei istorii*, No.1, 1952. The second effort was a book, *Epocha robovladecheskog stroya* (Epoch of Slave Society, Moscow, 1956). The two pieces set the "tone" to be followed in historiography of China which lasted a long while. In its aftermath, Van Yanan wrote a study in Russian of the political economy of old China which did not mention AMP. In the book, *Isledonanaya ekonomicheskikh form poly-feodalizam i poly-koloniyalizamogo Kitaya* (Examination of the Economic Form half-Feudal, half-Colonial, Moscow, 1959), the author generally followed in his exposition the line of Mao, Kuo Mo Jo, and Stalin that China, after primitive communism went through the stages of slavery, feudalism, comprador capitalism, and socialism. Yet lively debate continued in the 1960s.^{2S} Rising to a number of challenges to this thesis, Kuo Mo Jo wrote in the periodical *Red Star* (July, 1972):

During its development, the Chinese society has gone through stages: slavery and feudalism were the earliest - this is fully in accord with Marxist theory. Forty years ago, the Trotskyists tried to argue that after slavery, society was built on ideal village communities. These are wrong ideas and must be rejected. However, we do need a concrete analysis of when important changes took place - when feudalism replaced slavery. We can use graves and other archaeological data to decide this. The Hsiao and Jin dynasties have been especially investigated - tombs of Emperors, in particular, have been studied. Some historians believe that the post Jin period (about 1066) marked a turning point; others suggest that the period of change after the Western Chu dynasty was already feudalism and yet others think that the period of change-over to feudalism was between the end of the Jin dynasty and the beginning of the Chin. Mao Tse Tung was correct when he said that "from the viewpoint of Cu- Chin, China was a feudal society: its politics and economics were feudal, as was its culture.

This paragraph summarises what became the official view on Chinese history for some years. Nevertheless, discussion on the existence of AMP in Chinese history started up again in 1979-82 in particular. The new ideas being bruited about pre-capitalist formation in Chinese history by the Chinese historians came at the same time that political change was occurring in China, with Party plans for some political reforms and modernisation of the defence and other industries.¹²⁹

Articles began to mention "the past Chinese Bureaucratic State based on Centralism" which is almost spelling out "AMP." In a similar vein, historian Vu Dukun wrote of an ancient system with the state presiding over "a slave society of a special Asian type." He was also active in organising a conference in China¹³⁰ to discuss Melotti's book, *Marxism and the Third World*. About this time a new journal appeared, *Selected Writings on Studies of Marxism*. Its issue No.4 for 1984 contained an article, "Zhou Beilong and Su Chongde" which some observers saw as questioning some widely held views on Chinese history. The new initiatives were in part the result of a call by the Institute for Marxism- Leninism- Mao Zedong Thought for more creative study of China's

past.¹³¹

Yet the critics of AMP in Chinese history continued to strongly defend their position.¹³² They included Hu Yaomu and Deng Likun, while Lin Ganguan suggested AMP could be seen as a model or "ideal type" against which the actual course of history might be measured. However, some of these critics, supporters of the Kuo Mo Jo line, not for the first time, ignored crucial evidence in adopting a "position."¹³³

In the West, especially in America, Chinese followed the processes, debates, and events just described. For example, a collection reporting the social science and legal debates was edited by Adrian Chan as *On Democracy and the Legal System* (New York, Sharpe, 1983). It mentions some of the issues pertaining to the historians' controversies.

Indian Researchers and AMP

Lord Canning's writings and reports in the 19th Century started an interest in the study of Indian history. James Mill's *History of the East India Company* added further interest. Marx's writings on India were thorough and provocative.¹³⁴ Later, those stimulated to discover the economic history of the country (including Indians studying in England) were able to use excellent standard works: there was the 1914 book by V. Smith, *Early History of India* (Oxford) and in 1950, S. Piggott in *Pre-history of India* added much material on Ancient India. The outstanding Marxist historian of India, D. Kosambi¹³⁵ was not heavily involved in AMP type issues, perhaps because he was working before Marx's substantial writings on Asia became available. His books and articles pre-dated the British and French debates on AMP that we analysed earlier. This relative silence on AMP or Marx on precapitalist economic formations was also true of other left historians - Bedeker,¹³⁶ Pannikar¹³⁷ and E. M. Nambooridiripad.¹³⁸

By the late 1960s, things were changing as can be seen in the paper of Habib at the Indian History Conference in 1961 whose Proceedings suffered a delayed publication date of 1969. That piece was "An Examination of Wittfogel's Theory of Oriental Despotism," and was followed by a chapter in a 1973 book.¹³⁹ Habib questioned some of Wittfogel's statements on Indian geography and history and noted looseness in his mention of Rome as being an AMP during its historical experience.

Influential, too, was the review article by B. Wielenga, "Marxist Views in India in Historical Perspective" which was circulated in 1976.¹⁴⁰ In the same year, there appeared in *Indian Historical Review* (Vo 1.2, January) another review which also detailed AMP issues - "The Analysis of Pre-colonial Social Relations in the Writings of Karl Marx" by A. Gunawardana.

In the 1980s, more AMP issues were debated on. For example, due to the work of H. Alavi¹⁴¹ on pre-British India, new articles appeared - in the *Journal of Contemporary Asia*¹⁴² and in the Bombay periodical, *Economic and Political Weekly* (notably an intervention by Ashok Rudra, an expert on the political economy of Indian agriculture in the 26 December issue for 1981).

We may now mention two works that took an informed if critical stance towards AMP: the first was Bulla Bhadra's *Materialist Orientalism* published in India in 1989 which claimed that long periods of private ownership of land in India's history invalidated the AMP views of Bernier and Marx for whom state owned land was "the key to the Oriental Heaven;"⁴³ the second was the monograph by K.N. Chaudry, *Francois Bernier and the Image of Oriental Despotism*, which challenged the great traveler's findings on the social relations which he described in Mughal India.¹⁴⁴ He said that economic prosperity and private capital accumulation abounded in the society that Bernier described and not only stagnation of state ownership. Followers of Chaudry have generally argued that Marx and Engels were "over-trusting" of the reports of Bernier and other early travelers to China. Re-issued in the 1980s was the important book by S. N. Mukherjee¹⁴⁵ about the attitude to Indian "Oriental Despotism" exhibited by the colonial officials Sir Thomas Roe and Sir William Jones.¹⁴⁶

This series of articles by B. Ray is worth mentioning: "Pre-capitalist Society in India and the Rise of the Bourgeoisie," "Marx's Vision of History and the Present Day Problems of the Third World," and "Academic Exercise on the Marx Centenary" which were re-published under the rather inappropriate title, "Socialism and

Democracy with a Human Face." All three essays aid the understanding in India of the social formations that existed there.

In 1983, D. Banerjee in Burdwan (Calcutta) organised a "Marx Centenary" international conference and a subsequent book around the theme "Marx and the Third World" which inevitably involved discussion of AMP, feudalism, and "pre-capitalist economic formations" generally. Among those giving papers were Ter-Akopian, Bipan Chandra, B. McFarlane, and M. Jaksic who were interested in these topics.

Before leaving this section on AMP and India, we would like to emphasise the need to study seriously the challenge to Wittfogel by Habib issued at the 1961 Asian Studies Conference in India. Essentially, the complaint was that not all of Asia was despotic in past systems and not all of despotic areas were "hydraulic," since much of Asia's semi-arid regions did not need large-scale hydraulics built by many men at the order of the Head of State. Rather, "shadufs," small tanks, and wells were able to support agriculture's needs.

