

Working Papers Series N°33

REFLECTIONS ON THE GENESIS AND
DYNAMICS OF ACCUMULATION IN EUROPE
AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE
AND HUMAN RIGHTS

*an essay on
western development and culture*

-Joost B.W. Kuitenbrouwer

Publications Office
Institute of Social Studies
The Hague, The Netherlands

December 1986

Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Roman theory and practise of ownership | 7 |
| 3. Transformations in ownership and the perception of values and power | 9 |
| 4. Ownership and socio-religious movements | 12 |
| 5. The right to steal as a right to livelihood | 14 |
| 6. Utopias as a response to the destruction of the right to livelihood | 16 |
| 7. Relations between violence and democracy | 18 |
| 8. The genesis of a new ideology of labour, poverty and Wealth | 21 |
| 9. Pacification and "civilization" as conditions for the expansion of the commodity economy | 26 |
| 10. The politics and ideology of equilibrium | 30 |
| 11. The development of strategies for the control of labour | 33 |
| 12. The rationality of socialist labour control | 40 |
| 13. The rationality of socialist accumulation | 43 |
| 14. Marx, social justice and human rights | 48 |
| 15. Recent patterns of accumulation and its implications | 51 |
| 16. The quest for a new paradigm | 55 |
| 17. Beyond accumulation | 59 |
| Footnotes and references | 69 |

1. Introduction

This is an essay on the social genesis and dynamics of accumulation in Europe. It focuses on the transformations in the perceptions and conceptions of social justice and human rights and their dialectical relationship with the socio-cultural transformations which enhanced this process of accumulation, and grew out of it.

The first section of the essay concentrates on the history of spiritual, social and cultural transformations in Western Europe. In it special attention is given to changing views on property rights and the right of livelihood.

The second section is devoted to the genesis and dynamics of socialist accumulation in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union. Also some attention is given to the second major socialist experiment, outside Europe, that of the People's Republic of China. This part is rounded off with an analysis of the views of Marx on the nature of the development of Western Europe and the implications of his conception of socialism for social justice and human rights.

The third and final section of this essay centers on processes and patterns which have shaped the present-day hegemonic world order and the nature of recent patterns of accumulation in which this order articulates itself. This part of the essay ends in a reflection on a newly emerging development paradigm and the movements for social and personal transformation which are an expression of it and which strive to create the conditions for its realization.

The basic premise underlying this essay is that the development of present-day "capitalist" and "socialist" social formations is deeply rooted in the history of social and cultural transformation of Europe. This history is understood as a social and cultural history in which psychodynamic transformations play a primary role, as they set into motion processes which make material accumulation possible. At the same time material accumulation requires them for its reproduction and expansion.

Processes of social transformation give rise to contradictions and these to social movements. Such movements engender among existing and newly emerging elites strategies to contain, neutralize and transform hitherto hegemonic cultures and values to make them serve new aims and integrate them into new values and new cultures, designed to pacify and discipline the common people.

The control over and manipulation of religion, philosophy and science is seen as of critical importance in the creation and maintenance of conditions for a new social and political order. Paradigms in social science are also understood as crucial ideological instruments to legitimize newly emerging power structures and practices which serve to sustain the dominant thrust of development, alongside religion and philosophy.

The study focuses on the 'making' of European values and institutions and the contradictory nature of progress and modernization as the fruits of accumulation. It is argued that before parliamentary democracy was generalized, the common people faced for a long time violence and suffering. With colonial expansion, the European working class gradually became a partner of the industrial elite, as both shared the benefits from the colonial venture, even although contradictions between them remained. Colonial expansion served to direct violence outward, towards the colonies (more recently "the South"), resulting in mass poverty and repression. This enhanced the growth

of social and political peace in the metropolis. But even then, democracy there required the development of new forms of control and surveillance, to work.

In this essay a picture of European history emerges as a process of violation of the common people's rights. The common (wo)man was in every phase of transition towards a new formation faced with inroads into the hitherto popularly accepted norms of social justice and equity. Although at crucial stages in the process of transformation, common people often played a decisive role, in the end they were always victims rather than beneficiaries. This very fact obliged the elite to praise the new order as beneficial to the common people, if not immediately, than at least in its outcome. If sacrifices had to be imposed, they were presented as inevitable, as they would create conditions for wellbeing and welfare in the long run. Thus hegemonic economic science insisted on present sacrifice as essential to future happiness. In that sense, it did not fundamentally differ from the hopes, inspired by religious utopias, although in the latter the emphasis was on the spiritual and in the former on material benefits. This served as a powerful leverage to legitimize policies and strategies of accumulation.

The insights which the study has rendered may be summarized in the following way:

- the rise of democracy in industrial societies in Europe and the growth of social and political equilibrium which made it possible was preceded by a long violent process of forced integration of the common people into a new social order. Crucial to this integration was the internalization of new hegemonic values and rules of social conduct and discipline, sustained by laws that legalized that order.

- the process towards democracy in Western Europe was also decisively facilitated by the incorporation of colonies into its orbit as a pool of resources and as a market. In this view policies and strategies of military and ideological containment and control over the "South" were instrumental to the development and maintenance of prosperity and political democracy in the industrialized countries (the "North").

- capitalist accumulation in Western Europe and socialism in Eastern Europe have had common origins in the quest for accumulation as the foundation for industrial civilization. Although at the surface different in ideology, aims, strategy and method, socialism may be seen as a particular form of the development of capitalism, rooted in the attempt to perfect the mechanisms of accumulation.

- in view of their common origin and thrust, solutions to the fundamental problems which capitalism, as well as existing socialism, are facing can only be found in the creation of new forms of civilization which transcend both.

- such a process of transcendence is essential to (wo)mankind's survival and calls for new forms of consciousness and creativity which have been hitherto blocked by the very nature and forms of hegemonic patterns of development.