To conclude: Much of the concerns and skepticism about AMP in India are based on a suspicion of the motives and methods of many Western historians of India - including Marx. Wittfogel in particular encountered more resistance in India than anywhere else except in Russia during Stalinist times. This does not indicate lack of interest about AMP in India, so that among the most important contributions by Indians to the topic of AMP, we can select three outstanding ones: first, the work of S.N. Mukherjee which corrects many errors about the alleged bias of colonial officials Thomas Roe and William Jones who had described the detail of "Oriental Despotism;" second, Chaudry's challenge to the vision of Bernier about the Oriental Society of his travels; third, Habib's unanswerable critique of Wittfogel on AMP as applied to the Northern plains of India and to Ancient Greece and Rome.

Japanese Scholars and AMP Research

Issues in the economic history of Japan have been much discussed in Japan itself and in the West. It has been pointed out that various structures of power that existed in Japan were very different to those prevailing in the continents of India and China and hence AMP, in a Japanese context becomes problematic. This "geographical-materialist" fact has undoubtedly influenced attitudes to Japanese economic history. The structures involved were well understood in the powerful 1958 book by Norman Jacobs, *Origins of Capitalism in East Asia* (Hongkong University Press). Marx himself had declared Japan to be "clearly feudal." Marxists there were affected by the Soviet debates of 1929-34 and did a lot of their own new research from a Marxist perspective.

Noro wrote¹⁴⁷ on Japanese centralised controls and regulation and their interaction with private property in 1929. In the 1930s the following works appeared: Zohei Ito on the arrival and growing power of the state in Japan;¹⁴⁸ Kimio Izu on the epoch of the Zamato;¹⁴⁹ and, Goro Hani on the formation of the capitalist mode of production in Japan.¹⁵⁰

There followed almost immediately a rush of publications on the more philosophical and historical-theory plane which included articles on AMP. Kotsumi Moritami argued¹⁵¹ that the AMP was a mode of production historically located between slavery and primitive communism, the first mode of production. Yoshimishi Watanabe¹⁵² in looking at Japan's own ancient history agreed with Moritami that India and Russia had experienced a mode of production like AMP between primitive communism and subsequent epochs. Jiri Rajakava¹⁵³ pointed out that AMP was a special regime of tribute that could be found across Asian history, this fact distinguishing AMP from a slave mode of production. Hari Haikava¹⁵⁴ speculated that AMP was a specific form of Asian feudalism, which later gave way to a national market economy. In this, he was lining up with Russians like Mififorov, who were arch-critics of AMP.

We record here also that K. Shiozawa was a major figure in these debates in Japan about pre-capitalist economic formations in the period 1958-66, paralleling the debates in France and England, but just missing the renewed Soviet debates of 1966-71. The articles in English translation of their titles were: "The Theory of the AMP and the Ancient Japanese State;"¹⁵⁵ "Japanese Historians and AMP"¹⁵⁶ and "Marx's View of Asian

Society and his Asiatic Mode of Production."¹⁵⁷ This writer designated AMP as "the first class-based society" in which, nevertheless, the commune members controlled the degree of social differentiation that was emerging.¹⁵⁸

Italian Contributions to AMP Debate

In the 1970s, the Italians took up the French lead given in the 1960s when a dozen scholars, grouped around the journals *Critica Marxista* and *Rinascita*, wrote many articles. This was also the time that the Communist Party of Italy was encouraging a more open discussion of Marxist theory and historiography. Among the first to take advantage were Robbio¹⁵⁹ in 1963 and "Aziaticus."¹⁶⁰ Venturini also published an article¹⁶¹ in English in the same year. The first two named wrote "think-pieces" prepared for leftist newspaper; the third was a major survey article about the various ways "Oriental Despotism" has been interpreted.

Italian Marxists were also interested in other issues opened up by the debates in England and France of the 1960s. For example, Sereni wrote on the meaning of "social formation"¹⁶² and Luporini¹⁶³ discussed the "Unknown Marx," who, unknown to the Communist Party, had apparently written a great deal on AMP. La Grassa¹⁶⁴ pondered the relative significance (in the light of the new information about AMP) of categories like "social formation," "mode of production" and "social relation of production." A colleague, Prestipino, explored the logical aspects of the "social formation" category.¹⁶⁵ Three further articles were: (a) V. Gerratan, "Social Formation in the Context of a Process of Transition;"¹⁶⁶ M. Tosi, "The Dialectics of State Control in Mesopotamia, Iran, and Central Asia"¹⁶⁷ and Umberto Melloti's book, *Marxism and the Third World* (London Macmillan, 1977). This book about AMP reopened a lively discussion in Italy and also in England and Asia. The book was reviewed in *Journal of Contemporary Asia* by Dirlik¹⁶⁸ and by Marian Sawyer.¹⁶⁹

Studies and Publication on the Asiatic Mode of Production in Eastern Europe

Poles

While Polish economic historians have traditionally favoured the study of feudalism, the AMP debates were known there and stimulated quite a lot of interest, especially in the parallel revival of Marx's concept of socio-economic formations. In Warsaw, the Centre for the Study of Developing Countries took up these issues through its Director Ignacy Sachs and the Patron, Michal Kalecki. Later when forces inside the Polish United Workers' Party led by ex-General Moczar, had made research of a free kind impossible in Poland (especially in 1967-8), Sachs and others went abroad. Having earlier researched the issues, Sachs was able, after his arrival in Paris, to publish almost immediately a couple of good pieces on transition periods¹⁷⁰ and on AMP.¹⁷¹ Also in 1967 there appeared Malowist's study of early Sudan,¹⁷² and then Majewski's semi-archaeological study of Ancient Egypt as an example of AMP.¹⁷³

Although there is not a large output from Poles on AMP, Polish economic history has been featured by excellent study of feudalism which raised many points similar to those that came up in the AMP debates. This was understandable in the light of the many partitions of the country by foreign aggressors. J. Rutkowski and I. Rychlikowa both completed separate works on Polish feudalism, while the analytically talented W. Kula in his *An Economic Theory of the Feudal System* (London, Verso, 1976) made interesting comments, in his first book published abroad, that allowed contrasts to be made between feudalism and other modes of production.

Czechs

Czech professor Jan Harmatta in June, 1957 published "La societe des Huns a l'epoque d'Attila" (The Society of the Huns at the Time of Atilla) in *Recherches Internationales*. This article set out the issues to be considered under the topic of centralised state controls. *Ajournal* published in Czechoslovakia, *Eirene*, carried a number of articles in the 1960s about AMP and pre-capitalist societies, including a number by Hungarian academic F. Tokei as well as local writers T. Pokora¹⁷⁴ and J. Pecirka.¹⁷⁵ Other writers at this time included Skalnik¹⁷⁶ and Haubelt¹⁷⁷ who both wrote on the utility of AMP as a tool of Marxist analysis.

Yugoslavs

Writers in Yugoslavia and academics appearing on the "Third Programmes" of Radio Belgrade and Radio

Skopje made major contributions to the theory and history of AMP. They were the first in Eastern Europe to do so - to reintroduce AMP as a major topic in both Marxism and historiography. In 1980, Wittfogel was published in Serbia - previously this was a name only pilloried in Eastern Europe. The Serbian writings came out before the Slovenes and the Croats were allowed to publicly discuss Wittfogel.

Particularly important in the demonstration of an "open" Marxism and the revival of interest in AMP were the journals *Marksizam u Svetu* (Marxism and the World) and the Bulletin published by the Third Programme of Radio Beograd.

It is significant that parts of Serbia, as well as all of Bosnia and Herzegovina, were occupied by the Ottoman Empire for 500 years, and that the Orthodox Church stemming from Byzantine years (395 A.D. to 1453 A.D.) greatly influenced Serbian history and culture. In so far as both Byzantine and Ottoman rule had many characteristics of AMP, it was logical for Serbian historians in the 1970s and 1980s to take a deep interest in AMP. As Marxists, they would have been aware that Marx and Engels in the German Ideology had referred to the devastation wrought on the Byzantine empire by the Turkish invaders- referring to this act as "a turning point in the history of civilisation."

A collection prepared by G. Ostrokorski and translated as *O Vizantijsko Feudalizmo* (published by Prosvet in 1969), touched on the role of private property in the Byzantine empire as modifying the notion of a pure AMP there. However, the centralised control and use of religion by despots attest to some AMP characteristics, so that various authors have written about the Byzantine system as half-AMP and half-feudal. H. Bibicou in his article in *La Pensee* No. 129, (1966), "Byzantine et la Mode de Production Asiatique" suggested that in Byzantine, there was a mixture of "natural economy" (production for use) and commodity production on private estates. However, there was also state centralisation and many tithes to pay to clerics at many levels which overall brought Byzantine features closer to the AMP model.

The Ottomans overthrew the rule of the Byzantine Empire in the 15th Century. What did they replace it with? A detailed description of all the vertical connections of Ottoman rule, that, with other historical characteristics, suggests a near-AMP system, was presented by the leading novelist Ivo Andric in two major novels on the Ottoman occupation of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Serbia: *Days of the Consuls* and *Bridge on the Drina*.

Academic interest in the structure of the Ottoman Empire developed in Yugoslavia in 1974, with the publication, by the League of Communists' Publishing House, of H. Inalchik's *The Ottoman Rulers*, translated into Serbo-Croatian as *Otomansko Carstvo*.¹⁷⁸ Other translations soon followed, including J. Hammer's *History of the Turkish Sultans* (*Historija Turski-Otomansko Carstvo*) in 1979 in Zagreb, and an analytical article about the Ottoman system as AMP by C. Keyder republished in *Marksizam u Svetu*, No. 7-8, 1985 entitled "The Ottoman Social Formation" and translated as "Otomanska Drustvena Formacija."

Outside of Yugoslavia, itself, there were a number of articles dealing with the mode of production under the Ottomans. In 1976 Yertel in *La Pensée* (No. 186) wrote on the Ottoman Empire in the light of the AMP debate, while Keyder and Islamogu also wrote a substantial bibliographical-analytical article in *Review*, No.1, 1977 entitled "Agenda for Ottoman History."

The interest in these two Oriental despotisms ("Ottoman and Byzantine Empires") and in how Marxists should understand Asia had domestic roots. In 1923, Filipovic had published on modes of production but was not then aware and at that time, was thought to be unduly influenced by a writer unpopular with the Leninists, Bogdanov. In 1974, the Yugoslavs had translated Plekhanov's *History of Russian Social Thought* with its remarks on despotism. An article specifically on the concept of AMP came from Mesihovic¹⁸⁰ in 1977 which raised the issue of AMP as a combination of productive activity by small villages and economic units with state controls amounting to exploitation of these units.

These two academics organised discussions, radio broadcasts and journal articles: Pirec¹⁸¹ and Jaksic.¹⁸² In a series of articles, Pirec outlined his view on China and specifically gave support to AMP. M. Jaksic, broadcast on Radio Belgrade about AMP as the economic base of Oriental Despotism,¹⁸³ wrote on the transition between

modes of production, 184 and completed a major book, *Aziatski Nacin Proizvodnje* (Asiatic Mode of Production, Belgrade, "Nauka" 1989).

These two authors combined to bring out a collection of essays in Serbo-Croatian which included translation of many authors who wrote on AMP. This volume was *Marksizam: Iskushena Azijsko Nachin proizyodnje i Vanevropska Drushtva* (Marxism: Explorations of the Asiatic Mode of Production and Non-European Societies, Belgrade, "Ekonomika," 1985). Filipovic, 184 Kangrga, 185 and Kasic 186 also have continued the study of pre-capitalist society.

We also mention here the seminal role of the "special issues" of the journal *Marksizam u Svetu* on AMP. One of the most important was the issue No. 7, 1980, with an introductory essay by Jaksic and translations of the articles of such authors as TerAkopian, Nikiforov, Chesneaux, Wittfogel, Marian Sawyer, and G. Lewin. Two other associated issues of this journal were specials on "Articulation of Modes of Production" (in Nos. 1-2, 1982) and then "Issues in Marxist Historiography" (in No. 12, 1983). These special numbers were among the best facilitators of discussion on the AMP concept in Eastern Europe and they retain a lasting value.

Conclusions

The main conclusions from our survey so far are:

First, that the case of AMP provides an intriguing link between ideological debate and background political change in society. In the USSR for example, the rise of Stalin's faction and of the Mao-Kuo Mo Jo leadership in cultural affairs of the Chinese Communist Party were accompanied by the virtual banning of research and discussion of AMP. Conversely, the political demise of these groups quickly led to the rekindling of interest in AMP.

Second, that the scholarship surveyed here has been of three kinds: (a) studies of precapitalist societies and the impact of colonialism on them; (b) historical and epistemological innovations in Marxist theory about the extraction and redistribution of economic surplus; and, (c) works elaborating main features of conditions of social life in various countries, using AMP as a measuring rod, such as China, India, Kampuchea, and Mesopotamia.

Third, that in the method of Marx the notion of only five historical modes is excluded as is the projection of change over time as being only of a linear kind. For it was Marx who wrote: "events strikingly analogous but taking place in different historical surroundings lead to totally different results. By studying each of these forms of evolution separately and then comparing them, one can easily find the clue to this phenomenon, but one will never arrive there by using as one's master key a general historicalphilosophical theory a supreme virtue of which consists in it being supra historical." (Marx, Letter to the Editorial Board of *Otechestvenie Zapisi*, reprinted in Ter-Akopian (ed.), *Marx and Engels on Pre-capitalist Economic Formations*, Moscow, 1979).

Finally, that pro-AMP forces "won" the debate in the sense that the following propositions are now generally accepted: (a) that Marx always approved of the careful use of AMP and never rejected it; (b) that the East did not universally experience a slave mode of production before feudalism; and, (c) that the thesis that only five modes of production have appeared in history is no longer tenable.

Notes

1. See, for example, M. Jaksic, *Azijsiki Nacin Proizvodnje* (The Asiatic Mode of Production), Belgrade, Nauchna Knjiga, 1991; B. McFarlane and S. Cooper, "The Asiatic Mode of Production - Economic Phoenix?" *Australian Quarterly*, Sept. 1966.
2. While our article below aims to be comprehensive, it has not covered in detail the research done in Latin America, China and Japan on the AMP, although there are a number of references and some discussion in the text of these publications. Apart from space limitation, the main constraint, we point out that there is a survey of Latin America by J. Llobera in his article, "Inca Society" in Bailey, A. and Llobera, J., *The*

Enlarge this image.

Asiatic Mode of Production (London, Routledge, 1981) and by M. Omelda, "On the Society of the Aztecs, Mayas" also in Llobera, op.cit., Earlier, W.H. Prescott and A.H. Verril discussed the social formations of America before the arrival of Columbus. The Chinese publications referred to in our article have been limited to cases of debates held since 1971 as the previous discussions in the Peoples' Republic of China have been previously and exhaustively examined in a very long survey by Albert Feuerwerker in the academic journal, *American Historical Review*, 1966, pp. 327ff and by J. Rapp in broadcasts over Radio Belgrade's "Third Programme," in 1986. The relatively brief coverage given below of Japanese scholarship on AMP is due to our unfamiliarity with that language.