- these new forms are seen as arising from within the very search for survival growing out of prevailing patterns of accumulation. These new forms of consciousness and creativity grow in the process of contestation by broad-based social movements and of awakening towards the need for a radically new way of life.

The focus in this study is on long-term processes and transformations. In that sense, the intention is different from that which as a rule inspires development studies. These focus mostly on problems requiring immediate solutions. In these studies social science inevitably becomes an instrument of social, economic or political engineering. The primary concern is with questions of an operational nature. The sense of crisis as it prevails today also tends to naturally direct the attention to vital issues of immediate interest. Yet at the same time, the need to understand the nature of the long-term movement of society also grows, as it becomes clear that solutions of problems in the short run call for deep-going transformations of societal patterns and values which have crystallized over a long time.

There is another reason which underlies the limited interest in a historical perspective in development studies. Such a perspective may elucidate the transient nature of power structures and bring to light that no status quo can last indefinitely, whatever are its ideological and political sources of inspiration and however impressive may be its means of defense.

Both forms of opposition to a historical approach are closely connected. Crisis management operates on the assumption that disequilibria are only "temporary disturbances" which will fade away, once equilibrium has been restored by the removal of its "external" causes. In this study it is assumed that the disequilibria which affect present day capitalism and existing socialism are inherent in their very mode of being of which the specific modes of operation are only outward manifestations. Hence also the thesis that these disequilibria can only be overcome by qualitative transformations which strike at the very roots and dynamics of their mode of being as a mode of accumulation.

The final part of this study contains a reflection which traditionally has been judged as outside the domain of social science. Yet the borders of what is and ought to be social science are challenged in the very genesis of a new paradigm on development. This new paradigm assumes the unity and interdependence of all phenomena, including the indivisibility of the material and spiritual world. In that sense it defies a materialist, positivistic perspective and it contains a radical challenge to the premise of objectivity of the social scientist vis-a-vis the universe to be investigated. This claim on objectivity is closely connected with the growth and multiplication of distinct social science disciplines which each investigates a particular fraction of social reality which was progressively dissected into isolated parts, to be examined as if they each had an independent nature. The new paradigm emphasises the need to look at particular manifestations as expressions of totality. This demands the transcendence of established disciplines. With the break down of the old paradigm in natural science, also that of social science is disintegrating, although more slowly. With the pressure for the instrumentalization of social science however, its claim on objectivity also mounts, so as to make itself invulnerable to dissent. Transgressing the borders set by the old paradigm involves a challenge to the comfort of equilibrium which has always marked

hegemonic social science as an instrument to look objectively at the objective world outside ourselves and which is rooted in the premise of the strict separability of subject and object.

The claim of strict separability of subject and object which is no more tenable in the sciences (both the natural and the social sciences) as the position of the subject is decisive for the outcome of her/his findings, is also to be challenged with regard to historical enquiry. Any view on the past is always shaped by one's perspective in the present. Objective history cannot exist, as the past has no meaning independent from the present and its demands. The latter differ, depending on the perceptions, concerns and position of those who ask questions to the past. In that sense any interpretation of the past will always be contested, as there is more than one perspective. Facts as such do not exist and are always open, in the context as it is perceived, to various interpretations. Therefore any interpretation of facts in the past invariably contains a speculative dimension and beneath it a certain view of the world. This is fortiori the case when it concerns the interpretation of the nature of right and law and the contradictions between the two. Such a study touches the very heart of the quality of relationships between various groups and classes. It attempts to show that where the (ancient, earlier) right and rights of the common people were curtailed by those who were seeking to control power, pressures were set into motion to transform perceptions so as to secure conformity to the new social reality and the legitimacy of new hegemonic classes and social institutions. The new reality structured by the powers in existence and by laws and legislation is then preceded and accompanied by strategies of socialization into the newly dominant values which require to be internalized, so that relative societal equilibrium is assured.

In this sense the study presumes that violence and repression cannot only be qualified as such, if and when they are "open", but that in another form, they may also be present in what in the hegemonic views of the day is called "normal society"

As a rule this dimension of European history receives little attention, particularly in the context of what today are called "development studies", that is studies on the nature of the problems which societies in the South are facing in their "development". As a rule, in such studies, industrialized societies have been taken as "models", as they are presumed to be "developed", as if the "development" process in these societies had reached their end-term. The ideological use of the concept of "development" in this sense was closely connected within the 19th century with the rise of nationalism in the industrialized countries. It was inspired by the need to ward off pressures for a change in the status quo by the colonized societies of the South and to incorporate them into the new world order, after political independence was granted. This presumption has greatly influenced the nature of "development" studies. The latter tend to define development in terms of what is lacking to meet the demands of the "model". Mostly, little attention is given in these studies to the processes and patterns of "internal colonization" which took place in the industrialized societies over the centuries when they themselves were "developing".

A study of the nature of the process of "internal colonization" in Europe may help to shed light on the social and spiritual transformations which the present day industrialized societies of the West went through before qualifying themselves as "developed". The assumption underlying this

essay is that the perceptions and values which inspired these transformations have played a crucial role in orienting the Western colonial venture as well as more recently world wide modernization.

There is evidence that the nature of the "development" process in the South is qualitatively different from that which characterized the North, in view of its dependent character. It may nevertheless be useful and revealing for people in the South to gain insight into the nature of European development. They may recognize in it basic features which are present in their own processes of pacification and domestication.

A study of the nature of European accumulation may also serve to break the spell and enchantment of the "model". This might serve to stimulate the search for autochthonous original paths of development. The relevance and need for such a search is enhanced by the very signs of a break down of the hitherto hegemonic pattern of accumulation. In view of its threat to human survival, both in view of its destructive implications for the earth as well as its increasing incompatibility with the demands of human freedom and dignity, both in the North and the South, the present dominant pattern of development appears untenable.