3. Mukherjee, S.N., *Sir William Jones: A Study in British Attitudes to India*, Bombay, Orient-Longmans, 1987.
4. It may be noted that in Africa, Latin America and Asia there are mixtures of various modes of production: higher barbarism, slavery, the AMP and capitalism. The implications of such a mixture must be closely studied as part of any genuine attempt to construct a "political economy of backwardness" (a term which may be positively misleading).
5. Marian Sawyer, *Marxism and the Question of the Asiatic Mode of Production*, Martinus Nijhoff, 1977.
6. Vera Zasulich, a Russian Marxist, had edited the second Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto*, with a Preface written by Marx and Engels themselves. The first Russian edition had been done by Bakunin. Marx's (draft) letter to Zasulich is found in a number of collections including that of that of Ter-Akopian (ed.) *Pre-capitalist Economic Formations*, Moscow, 1979 (in English).
7. Marxian-style analysis of these rural communes was done by Soviet author, L. Madiar in his 1928 book, *Agrarian Society in China*. Detailed accounts of these communities were also given in Wittfogel's *Oriental Despotism* (New Haven, 1957).
8. Bhadra, Bella, *Materialist Orientalism: Marx, the Asiatic Mode of Production and India*, Puntis Pustal, 1989.
9. Sir George Campbell was a colonial official who wrote *Modern India* in 1852; he discussed the common ownership of land in India.
10. Sir Thomas Roe published his *Journal Giving an Account of his Voyages to India* (London, 1732). See also Forster, W., *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe*, Oxford, 1926. See also, Mukherjee, S.N., Sir William Jones, Bombay: Longmans, 1987.
11. L. Krader in his *Asiatic Mode of Production*, Van Gorcum, 1978, p. 5. This point is not to be confused with the book of J. S. Mill's father whose work is designated as follows: Mill, James, *The History of British India*, 1848. For Russia, M. Sawyer suggests Lenin used the term "AMP" in his debates with Plekhanov, but the wider use of the term is owed to the article of David Ryazanoff on the Chinese Revolution in *Pravda*, 14 January, 1925.
12. Sawyer, Marian, "The Sources of Marx's Concept of Oriental Despotism in British Political Economy," *Etudes du Marxologie*, Series 17, 1974.
13. Fox, Paul, "Views of Marx and Engels on the Asiatic Mode of Production and History," *Letopisi Marksizma*, Vol. 3, No.8, 1930, pp.3-29.
14. Childe, V.G., "The Bronze Age," *Past and Present*, No.12, 1957. Childe also wrote a pamphlet, *Tools*, (1945) which explained how earlier peoples used tools ("forces of production") to wrestle with Nature. The pamphlet was based on an extract from Childe's book, *Progress and Archaeology*, London, 1945.
15. Childe, V.G., *What Happened in History*, London, Max Parish, 1960. This work had sections on the use of iron in agriculture (see pp. 16ff). In his book, *Social Evolution* (Fontana edition, 1963) Childe emphasised that during the transition from savagery to barbarism, it is food production that marks the change and the arrival of the latter. In the same book, referring to Crete in about 400 B.C. he evokes an AMP type picture when he writes "Palace-building implies the use of considerable manpower. Quarrying of stone, tree-felling and transporting, and the erecting of materials for the benefit of the prince or King. Apart from a limited number of masons, carpenters and painters, it was most probably supplied by the customary services of families who supported themselves through subsistence agriculture" (p.133).
16. Needham, J., *Science and Civilisation in China Vol.1*, Cambridge University Press, 1954. See also Needham's review of Wittfogel's *Oriental Despotism* in the Marxist journal, *Science and Society*, No. 23, 1959, pp. 58-65.
17. Griffiths, D.A. "Stages of Development," *Marxism Today* (London), Dec. 1961.
18. Simon, J. "Stages in Social Development," *Marxism Today*, No.6, 1962.

Enlarge this image.

19. Lewin, G., "Problems of Social Formation in Chinese History," *Marxism Today*, 1967. The author criticises the Stalinist insistence on the "five modes of production only" thesis. Supporting the essay-introduction of Hobsbawm on Marx' writings on pre-capitalist economic formations, he noted that "successive" is not synonymous with "progressive."
20. Hoffman, E., "Socio-economic Formations and Historical Science," *Marxism Today*, 1967.
21. Thorner, D., "Marx on India and the Asiatic Mode of Production," *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, No.9, Dec. 1966; also republished in Serbian language in *Marksizam u Svetu*, No.7, 1980. Thorner's support for AMP was qualified.
22. V.G. Kiernan, "Marx and India," in Saville, J. and Miliband, R., *The Socialist Register*, London, 1967. See also Kiernan, "The Great Asian Religions and Their Social Formations," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol. 13, No.2, 1983 and his review of Welinga's "Marx's Views on India in Perspective" which appeared in *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol.8, No.3, 1976.
23. Comment on Wittfogel in McFarlane and Cooper, loc. cit., 1966.
24. Hoffman and Shapiro in their comments on AMP in the *Marxism Today* debates, seemed unaware of Paul Fox's 1930 article written in Moscow which fully supported AMP in a scholarly Marxist way.
25. Leach, E., "Hydraulic Society in Ceylon," *Past and Present*, 1959.
26. Lichtheim, George, "Marx and the AMP," *St. Anthony's Papers*, (Oxford), No.4, 1963.
27. Barron, S.H., "Marx's *Grundrisse* and the Asiatic Mode of Production," *Survey*, No. 1, 1975. After Nicolaus had prepared and published his version of *Grundrisse* for Penguin Books, Barron mined it for insights on earlier societies.
28. Friedman, J., "Marxist Theory and Systems of Total Reproduction," *Critique of Anthropology*, No.7, 1976.
29. Turner, B., *Marx and the End of Orientalism*, London, 1979.
30. Bailey, A and Llobera, J., *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, London, Routledge, 1977. See also Llobera and Kahn, J., (eds.) *The Asiatic Mode of Production Revisited*, 1977.
31. Taylor, J., *From Modernisation to Modes of Production*, London, Macmillan, 1977.
32. Anderson, P., *Lineages of the Absolutist State*, London, New Left Books, 1974.
33. Rapp, J. was heavily involved in Radio Belgrade's 1980 "Third Programme" broadcasts on AMP, giving a detailed survey of the most recent Chinese discussion and debate about the concept and usefulness of AMP. See the text above for more details.
34. Dunn, S., *The Rise and Fall of the Asiatic Mode of Production*, Routledge, 1982.
35. O'Leary, B., *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1989. The author criticised AMP as a concept from a philosophical point of view. A later study of AMP by a writer in Britain was Kate Currie's *Beyond Orientalism: An exploration of some recent themes in Indian history and society*, Calcutta, Bagchi Publishers, 1996.
36. Hindess, B. and Hirst, J., *Pre-capitalist Modes of Production*, Routledge, 1975. It is hard to classify these writers because the book is written in the impenetrable style of the Althusserian school. However, their main message is clear enough: the AMP is, in their view, conceptually impossible.
37. Chesneaux, J., "Recents travaux marxistes sur le mode de production asiatique," *La Pensée*, No.114, 1964 and, in the same issue, "Le mode de production asiatique: quelques perspectives de recherche." Chesneaux's views were reproduced in Serbian in the journal *Marksizam u Svetu*, No.7, 1980 which was a special issue on AMP edited, with his introductory essay, by M. Jaksic.
38. Suret-Canale, J., "Les societees traditionnelles et le concept de mode de production asiatique," *La Pensée*, No.117, 1964.
39. Godelier, M., "Les ecrits de Marx et Engels sur le mode de production asiatique," *La Pensée*, No.114, 1964.
40. Boiteau, P., "Les droits sur la terre dans la societee malagache pre-coloniale," *La Pensée*, No. 117, 1964.
41. de Santis, S., "Le commune de villages chez les Incas, les Azteques et les Mayas," *La Pensée*, No. 122, 1965.
42. Chesneaux, J., "au en est la discussion sur le mode de production asiatique?," *La Pensée*, No. 122, 1965 and Godelier, M., "La notion de mode de production asiatique," *Les Temps Modernes*, May 1966. Godelier's later 1978 piece is a superior account of Marx's work on AMP taken as a whole. See Godelier, M., "The Concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production and Marx's Models of Social Evolution," in Seddons, D., (ed.), *Relations of Production*, London, F. Cass, 1978.