Thus a study of the nature of European development may be of some help for people in the South to balance enchantment with the benefits of modernization with a heightened awareness of its human implications. On the other hand, historical reflection may help people in the North to acquire or sharpen a sense of relativity towards the virtues of their own "civilization". It may also perhaps stimulate more openness to values of people in the South which have disintegrated and eroded in their own societies in the course of accumulation. Thus such reflection may contribute to stimulate mutual learning and discovery.

In the final section of the essay the focus is on those dimensions of the human being which were repressed in the process of Western development. It is argued that only with the re-integration of these dimensions into the mainstream of theory and practice development, there is a chance for human survival and that the movement towards a new balance is inspired by the very growth of consciousness of the likelihood of mankind's self-destruction. It is proposed that survival calls for a radical transcendence of present patterns of development and that this demands above all a spiritual revolution.

The attempt in this essay to develop an integrated approach has several methodological implications.

To elucidate the common features of processes in North and South at different moments of time, I frequently make references to situations in the South in the course of my review of social transformations in Europe. This follows from the trans-cultural perspective from which this essay is written in which history is seen as a worldwide process, uneven in its unfolding in different locations and at different times but which, in spite of this, may still be seen in its underlying structure as one single whole.

Although the essay has been written around a number of central themes, the realities beneath these themes, as different foci for analysis, are yet part of an indivisible process and pattern. My interest is in the interweavings of these realities. The method which I follow is therefore not a linear but a circular one. Themes which have been discussed in one chapter may come back in another in which they will be looked at from another angle. This applies also to the chronological approach in this essay. Due to the very conception of development underlying this essay, I do not necessarily

follow a formal linear time sequence but one in which past and present at times follow each other and on other occasions interweave, as the past is seen as elucidating the present and the present the past.

2. Roman theory and practice of ownership

The very acceptance of social justice as an essential dimension of development implicitly points to the prevalence of injustice, embodied in political, economic, social, cultural and legal arrangements which generate inequality and an unequal distribution of assets, income and opportunities.

The tension between the recognition of the rights of some at the expense of others is pregnantly expressed in the ancient Roman dictum "summum ius, summa iniuria": what may be a right in its fullest form to one, may at the same time entail the most severe form of injury to others. It is at the heart of Roman private property law which became the legal foundation for accumulation in Europe.

The principle that private ownership of local or other resources carries with it full and exclusive rights is deeply entrenched in the evolution of European society since Roman times and of the development of private ownership. The recognition of this exclusive and full individual right is poignantly expressed in the formulation of the right of owners in Rome to use and to abuse, "ius utendi et abutendi". Roman civil law, worked out with great intellectual rigour, hardly touched upon the protection of the rights of the working poor and eminently focussed on the regulation and protection of property rights, peculiarly sacred in the eyes of the Roman governing class. The Roman philosopher Cicero explained the foundation of states by the need to preserve the inviolability of property rights. In their need for the preservation of power, the Romans often pretended that their empire had been acquired, almost against their will, as an unintended reward for the defense of others, especially its allies. According to Cicero indeed, the Romans became "masters of all lands" in the course of the defense of their allies. He formulated the theory of "natural slavery" according to which some people could actually benefit from being in a state of complete political subjection to others.¹ Cicero unambiguously presented the Roman hegemonic view on the blessings of the Pax Romana and Rome's civilizing mission in spreading its peace by its sacred task of the pacification of barbarian people. Yet he shows also his deeper consciousness and sensitivity, where he confesses that the Romans by their oppressive and exploitative practices engendered hatred and resistance, as a result of their violation of other people's rights (iniuriae), their inequality, lust, greed and rude treatment. In the words of a Roman general, quoted by the historian Tacitus "without arms there can be no peace among people nor can there be arms without pay or pay without taxation".² There is much evidence that it were the poor who had to bear the brunt in the increase of the costs of pacification, as taxes on them were raised and forms of extraction grew more oppressive. Roman expansion and pacification were at the same time driven forward by the need to pacify the exploited classes at home and secure domestic stability.³ Pacification required both the expansion of the army and the civil service which in turn required a raise in taxes and further restrictions on the livelihood of the common people. The burden of maintaining the imperial armies and the bureaucracy as well as the Church, which became a crucial instrument in providing ideological legitimacy to the process of pacification and incorporation, in support of the leisured class, mainly consisting of absentee land-owners, fell mainly on the peasantry. They formed the bulk of the population. There is evidence that the combination of highly concentrated economic and political power in the hands of the propertied class, the imperial establishment and administration, ultimately

brought about the disintegration of the Roman empire. It was marked by numerous peasant revolts, both in the center and in the periphery, the conquered provinces like the area of the Rhine delta, presently the French and Belgian Flanders and the South of the Netherlands.

A major source of inspiration to General McArthur to attempt to carry out a land reform in the Philippines and to push through a relatively radical land reform in Japan, at the end of the Pacific War, which served as an example for subsequent land reforms in Taiwan and South Korea, was the teaching about the Roman Empire which he received from his history teacher in high school. Ladejinsky, McArthur's principal adviser and architect of the Japanese land reform, to whom the General told this in the course of their cooperation, was himself inspired by another North American scholar, Professor Sinkovich of Columbia University, where he did his studies, before he joined the State Department and later the World Bank. Also this scholar had argued in his book "Hay and History" that the Romans lost the empire because of their negligence in matters relating to agriculture and the peasantry.⁴

Virgil, the great Roman poet, with his enchanting bucolic description of the beauty of rural life, sharply articulates Roman nationalism and the policy of pacification when he exhorts the Romans to impose the Pax Romana, spare the conquered and put down the proud, that is those who refused to submit to Roman domination. The relations between the Roman rulers and the conquered peoples was by themselves defined as that between friends and allies, patrons and clients whose freedom was guaranteed by Roman guardianship (tutela) which in turn secured their freedom (libertas).⁵ Freedom in the Roman conception basically had two connotations: it expressed the position of privilege, conferred by Roman citizenship on Romans themselves and on the aristocracy, co-opted in the conquered provinces who, as a reward for their loyalty and services, had earned this distinction and whose cooperation was essential to the maintenance of empire. The word had also a closely related meaning. It was commonly invoked in defense of the existing order by individuals or classes in enjoyment of power and wealth. It meant the rule of the aristocrats and other members of the elite and stood for the perpetuation of privilege. This use of the word "freedom" was corroborated by Tacitus when he wrote that "nobody ever sought power for himself or the enslavement of others without invoking liberties and such fair names."⁶ In this context, the rule of law basically meant the protection and promotion of property and its ensuing privileges by patricians vis-a-vis the common people. The protection of privileges by the few had no countervailing power in the development of constitutional or criminal law protecting the poor. On the contrary, power derived from ownership and wealth extended also into these domains.

Unlike Greece, Rome never was a democratic state. It was always strongly oligarchical. In spite of this difference however, both Greece, where democracy was broken up after a sustained struggle against democracy by the rich, as well as Rome, had, as city states and centers of accumulation, wealth and civilization, been built on slavery as a dominant mode of production. In both were liberty and slavery each other's structural condition.

3. Transformations in ownership and the perceptions of values and power

The genesis of feudalism in Western Europe may be seen as the concurrent dissolution of tribal communal modes of production and the slave mode of production and as synthesis of Roman and Germanic elements. Within communal ownership, movable and subsequently immovable private property developed as a form initially subordinate to but then dominant over communal ownership. The feudal organization served to control a subjected class of direct producers, consisting of an enserfed small peasantry. In the countryside, the chief form of property became landed property, with serf-labour chained to it. The new form of accumulation created severe contradictions and generated a new ideology of harmony, legitimizing the newly emerged class structure.

Throughout the middle ages, the flight of the serfs into the towns constantly at war with the feudal powers, controlling the countryside, went on uninterrupted. These serfs, trying to escape the oppression and persecution by their lords, found upon their arrival an organized community against which they were powerless. They had to subject themselves to the station assigned to them by the demand for their labour and the interest of their urban competitors. These towns were true associations,⁸ called forth by the direct need of providing for the protection of property.

The systematic persecution of heretics and witches from the early 14th century to the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance has often been interpreted as a struggle against undesirable remnants of primitive paganism, incompatible with the christian faith. It has also been seen as the expression of a conflict between two antagonistic worlds: one, the ancient communal society with its religion and customary law and the concomitant property and distributive arrangements and another newly emerging dominant mode of production, feudalism, within which gradually capitalism developed in the⁹ process of the expansion of exchange and a growing division of labour.

As a rule those persecuted were poor people, the large majority of whom were women. They were often qualified as hysterical. Why is it that the inquisition singled out women as witches to be burnt at stake? There is no easy unequivocal answer to this question. One interpretation is that their condemnation, as a rule for immorality, was inspired by the fact that they were seen as the custodians of the 'irrational' old order in the process of disintegration?¹⁰

There is a good deal of evidence that the struggle against witchcraft by the Roman Catholic Church had its origin in the attempt to eradicate heretical movements which were associated with demonical powers.¹¹ This is emphasized in a Papal Bull from 1484 and a subsequent Dominican treatise, the 'Malleus Malificarum', which was a compendium of the witchcraft doctrine of the Church and which had a great deal of influence in legitimizing persecution. Looking more closely at the nature of witchcraft persecution, there is evidence that the phenomenon was intimately connected with the intense conflict which accompanied the transition from a communal to a more individualistically oriented society in which the old norms of solidarity and mutual aid were gradually challenged and given up.

The great bulk of witchcraft accusations appear to have reflected an unresolved conflict between the social obligations towards indigent neighbours and the pressure for individual freedom and interest which could only develop at the expense of earlier forms of morality.¹² Feudal arrangements and values provided a guarantee for a system poor relief. Gradually however, although the church continued to insist on the moral duty of charity and as

the local and State authorities forbade "indiscriminate" begging, the poor were being seen as a burden to the community and a threat to public order. Witch-belief helped the poor to uphold the customary obligations when these were disintegrating and the poor lost their security of livelihood. Thus the fear of retaliation by witchcraft served as a powerful deterrent against breaking the old moral code, by not honouring customary obligations. The growth of persecution of witches, often women and especially widows, who were most dependent on support by neighbours, reflects the disintegration of the time-honoured obligations. Those who felt guilty for not fulfilling these obligations diverted attention from their own guilt by focussing attention on the evil of the witch.¹³

With the growth of more anonymous mechanisms to deal with poverty through arrangements by the State and the bourgeoisie, personal charity was less and less experienced as a moral obligation and the pressures to undo oneself from feelings of guilt and project these on others, to be accused of being the source of evil, gradually disappeared. This decline was hastened by the rise of rationalism in which there was no place for demons. Thus the decline of witchcraft persecution in the course of the 18th century reflected the concomitant process of the breakthrough of the free market economy and its associated values of personal responsibility towards the well being and welfare of the community in which one lived. With the growth of materialist values, the belief in demons as evil representatives of a spiritual world subsided and proof of witchcraft was no more accepted in the courts. In that sense, the decline in witchcraft persecution reflected the new world view and attitudes of the elites. Witch-beliefs tended to last longest in rural communities in which, unlike as in towns, the new sense of life and of individual freedom and pursuit of self-interest penetrated more slowly and where misfortune was more easily accounted for in terms of personal relationships and intentions.¹⁴

The relationship between the incidence of witchcraft and what in dominant values of society is considered as a breach with the ethical code of solidarity vis-a-vis neighbours has been a feature in all communal societies. Colonial governments did much to repress witchcraft as incompatible with progress and modernization.