Enlarge this image.

43. We have used the translation of Divitcioglu's article which appeared in the special issue on AMP of *Marksizam u Svetu*, No 7, 1980.
44. See Hoffman, E., op. cit. and in Russia, Kachanovski, J. *Robovladinie. Feodalizam ili Azijski Sposob Proizvodstva*. (Slavery, Feudalism or AMP?), Moscow, 1971.
45. Coquery-Vidovich, "Recherche sur un mode de production Africain." *La Pensee*, 1968; and also "Afrique historique et concept de production dans les sociétés précapitalistes," *L'homme et Sociétee*, No. 58, 1980.
46. Dhoquois, G., et al., "Le mode de production asiatique." *Cahiers Internationales de Sociologie*, XVI, 1966; and Dhoquois, G., "Deux ouvrages de référence sur les sociétés pré-capitalistes," *La Pensee*, No. 154, 1970. One can also mention a piece that will be discussed later in the text above. This is the article by Vidal-Maquet, "La Russe et AMP," *Les Annales*, No.2, 1966.
47. In Ter-Akopian (ed.) op.cit., p.451. Economic historians confirm the rapid disintegration of what Marx had taken note. By 1907 not much was left of the MIR, and Stolypin's agrarian laws accelerated disintegration between 1907 and 1917.
48. Ibid. pp. 270-1.
49. M. Sawyer, op.cit., 1977 (pp. 222-3) quoting an article by Marx in the *New York Tribune* from 1856, "Revelation Concerning the Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century." (See also Lenin's pamphlet, *Karl Marx* for this reference. Lenin commented that the article revealed the "venal dependence of British liberal ministers upon Russia").
50. Tugan-Baranovski, M. I., *The Russian Factory System in the Nineteenth Century* (Russian edition, 1898; English edition, American Economic Association, 1967).
51. Lenin, V.I., *A Characterisation of Economic Romanticism*, Moscow FLPH, 1952.
52. A geographer, Mechnjikovlev, wrote in the 1880s *Civilisations and the Great Rivers of History*, which attracted notice in the Marxist journal *Die Neue Zeit* in 1890. Source: Bailey and Llobera, 1975, op.cit..
53. See Plekhanov, G., *Fundamental Problems of Marxism*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1937. For Plekhanov's specific comments on AMP and oriental despotism see Barron, S. H., "Plekhanov's Russia: the Impact of the West on Oriental Society," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. XIX., 1958. A balanced estimate of Plekhanov's political position is given in GRANAT (*Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, English edn, 1979). See also the very informative book, Getzler, I., *Martov*, Melbourne University Press, 1967.
54. Reddaway, W.T. (ed.), *Documents of Catherine the Great*, Cambridge University Press, 1931.
55. See Nikiforov, V.N., *Vostok i Vsemirnaya Istoriya* (The East in World History), Moscow, 1977.
56. Miljukov, P., *Oчерки по Истории Руской Kультура*, St Petersburg, Mir Bozji. See also the useful old book in English, Wallace, D.M., *Russia*, London, Cassell, 1905.
57. Rziga, V.F., *Perestov. Publicist XVI Veka* (Perestov, Publicist of the XVI Century), 2 Vols., Moscow, 1908.
58. Grekov, B.D., *Kiev Russia*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959 (translated by E. Sbovnikov).
59. Kljuchevski, V.O., *A History of Russia*, New York, Russell & Russell, 1960.
60. Ribakov, B.A., *Remesto drevnei Rusi* (Handicrafts of Old Russia), Moscow, 1948.
61. Sakharov, A.M., *Goroda severno-vostochnoi Rusi XIV-XV Veka* (The towns of Northeast Russia in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth centuries), Moscow, 1959; also Saharov, A. M., "Problemi obrazovanie Russkogo centralizovannogo gosudarstva v Sovetskoj istoriografii." (Problems of Russian Centralised Government in Soviet Historiography), *Voprosi Istarii*, No.9, 1961, pp.70-88.
62. Solovjov, S.M., *Istoriya Rossii s drevneishih vremen* ("A History of Russia from Ancient Times"), 15 Vols., Moscow, Society for Economic Literature, 1960-66.
63. Keep, J., "The Current Scene in Soviet Historiography," *Survey*, Winter, 1973; also Keep, J., "The Rehabilitation of M. N. Pokrovsky," in Rabinowitch, A & J., *Revolution and Politics in Russia*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1972.
64. Pokrovsky, M. N., *A Brief History of Russia*, (trans. by Minorski, D.M.) London, Martin Lawrence, 1933.
65. Wittfogel, K., *Oriental Despotism*, English edition, Yale University Press, 1957 and 1967.
66. In 1927 Wittfogel wrote "Problemi ekonomicheskoi istorii Kitai" (Problems in the Economic History of China), *Vestnik Kommunisticheskoe Akademii*, No. 20. In 1929 he wrote a three-part study in the Communist Party journal, *Pod Znamenen Marksizma* (Under the Banner of Marxism), Nos. 2-3, No.6 and Nos. 7-8, 1929. The titles were gathered under the one heading—"Geopolitika, geograficheski

Enlarge this image.