Accelerated modernization since political independence sped up the growth of a "free market" economy under the control of authoritarian States, with a premium on private initiative and accumulation. Mechanisms which serve the expression of solidarity within the extended family, clan and local community continue to play an important role, as the 'informal sector' serve as a social security system for the formal sector which in this way discharges part of its costs on the 'pre-industrial' communities. As a result of this increased burden on the pre-industrial community, conflict tends to increase. Pre-industrial correctives to secure solidarity to the extent that they tend to generate violence, are however repressed, as incompatible with the norms of stability and law and order, considered essential for economic growth.

The process of transformation of a communally inspired ethos provided a new dimension of power to male domination. Recent studies suggest that the roots of male dominance can be traced in many communal modes of production. The monopoly by men over production and war, and even more essential over cosmic powers, which are presumed to regulate the universe and which secure the reproduction of life (fertility) and survival (livelihood), appear to be deeply entrenched and to have preceded the development of classes.¹⁵ The

transition towards a society ruled by individualistic interests and values, undermines even further the position of women whose clinging to past values was considered a threat to and an obstacle to progress.

The church, which became the largest single property owner and as such the largest feudal organization, provided also the ideology which legitimized wealth and property, privilege and labour. It defined the conflict, actual or potential, between the two in terms of functionality, harmony and equilibrium. As one bishop said in the 12th century: "The house of God is threefold: Some fight, some pray and others labour." This distribution of tasks is further clarified by a secular author of that time who argues: "The peasants need to labour for the priests and the knights, the priests have to keep the knights and the peasants out of hell and the noble knights have to protect the priests and the peasants against any who may wish to harm them." A famous woman mystic in the 13th century, Hildegard from Bingen, had no difficulty in explaining why in the monastery of which she was the head, she only accepted as nuns girls from noble families: "God takes care that the lowly people do not elevate themselves beyond the high people, like Satan did with Adam and Eve. Who would think of bringing together all his cattle in one stable: cows, mules, sheep and bucks? That would cause chaos. Therefore we should be careful that not all people be brought together into one herd. That would lead to frightful immoralities. People would tear up each other in mutual hatred, if the higher estates would be humiliated and would have to become lowly and the lowly would elevate themselves and become high people. God has divided his people on earth into different estates like the angels in heaven have been organized into several categories like the simple ones without rank, the archangels, the cherubins and the seraphins. And He loves them all."¹⁶ Thus religion, as ideology, served to legitimize the hierarchy of existing social relations and an unequal oppressive order.

The functionalist vision on how society should be run reveals a deep concern about the threat of a break down of the social order. It reflects also the emergence and growth of contradictions which shook up a society in Europe in which a vertical social order was rooted in a relatively unchallenged hegemonic ethos. In it the supreme rulers were assumed to be obeyed and each class had its vocation and task to perform. The above pronouncements of a bishop and female abbot may be seen as attempts to restore a social order which was unceasingly challenged by the growth of new social forces and their strivings for recognition and power. This order was challenged by the bid for independence of knights who challenged the power of the emperor and later on of kings. This was reflected in the fragmentation of power and the emergence of a multiplicity of power centres. It was also challenged by the schismatic movements which reflected the struggle against social, economic and political subordination as it was no more accepted. It was also defied by the growth of a powerful group of burghers. While the knights defied the supreme authority of the emperor and king, the ecclesiastical order and its various powerful movements (like that of the monastical order of Cluny in France) challenged the secular authority and proposed its subordination to the spiritual authority so that the earthly hierarchy would reflect the heavenly one. The burghers in turn challenged both the power of the king and the nobility on the one hand and that of the church on the other hand. Finally the poor masses were potentially ready to protest against the power of the king, the church and the burghers who attempted to be admitted in the ruling stratum. To achieve this they needed to integrate

the poor in the process of early industrialization on highly unequal terms, making use of their monopolistic position in the growth of the commodity economy. The conversion of impoverished and roving peasants, who escaped to the towns, into labour played a crucial role in this.

The above ideal of a social order, rooted in functional cooperation, was sealed by the French king, Philippe the Second, upon the battle at Bouvines in France in 1214 where he rounded off his campaign to gain supremacy in Europe, especially vis-a-vis the English king. This king had an image shaped of himself after the ideal image of King Arthur, supposed to be his ancestor. It was fundamentally different from that of Emperor Charles the Great which served as the image of the French king and which idealized centralized power and authority. The image of King Arthur on the contrary glorified knighthood and its value in the realization of 'earthly' tasks which needed to be performed in order to make society function. Gradually the 'use of heaven' as the supreme reality, of which the earthly reality was and should only be a mirror, faded away. The ideal of a functional order in which various groups were supposed to cooperate under one supreme authority served for centuries as the guiding ideal for an orderly society. It has continued to exercise force up to the present time, underneath a variety of ideologies which stress the value of law and order.¹⁷

4. Ownership and socio-religious movements

The process of feudal accumulation was powerfully challenged by religiously inspired movements which defended the right to livelihood against destruction. Multiple heretical movements originating in all parts of Europe frequently rallied the poor people. They were as a rule inspired both by ancient indigenous popular beliefs and by radical interpretations of the gospel. The basic inspiration in both sources was however a common one. Both revealed a nostalgia for an earlier tribal social order in which, like it is written in the Acts of the Apostles, "the community was one in heart and soul and nobody claimed that what he had was his property but they shared all that they had in common."¹⁸

The emergence and vitality of the above movements, often of a millenarian character, inspired by the coming of an ideal reign of peace and social justice which would be lasting, was closely connected with the disintegration of the communal ties. These continued to underlie in many respects feudal social relations and their replacement by insecurity when both in the material and spiritual domain long honoured practices and values of sharing (e.g. the commons, the unpartitioned fields, sharing the same 'pot, fire and loaf', the unity of kin, the protection of clients by their patrons) were increasingly challenged. In that sense spiritual and political radicalism were a concomitant of attempts by the masses of marginalized people to maintain the status quo. They followed utopian religious leaders who challenged the newly emerging 'capitalist' order from the 11th to the 16th century when the transition¹⁹ towards a new capitalistically inspired order finally becomes consolidated.

The heretical movements spread all over Europe. As social and political movements, they challenged the authority of the church as the major holder of both spiritual and material power and the defender of the other feudal power holders, the knights and the landed aristocracy. In Eastern Europe and in particular in what is now Bulgaria, the anti-feudal Bogomil movement, originating in the early Middle Ages, condemned the rich. They

mobilized the serfs against their masters and were in permanent revolt against oppressive labour services while they preached poverty as the highest virtue.²⁰ Their influence was wide and reached into Western Europe where it inspired the Cathars in Italy and France. The incorporation and neutralization by the church of the spiritual movement for poverty, initiated by St. Francis, the son of a rich merchant of Assisi in Umbria, Italy in the early 13th century, set in motion a violent political counter-movement, aiming at the destruction of the properties of the rich. The great Florentine poet Dante Aleghieri reserved the hell for the rebel leading the movement against the established authority, but still he expressed some sympathy for him in his Divina Comedia.²¹

Umberto Eco, in his recent novel, "The Name of the Rose"²² depicts the climate of terror reigning in Europe in this period among intellectuals and the poor, afraid to be denounced to belong to heretical movements, and to be condemned by the Inquisition. It is not too speculative to guess that in writing his novel, Eco had the intention to hint at the climate in many present-day societies where strict adherence to religious orthodoxy is used as an instrument of elite and State control over highly explosive societies, marked by increasingly serious contradictions between a minority of rich and a vast majority of poor to very poor.

Another violent movement, in the beginning of the 16th century, is the one, led by Thomas Munzer, initially a follower of Luther. He broke with Luther when the latter sided with the feudal aristocracy and denounced the poor peasantry. Munzer not only dreamt of a world without classes, but wanted also to bring it about by violence. The earth should be turned into a heaven. To this end, he preached the elimination of "princes and lords, responsible for usury, theft and robbery and who see in the common people their own property. Everything has to be theirs: the fish in the water, the birds in the air and all that grows on the land. They tell poor people not to steal but they themselves, seize and plunder what they can'.²³ Desperation induced the peasants who were themselves quite moderate in their demands and whose sense of justice only demanded recognition of their rights on livelihood, to follow this radical leader. The peasant army was defeated by an alliance of the protestant and catholic nobility. The defeat was followed by massive executions, heavy war payments, fines and confiscations. This terror had a deeply paralyzing effect on the peasantry, as it forced them into deep submissiveness. The growing resentment of the peasantry had been fueled by the pressures of the nobility on them for more money. To this end, the nobility which attempted to secure more income, without entering into commercial agriculture, tried to revive what they called their "ancient rights" and what the peasants called "new obligations". The defeat of the peasantry, fighting to defend, what they considered their ancient rights ended an age-old struggle²⁴ between the peasant communities for their rights against their overlords. The resentment by the peasantry was not only fuelled by the attempts on them by the landlords to raise the rent. It was also inspired by their fear that as a result of the growing centralization of the State, they would lose their autonomy and with it their inherited rights which they hoped to protect by their initially moderate demand for local self-government.

It has been argued that the radicalism of Thomas Munzer had no roots in the peasantry and that he had no genuine interest in the material welfare of the poor whom he²⁵ rather used to suit his own utopian ideals, exploiting their discontent. At any rate it gave the aristocracy an opportunity to

deal a mortal blow to the claims of the peasantry on an equitable position in society. The fact that they made use of the opportunity suggests that the aristocracy regarded the claims of the peasantry as a serious threat to their privileged position, irrespective of Thomas Munzer's personal intentions and ideology. As a result the prospects for the emergence of democracy in Germany were delayed until the 19th century when conservative modernisation was set in motion by Bismarck.²⁶ Social movements which tried to seek legitimacy under a religious flag may be viewed as expressions of desperate attempts to maintain or regain ancient rights on security of livelihood, when these were challenged by new property arrangements. In view of their "nostalgia" for the reconstitution of the rights of the poor, these movements, in spite of their sometimes revolutionary character have been called "conservative". Like so many other peasant movements up to the present, they were inspired by a conception of social justice which demanded the recognition of their moral right to security of livelihood.²⁷ The view of such movement as 'conservative' or even 'reactionary' may be questioned. It derives from a historical materialist perspective in which expropriation has been seen as an inevitable phase and a forebody to a more free and just society. This right to livelihood was increasingly restricted with the growing curtailment of common customary law and the conversion of Roman law into the new "common law".²⁸

5. The "right to steal" as a right to livelihood

The "right to steal" may be considered as a particular religiously inspired right to revalidate the ancient right to livelihood. This very old customary "right" was common to many Indo-Germanic peoples in tribal social formations. It expressed the right to livelihood and was legitimized by divine protection and exercised by cultic men's associations. Until today there are remnants of this right in Europe, including in the Netherlands.²⁹ It may be considered as a manifestation of the struggle of tribal people against the erosive consequences of the development of private property and its marginalizing consequences. There is a tradition which persists in many parts of Europe for children and artisans to go around, often disguised and masked, and ask for gifts. It may be interpreted as reflecting this "right to steal" in its most eroded form after a long process of disintegration.³⁰ The celebration of the festivity of St. Nicholas in its different forms in various parts of Europe, particularly popular in the Netherlands, where it has become today increasingly vital for the prosperity of the merchant community, has also, like the celebrations until recently of other Saints, like St. Martin, its roots in this ancient right to steal. The bag which "black Peter", the servant of St. Nicholas (the tribal God Wodan, transformed into a Christian Saint), continues to carry ever today, is originally the bag which the men of the cultic associations carried to steal (to even out inequality and secure livelihood for the poor). With the development of private property and of legal arrangements protecting private property, this "right to steal" was gradually "inverted" into charity by the Church and the well-to-do. Subsequently, the task was gradually transferred to the State as the guardian of the political order and the promotion of social harmony and peace, among others through the control over society through welfare. The practice of begging may also be seen as a new form in which the right to livelihood was expressed during the centuries when feudalism gradually