- materializam i Marksizam."
67. Dittrich, L., "Wittfogel and Russia." *Acta Nederlandica*, Leyden, 1966.
 68. Needham, Joseph, review of Wittfogel's *Oriental Despotism*, in *Science and Society*, No. 23, 1959, pp. 58-65.
 69. See the article "Water Economy - the Original Form of Political Economy." (We cite the Serbian translation in *Marksizam u Svetu*, No.7, 1980. Another source from which to detect Wittfogel's great confidence in his own theories is the piece he wrote for the *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol.XXVIII, No.2, Feb., 1969 entitled "Results and Problems of the Study of Oriental Despotism."
 70. This article was Gerschenkron, A., "Tugan-Baranovski," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Genossenschaftswesen*, No.3, Oct., 1929 and No.4, 1930.
 71. Beso Lominadze gave a speech at the XV Congress of the CPSU on "The Draft Agrarian Programme of the Communist Party of China," upholding the importance of AMP. He was later victimised.
 72. Madiar's book was a Marxist work in the style of an economic historian commenting on the main features of China's past rural economy, the AMP and the more recent trend to social stratification. The pre-Stalin epoch reviews of his book in the major newspapers, *Izvestia* and *Pravda*, were favourable, notably Varga, E. in *Pravda*, Jan. 1929 and S. Dallin, *Izvestia*, 4 October, 1928.
 73. See C. Brandt, *Stalin's Failure in China*, Harvard University Press, 1958; Isaacs, H., *The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1974, or the shorter Coghlan, M. "The Debate on the Nature of the Chinese Revolution of 1927," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol. 6, No.4, 1986.
 74. This review by Madiar is elaborated in Bailey, A. and Llobera, J. (eds.), *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, Routledge, 1981, pp. 77-8.
 75. *Diskusija ob AMP*, Komunisticheskaya Akademiya, Leningrad, Soc. lit., 1931.
 76. At the time, a Trotskyist position on China and mode of production posited feudalism followed by merchant capital. Trotsky himself did not use AMP.
 77. Prigozhin, A.G., "Problemi Obshchvennie Formacii," (Problems of Social Formations) *Pod Znamenen Marksizma*, Nos.7-8, 1930, p.168.
 78. Struve, V., *Istoriya drevnego vostoka* (History of the Ancient East), Moscow, 1934.
 79. Avidev, V., "Seljakaya obshchina iskustvennoe orochenie v drevnem Egipte" (Peasant Communes and Experiences in Ancient Egypt), *Istoriik-Markizma*, No.6, 1934.
 80. Kovalyov, S., "O nekotrih problemah robovadelcheskoi formacii" (Some Problems Concerning the Slave Social Formation), in *Problemi istorii dokapitalisticheskii obshchestva* (Problems in the History of Pre-capitalist Societies), No.2, 1934.
 81. Struve, V., "Marks opredelenie rane klasovog obshchestva." (Marx's View of Early Class Society) *Sovjetskaya Etnografiya*, 1940. See also Struve, V., "K voprosii o specificke robovshchestvo drevnego vostoka" (Concerning the Specification of Slave Society in the Ancient East), *Vestnik leningradskogo universiteta*, No.9, 1953.
 82. Kosminsky
 83. Yaknov, I., *Razviti zemlinih odnosneni v Asirii*, ("Development of Agrarian Social Relations in Syria"), Leningrad, 1949.
 84. Stepugina, T., "K voprosy o socialno-ekonomicheskii odnosneniia v Kitae v XIV-XV veka" (Questions Concerning Socio-economic Relations in China in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries), *Vestnik drevnei istorii*, No.2, 1950.
 85. Tumenov, G., *Gosudarstvenie hoziyastvo drevnego Sumera* (State Control in Ancient Sumeria), Moscow and Leningrad, 1956.
 86. Afanasev, O., "Obuzdeie v institut istorii A.N.SSS problemi aziatskog sposobe proizvodstva" (Discussion at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on the Asiatic Mode of Production), *Sovjetskaya Etnografiya*, No.6, 1956.
 87. Vasiliev, L.S., *Agrarnie odnosneniya u obshchina v drevnem Kitae* (Agrarian Relations in the Society of Ancient China), Moscow, 1959.
 88. Duman, L., "K voprosu o socialno-ekonomicheskostroe Kitaya" (Issues in the Socio-economic Formation of China), *Voprosi Istarii*, No.2, 1957.
 89. Van Yanan, *Isledovanie ekonomicheskii form polyeudalnogo polykolonialnog Kitaya* (Examining the Economic Forms of Half-Feudal, Half-Colonial China), Moscow, 1959.

Enlarge this image.

90. Anuchin, V., *Theoreticheskie problemy geografii* (Theoretical Problems of Geography), Gosizdat (State Publishing House), Moscow, 1960.
91. Anuchin, V., "A Sad Tale About Geography," translation in *Soviet Geography* (English version), Vol.6, No.7, 1965.
92. Stuchevski, I., "O specifecheskih formah robstva v drevnem Egipte" (On Specifying the Forms of Slavery in Ancient Egypt), *Vestnik Drevnii Istorii*, No.1, 1960.
93. Savelyeva, T., *Agrarnii stroi Egipte v periode drevnogo carsiva* (Agrarian Development in Egypt at the Time of the Ancient Kings), Moscow, 1962.
94. Saharov, A.M., "Problema obrazovaniya russkog centralizovannogo gosudarstva v sovyetskoi istograffii" (Problems in the Education of the Centralised Russian State in Soviet Historiography), *Voprosi Istorii*, No.9, 1961.
95. Danilova, L.V., "Diskusiya po vaznoi probleme" (Discussion of Important Problems), *Voprosi Filozofii*, No.12, 1965. The same year, Ter Akopian, a fellow supporter of AMP, and a towering figure in Soviet academic circles produced his magisterial review of the treatment of AMP in the work of Marx and Engels: "Razvitak ozgladov K. Marksa i F. Engelsa na aziatski sposob proizvodstva I zemel'elcheskuyu obshchinu" (The Development of the Views of Marx and Engels on the Asiatic Mode of Production and Peasant Society), *Narodi Azi i Afriki*, No.2, 1965. These two critical pieces were followed by the Conference of 1968, the proceedings of which were edited by Danilova (with assistance from Ter-Akopian) under the title, *Problemi istorii dokapitalisticheskikh obshchestv* (Problems in the History of Pre-capitalist Societies), Moscow, Nauka, 1968. This was the first appearance for some time of pro-AMP articles in large numbers.
96. Kim, G.F. (ed.) *Opshtee i osobennoe v istoricheskoi razvitak stran vostoka* (Society and Communes in the Historical Development of the Far East), Moscow, "Nauka", 1966. The conference papers included essays by Nikiforov, Stuchevski, Andreev, Ter-Akopian and many others.
97. Kim, G.F. (ed.), *Problemi dokapitalisticheskikh obshchestv v stranah vostoka* (Problems of Pre-capitalist Society in the Far East), Moscow, "Nauka", 1971.
98. Melekechvili, G.A., "Karakter socialno-ekonomicheskogo stroia na drevini" (Character of Socio-economic Formations in Antiquity), *Narodi Azii i Afriki*, No.4, 1972.
99. Vitkin, M.A., *Vostok v filozofsko-istoricheskaya koncepciya K Marksa* (Place of the East in the Philosophical-Historical Conceptions of K.Marx), Moscow, 1972.
100. Volkova, L.A., *Izmenie socialno-ekonomicheskoi struktura Kitaiskoi derevni* (Changes in the Socio-economic Structure of Old China), Moscow, "Nauka", 1972.
101. Platanov, A., "Problema aziatskogo sposoba proizvodstva v rabotah MarksaEngelsa"(Problems of the Asiatic Mode of Production in the Works of Marx-Engels), *Ekonomicheski Nauk*, No.1, 1978. As well there appeared a book from Progress Publishers, Moscow, in English in 1977 edited by G. A. Kozlov, entitled *Political Economy of Capitalism*. In the section on Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations, there is no mention at all of AMP.
102. Ter-Akopian, N.B., "Razvitak," loc cit. (*Narodni Azii i Afriki*, No.2, 1965). This article was later published in the Serbian language in the political-ideological journal *Markszizam u Svetu*, No.7, 1980.
103. Wittfogel originally published in Soviet Marxist journals. In 1927 he wrote "Problems in the Economic History of China," in *Vestnik Komunisticheskoi Akademii*, No.20, 1927. In 1929 his articles appeared in *Pod Znamenem Markszizma*, Nos. 6,7 and 8, 1929 under the title "Geopolitics, Geographical Materialism and Marxism." His book, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Chinas* appeared in Leipzig in 1931: while his articles in German include "Die Naturishen ursachen der Wirtschaftsgeshichte," published in three parts in *Archiv fur Socialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 1932.
104. Sellnow, T., "Die Grundprinzipien einer Periodisierung der Urgeschichte," *Volkerforschung*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1954; Weiskopf, E.C., "Probleme die periodisierung der altergeschichte," *Zeitschrift fur Geschichte*, 1957.
105. Erkes, E., *Geschichte Chinas von den Anfanan bis zum Eindriggen des u Kapitals*, Berlin, 1956.
106. Gunther, R. and Schrot, G., "Bemerkungen zur Gezetsmassigkeit in der auf-Sklaverei beruhenden Gesellschaftsordnung," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl Marx Universitaat*, Leipzig, 1963.
107. Lucas, E., "Marx's Studien zur Fruchgeschichte und ethnologie, 1880-82," *Saeculum*, 1964.
108. Buttner, T., "Das Prekolonial Afrika und der Diskussionen zur Asiatischen Produktionsweise," *Jarbuch*

Enlarge this image.