disintegrated and serfs were massively uprooted from their land and from protective patronage. They started a roaming life and finally ended up in the towns where they were rounded up. Town after town forbade begging and put heavy penalties on it. Thus Charles the Fifth issued an edict in 1546 against begging. The edicts condemned "scoundrels, rough people and beggars who go around with a magic bag" (magic to legitimize their "right to steal").³¹ Thus with the gradual expansion of the commodity economy, the right to have a share, the customary right of entitlement to overcome deprivation was extinguished by the newly emerging right of private ownership. The latter was surrounded with multiple safeguards, to guarantee the full implementation of the "ius utendi et abutendi", the right to use and to abuse. The creation at the time of para-military civic associations and militia to protect private prosperity, so widely introduced at present in societies in the capitalist periphery (the South), was needed in order to prevent and repress the 'criminality', especially theft, which resulted from expropriation and the destruction of the earlier right to livelihood. Amartya Sen in his essay on entitlement and deprivation has argued that in trying to understand the nature of deprivation, we have to view the poor not as poor but in relation to particular classes with particular ownership endowments and who are being governed by other entitlement relations than the rich. He observes that between food availability and food entitlement stands the law, reflecting the nature of ownership rights, embodied in the nature of prevailing legal arrangements.³²

Anthropologists have in great wealth described pre-market societies, where surpluses procured are precarious or not sufficiently large to allow for private property, without jeopardizing the livelihood of the whole community. In such societies strong pressures are at work against individual accumulation. Distribution has always been dominated by the aim to meet the needs of the community. No one would starve as long as anything remained in the community store house.³³ When the commodity economy makes inroads and exchanges multiply, an increasingly large part of total food production is exported towards the urban centers and/or abroad. As a result, the organic relation between production, distribution and consumption is broken up and hunger and famine tend to develop as a result of the erosion and break up of patterns of food production geared towards self-provisioning by villages, regions and societies. Since the development of colonial economies, in which food production and rural life were structured in function of external requirements resulting in exports to urban centers and the metropolis, this tendency has grown. It has dramatically accelerated during the past decades with the intensified incorporation of countries of the South into the dominant economic world order.³⁴ The introduction of the new principle into International Law of 'the common heritage of mankind'³⁵ represents an attempt by the societies of the South to protect their resources against Northern multinational capital. It may be interpreted as the re-activation of the original communal conception of the unalienability of what rightfully belongs to the community as a whole before the advent of private appropriation and the development of private ownership relations. This re-activation of the ancient communal conception of the people's right into an international legal concept may be seen as a form of resistance against the further expansion of the 'right to use and abuse' as the right on private property was originally defined in Roman law. It has been noted that the concept of 'common heritage of mankind' is in practice not only used by the governments of the South to protect national resources

but that it paradoxically also serves the rich nations and multinational capital to challenge this alleged right. They tend to argue that only they can 'properly' make use of these resources to the supposed benefit of mankind as a whole in view of their superior control over science and technology. Thus the same legal conception may in actual practice serve two opposite interests. This claim may be compared with that of the early European elites on the private appropriation of land, to guarantee its productivity "at the benefit of the community at large". It would be naive to imagine that deeply entrenched patterns of appropriation can change over night but science and technology cannot be indefinitely pre-empted by being used for a type of development which only benefit a minority of mankind.³⁶

6. Utopias as a response to the destruction of the right to livelihood

During the late middle ages, the contradictions in Europe between the old order providing relatively high security of livelihood and the new order geared to self-interest and economic freedom were intensified. This process, legitimizing and protecting the growth of private accumulation, has been pregnantly described and analyzed by Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England. His book, Utopia, published writing in 1516, is a design for a new society to do away with the terror and oppression of the one in which he lived. It was a reaction to the process of massive pauperization which took place through the enclosure movements through which the peasants' rights on livelihood were obliterated to allow for a rapid process of concentration of landholdings. At that time England was a country where the high aristocrats could enjoy an income of 50.000 Pounds a year, while thousands of people starved, or were hanged for stealing food. Those who challenged the power of the mighty were disemboweled alive and freedom of speech and even of thought was unheard of. In that context, More's proposals for austerity and regimentation become understandable and a testimony to his humanism. The development of the wool trade with the Flanders brought about great social convulsions: "These placid creatures (the sheep) have now developed a raging appetite and have turned into man-eaters. Fields, houses, towns, everything goes down their throat.... They are either cheated or bullied into giving up their property and systematically ill-treated until they are fixed to sell. Then what can they do but steal and be hanged? Thus a few greedy people have converted one of England's greatest national advantages into a national disaster. For it's the high price of food that makes employers turn off so many of their servants - which means inevitably turning them into beggars or thieves Stop the rich from cornering the markets and establish virtual monopolies. Revive agriculture and the wool industry so that there's plenty of honest and useful work for the great army of unemployed. Until you put these things right, you are not entitled to boast of justice meted out to thieves, for it is justice more than real or socially desirable. You allow these people to be brought up in the worst possible way, and to be systematically corrupted from their earliest years. Finally, when they grow up and commit crimes that they were obviously designed to commit, ever since they were children, you start punishing them. In other words, you create thieves, and then you punish them for stealing... To my mind, ... no amount of property is equivalent to a human life. If it is argued that punishment is not for taking the money, but for breaking the