- fur Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Series 4, 1967. It may be noted, however, that Engels that the term "Asiatic Society" applied also to North Africa.
109. Felder, R., "Asiatische oder feudale Produktionweise in China," *Zeitschrift fur Geschichtswissenschaft*, No.1, 1971.
 110. Engleberg, E., "Asiatische produktionweise und einige problemen der Mischingformation," *Zeitschrift fur Geschichtswissenschaft*, No.2, 1974.
 111. See Tokai, F., "Some Contentious Issues in the Interpretation of the Asiatic Mode of Production," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol. 12, No.3, 1982, and Tokai, F., "On the Historical Basis of the Problems of the Third World," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol.13, No.3, 1983.
 112. Tokai, F., "Character of agrarian property under the Chu dynasty," *Acta antiqua academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, Vol.6, No. 3-4.
 113. See especially Tokai's article, "Le MPA dans l'oeuvre de K. Marx et F. Engels" (The AMP in the Work of K Marx and F Engels), *La Pensee*, No.114, 1964.
 114. Thus in 1966 and again in 1975 he repeated this theme, as did his pieces in *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol. 12, No.3, 1982 and Vol. 13, No.3, 1983, and the article "On the Asiatic Mode of Production," published in Serbian language in *Markszizam u Svetu*, No.7, 1980.
 115. Tokai, F., *Azazuanu termelst Kordelshez*, Budapest, 1975; Tokai, F. (ed.), *Ostarsedalom es Azsai termelst mod.*, Budapest, 1982.
 116. Tokai, op.cit. (1975 p.62).
 117. Agh, A., "Adelekok az 'aziai' termelisimod miriamu tortenetehez," *Magyar filozofiai szemle*, No.6, 1970.
 118. Balazs, E., *Chinese Civilisation and Bureaucracy*, London and New Haven, 1964. This author's previous scholarly investigations went back to 1932 with the article "Beitrag zur Windaftsgeshichte der Tang-Zeit."
 119. Sawyer's main ideas are condensed into a very handy extract (in Serbian) by editor M. Jaksic in the special "AMP" issue of *Markszizam u Svetu*, No.7, 1980.
 120. See E. Kamenka, *The Ethical Foundations of Marxism* and Kamenka, *Ludwig Feuerbach*.
 121. Sawyer's work was also discusses in the Radio Beograd "Third Programme" series on AMP in 1981 and re-broadcast by Radio Skopje.
 122. Nguyen Long Bich, "Phuong thuc san xuat chan a-la-gi?" (What is the AMP?), *Nghien Cuu Lich-su*, No.53, Hanoi, 1963.
 123. Nguyen Long Bich, "Le MPA dans l'histoire du Vietnam" (The AMP in the History of Vietnam) *Recherches Internationales*, No.57-58, 1967.
 124. Viet Tran in *L'homme et La Societe*, No.33-4, 1974. This publication is a well known academic journal in France.
 125. Bailey and Llobera, *The Asiatic Mode of Production: Science and Politics*, Routledge, 1981.
 126. Thetchkov, M.A., "La Classe Dirigeante du Vietnam Precoloniale," *La Pensee*, No.144, 1969.
 127. Feuerwaker, A., loc.cit.
 128. Rapp, J. gave a survey of post - 1987 discussions about AMP within the Academy of the Peoples Republic of China when he broadcast on Radio Beograd's "Third Programme" in 1988. See *Radio Beograd, Third Programme*, Winter, 1988, pp13-145.
 129. Pang Zhoueng (ed.), "Summary of the Symposium on the 'Asiatic Mode of Production,'" *Zhongguo Shi Yanyui*, No.3, 1981.
 130. Yu Guangyan, "Develop Marxism as the Science of Building Socialism," Institute for Marxism-Leninism-MaoZedong Thought," *Newsletter*, No.1, 1983.
 131. One of the articles attacking AMP came from the pens of Ma Jiaju and LinZirong entitled "Mode of production and the subjects of study of political economy," *Selected Writings on Study of Marxism*, 1981; also joining in the debate was an article tolerant of AMP signed by Hu Zongda, who entitled his piece, "On the Asiatic Mode of Production with a Criticism of the Theory of Five Modes of Production," *Zhongguo Shi Yanyui*, No.3, Sept., 1981.
 132. In 1979 Bruce McFarlane, in many discussions with Chinese Marxists, was met by strong denial that there was such a thing as Lenin's "testament." The testament assessed Bukharin and Trotsky and warned against Stalin's strong-arm methods.
 133. Marx, K., "British Rule in India." Also useful are Marx's comments in letters to Engels 1853-4 on AMP.

Enlarge this image.

- There are also a number of passages in *Das Kapital* on Asian society. All of these items in English are found in Hobsbawm, E., *Marx on Pre-capitalist Formations*. (London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1964) and in Ter-Akopian (ed.) *Pre-capitalist Economic Formations* (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1976).
134. Kosambi, D., "Marxism and Ancient India," *India Today*, No. 12, 1951; Kosambi, D., *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*. Bombay, Popular Books, 1958.
 135. Bedeker, D.K., "Marxism and Ancient India," *India Today*, No.3, 1951.
 136. Pannikar, A.M., *Asia and Western Domination*. We used the Croatian translation, Zagreb, Naprijed, 1958.
 137. Nambooridiriapad, E. M., *The National Question in Kerala*. Bombay, 1952.
 138. Habib, I., "A Critique of Wittfogel's Theory of Oriental Despotism," *Proceedings of the Asian History Conference*, 1961, Delhi, 1969; Habib, I., "Problems of Marxist Historical Analysis in India" in Shah, S.A., (ed.), *Towards National Liberation: Essays on the Political Economy of India*, Montreal, 1973
 139. Wielenga, B., "Marxist Views on India in Historical Perspective," *Studies in Indian Marxism*, (Madras), No.2, 1976.
 140. Alavi, H., "India and the Colonial Mode of Production." We have used the translation into Serbian that appeared in *Marksizam u Svetu*, Nos. 1-2, 1982.
 141. Barbalet, J., "Underdevelopment and the Colonial Economy," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol. 6, No.2, 1975; McEachern, D., "The Mode of Production in India," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol.6, No.4, 1975.
 142. Bhadra, B., *Materialist Orientalism Marx, the AMP and India*.
 143. Chaudry's monograph was prepared for a Symposium at the Francis Datini Institute in Italy in 1978. He argued that conditions were quite different in old India and China to those described by Bernier, which had influenced Karl Marx: trade was thriving, agriculture was growing rapidly and there was no sign of a stagnating economy.
 144. Mukherjee, S.N., *Sir William Jones*, op.cit.
 145. Mukherjee rejected E. Said's strictures on colonial officials such as Jones. Roe and Campbell and considered instead that they were knowledgeable about Indian society and sympathetic to it. See Mukherjee, S. N., "Orientalism and History," *Journal of Oriental Studies in Australia*, 1996.
 146. Noro, Eitaru, *On the Regime of Property Rights in Japan*, 1929.
 147. Ito, Zoheti, *The Power of the State in Japan*, 1931.
 148. Izu, Kunio, *The Epoch of the Zamats*, 1931.
 149. Hani, Goro, *The Formation of Capitalism in Asia*, 1932.
 150. Kotsumi, Moritaru, *Hegel and Marx on Asiatic Society*, 1933; also known in Japan and overseas as Kotsumi, Moritaru, *Problems of Chinese Economic History: New Data on the Asiatic Mode of Production*, 1935.
 151. Watanabe, Y., *Ancient Society in Japan*, 1935.
 152. Hajakawa, J., *The Asiatic Mode of Production and the History of Japan*, 1935.
 153. Klaukava, H., a critic of AMP, wrote a number of articles including "On the Reactionary Character of the Theory of AMP" (1933); "Concerning the Notion of the Application of AMP in the History of Japan" (1933) and "The AMP as a Category of History" (1934).
 154. Shiozawa, K., "The Theory of AMP and the Japanese State," *Rekishunshigaku Kenkuu*, 1958.
 155. Shiozawa, K., "Japanese Historians on the AMP," *La Pensee*, No.122, 1965.
 156. Shiozawa, K., "Marx's View of Asian Society and History," *The Developing Economies*, (Japan), No.3, 1966.
 157. We were unable, due to language barriers to give a full survey of Japanese work on AMP. Hence we have used Shiozawa (1965, loc.cit.) which also appeared in Serbian in *Marksizam u Svetu*, No.7, 1980.
 158. Robbio, E., "A proposito de modo produzione asiatico e regimi despotic communitari nela civiltà americ," *Rinascita*, 23 Nov., 1963.
 159. Aziaticus, "Una questione di teona da rieseminare: il modo di produzione asiatica," *Rinascita*, 5 Oct., 1963.
 160. Venturi, F., "Oriental Despotism," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Jan.-Mar., 1963.
 161. Sereni, D., "Da Marx a Lenin: la categorie di formazione economica-sociale," *Critica Marxista*, No.4, 1970.
 162. Luporini, C., "Marx Secondo Marx," *Critica Marxista*, No. 10, 1972.
 163. La Grassa, G., "Modo di produzione, rapporti do produzione et formazione ecomica-sociale," *Critica Marxista*, No.10, 1972.

Enlarge this image.

164. Prestipino, G., "Concetto logico e concetto scorio di formazione soziale," *Critica Marxista*, No.10, 1972.
165. Gerrantana, V., "Formazione sociale e societa di tranzitione," *Critica Marxista*, No.10, 1972.
166. Tosi, M., "The Dialectics of State Formation in Mesopotamia, Iran and Central Asia," *Dialectical Anthropology*, No.1, 1976.
167. Dirlik, A., Review of Melotti, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Vol. 8, No.3, 1978.
168. Sawyer, M., Review of Melotti, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Vol. 8, No.3, 1978.
169. Sachs, I., "Nowa faza diskusiju o formacijah," *Nowe Drugi*, No.3, 1966.
170. Sachs, L., "Une Nouvelle Phase de la discussion sur les formations," *Recherches Internationales*, No. 57-8, 1967.
171. Malowist, M., *Wielke panstwa Suldanu zuchodnicgo w poznym srednwieczyu*, Warsaw, 1967. This author was known in the West for her article, "The Social and Political Stability of Western Sudan in the Middle Ages," *Past and Present*, No.33, 1966.
172. Majewski, K., "La question du MPA dans la civilisation Egiptiene a la lumiere des sources archeologiques," *Cahiers du CERM*, 1970.
173. Pokora, T., and Skalnack, P., "Beginnings of a discussion about the Asiatic mode of production," *Eirene*, Vol.1.6, 1966. Pokora also wrote a monograph in German: "Gab es in der Geschite Chines eine darch Sklaverei bessimnto produktionsweise und gesellschaftsformation," *Neue Beitrasse zur Geschichte der alten welt*, 1964.
174. Pecirka, J., "Von der Asiatischen sposobe produktionsweise zur einer Marxistischen analyse der fruhen klassengesellschaften," *Eirene*, Vol 7, 1967; Pecirka, T., "Les discussions Sovietiques," *Recherches Internationales*. No. 57-8, 1967.
175. Skalnack, P., "Engels uber die Vorkapitalistischen Gesellschatten und die Ergebnisse der modernen Ethnologie," *Zbornik Filosofickei Fakulty Univerzitu Komenskei Phiosophica*, Vols. XII-XIII, 1971-2; Skalnack, P., Review of Vitkin, *Political Anthropolgy*, No.1, 1975.
176. Haubelt, J., "K problematicke azijskeho vyrobnio sposobu" (Concerning the Problem of the Asiatic Mode of Production.), *Dejeps a zemiepisve skole*, No.7, 1965-6. Prague.
177. Inalchik, H., *Otomansk Carsvo* (The Ottoman Rulers), Belgrade, Savez Komunista Jugoslavije, 1974.
178. Plekhanov, G., *Istorija ruske drustvene misli* (History of Russian Social Thought), Sarajevo, Maslesha, 1974.
179. Mesihovic, N., "Marks o azijskom nacinu proizvodne" (Marx on the Asiatic Mode of Production), *Pregled*, No.9, 1977.
180. Pirec, D., "Tumachenje azijskog nacina proizvodnje i neke determinante kulturne revolucije, (Interpretations of the Asiatic Mode of Production and Some Economic Determinants of Cultural Revolution), first published in Tomanovic, Z.P. (ed.), *Strategije socijalizma*, "Komunist," Belgrade, 1976. The same article was republished in *Socijalizam*, No.7-8, 1981.
181. Jaksic, M., "Savremene tendence u prouchavanju azijskog nachina proizvodnje," (Contemporary Tendencies in the Interpretation of the Asiatic Mode of Production) *Third Programme, Radio Beograd*, No.5, 1981.
182. Jaksic, M., "Diskusija wokol'przejscia od do kapitalizmu" (Discussion Concerning the Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism), in Zibertovic, A. and Carnota, A., *Inerdisciplinarnie Studia nad Geneza Kapitalizmu* (Interdisciplinary Studies on the Genesis of Capitalism), Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernicus, 1989, Turin.
183. Filipovic, F., "Razvitak drustva u ogledalu istorijskog materijalizma" (The Development of Society in the Mirror of Historical Materialism), *Nashe Teme* ("Our Themes"), No.1, 1979.
184. Kangrga, M., "Marks i njegovo povijesno značenje Evropskog duha u Hegelu" (Marx and His View of the Importance of the European Spirit in Hegel), *Filozofska Istrazhivanja*, 1981.
185. Kasic, B., "Marx i njegovo povijesno pitanje" (Marx and His Historical Question), *Casopis za savremenu povijest*, No.2, 1982.

Enlarge this image.

AuthorAffiliation

Bruce McFarlane*, Steve Cooper** and Miomir Jaksic***

AuthorAffiliation

* Retired Professor, University of Newcastle, Australia, ** Former National Research Officer, Australian Metal Workers Union, ***Department of Economics, University of Belgrade

Publication title: Journal of Contemporary Asia

Volume: 35

Issue: 3

Pages: 283-318

Number of pages: 36

Publication year: 2005

Publication date: 2005

Year: 2005

Publisher: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Place of publication: Abingdon, Oxfordshire

Publication subject: History--History of Asia, Business And Economics

ISSN: 00472336

Source type: Scholarly Journals

Language of publication: English

Document type: General Information

ProQuest document ID: 194241445

Document URL: <http://search.proquest.com/docview/194241445?accountid=12694>

Copyright: Copyright Journal of Contemporary Asia 2005

Last updated: 2011-08-29

Database: Asian & European Business Collection

Contact ProQuest

Copyright © 2016 ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved. - [Terms and Conditions](#)