law and violating³⁷ justice, isn't this conception of absolute justice absolutely unjust?"³⁷ More's analysis could well be read as an indictment of the way the impoverished masses are treated by the elites in the South at present and their use of the law to defend their wealth and position of privilege. In the course of their conversation, his friend Raphael who has visited Utopia expresses the following conviction: "To tell you the truth, my dear More, I don't see how you can ever get any real justice or prosperity so long as there is private property, and everything is judged in terms of money, unless you are prepared to call a country prosperous in which all wealth is owned by a tiny minority³⁸ who aren't entirely happy even so, while everyone else is simply miserable." And Raphael goes on to tell More that in Utopia "the authorities of each town work out, very accurately, the annual food consumption of their whole area, but they always grow corn and breed livestock far in excess of their own requirements, so that they have plenty to spare for their neighbours... They have no tailors or dressmakers, since everyone on the island wears the same kind of clothes - except that they vary slightly according to sex and marital status - and the fashion never changes. These clothes are quite pleasant to look at, they allow free movement of the limbs, they are equally suitable for hot and cold weather - and the great thing is, they are all home-made ... The chief business of the stewards - in fact their only business - is to see that nobody sits around doing nothing, but that everyone gets on with his job. They do not wear people out though, by keeping them hard at work, like cart-horses. That's just slavery ... and yet that is what life is like for the working classes nearly everywhere else in the world. In Utopia, they have a six-hour working day - three hours in the morning, then a two hour break, then three more hours in the afternoon, followed by supper. ... Most people spend their free periods on further education, for there are public lectures first thing every morning... After supper, they have an hour's recreation, either in the gardens or in the communal dining halls ... Some people practise music, others just talk... Since they rarely work a six hour day, you may think there must be a shortage of essential goods. On the contrary... three times six hours are enough, and more than enough to produce plenty of everything that is needed for a comfortable life... And now just think how few of these people are doing essential work - for where money is the only standard of value, there are bound to be dozens of unnecessary trades³⁹ carried on, which merely supply luxury goods or entertainment".³⁹ "Under such a system, there is bound to be plenty of everything, and, as everything is divided equally among the entire population, these obviously cannot be any poor people or beggars... As soon as it is clear which products are plentiful in each area, and which are in short supply, they arrange for a series of transfers to equalize distribution. So the island is one big household. When they have made adequate provision for their own needs - which they do not consider they have done, until their reserves are big enough to last them for a year, no matter what happens during the next twelve months - the remainder is exported. Such exports include vast quantities of corn, honey, wool, flax, timber, scarlet and purple cloth, rawhide, wax, tallow, leather and livestock. One seventh of their total exports to any country⁴⁰ go as a free gift to the poor - the rest they sell at reasonable prices".⁴⁰

Religiously inspired Utopias have served in many civilizations to inspire resistance against old and newly established forms of accumulation and social movements for transformation.

The utopian proposals by Thomas Moore reflect ancient descriptions of Paradise in early Indian, Chinese, Sumerian and other societies' histories like the one proposed by Socrates in his Republic. More's views are indeed very akin to those formulated in the Manifesto of the great Taiping rebellion in the middle of the 19th century in China. This rebellion was inspired both by a Chinese utopian tradition and a radical interpretation of the Christian gospel with which their leader became acquainted at a christian mission school in Canton. The collectivism of the "Celestial kingdom of Great Peace" was inspired by the following vision of society:

"All lands under Heaven shall be jointly farmed by the people under Heaven. If the production of food is too small in one place, then move to another where it is more abundant. All lands under Heaven shall be accessible in time of abundance or famine. If there is a famine in one area, move the surplus from an area where there is abundance to that area..." "...Land shall be farmed by all: rice, eaten by all; clothes worn by all; money spent by all. There shall be no inequality and no person shall be without food or fuel. No matter whether man⁴¹ or woman, everyone over sixteen years of age shall receive land".

The Taiping "Kingdom of Great Heavenly Peace" which was a movement for land-distribution, abolition of slavery, of prostitution and for women's emancipation, lasted for 15 years, until it disintegrated by internal strife and corruption. It was savagely destroyed by the Imperial Armies, aided by foreign troops, in the process of which millions of peasants died. The Taiping rebellion was a major source of inspiration to the common people who were nurtured by the folk tales and underground literature. It inspired also the policy of the right to livelihood of Sun Yat Sen⁴² and subsequently the Chinese Communist Party, which by the peasants, who hoped for social justice, was called Kung-ch'ah-tang, literally translated, "share - property - party,"⁴³

Like More's Utopia, that of the Taipings was inspired by a vision of societal forms of cooperation and solidarity which disintegrated with the rise of late feudal society.⁴⁴ This disintegration intensified with the rise of the commodity economy. Both utopias, More's as well as the Chinese, drew on and were supported by a radical interpretation of the Gospel, which peasants all over Europe made theirs, in opposition to the official church, claiming that "Christ had made all men free."⁴⁵ Such radical interpretations of the Gospel appear all a common source in the call for social justice by the prophets in early nomadic semitic society who were the voice of the common oppressed people and whose communal traditions of ownership and sharing were challenged by the rich.

7. Relations between violence and democracy

The establishment of political democracy was preceded by massive violence against the common people. The modernization of English agriculture by way of a process of concentration of landed property and the marginalization of the peasantry from the 14th to into the 19th century was a brutal and violent process.⁴⁶ It would not have succeeded without the Civil War in which the landed upper classes eliminated the King as the protector of the peasantry, which was ousted from the land in consequence of the enclosure movement. It has been suggested that it was this process of massive

violence which created the basis for the industrial revolution. It "freed" the peasantry from the land to become available as wage labour and in this way made possible a relatively peaceful transition towards parliamentary democracy, as modernization could proceed without the huge reservoir of conservative forces which existed in countries such as Germany, Japan and India.⁴⁷ In this view, the evolution towards a relatively peaceful democratic society would, however, not have taken place had the rural and urban upper classes not been forced to close ranks against the danger of French hegemony and in defence of their privileges within England itself. These would have been swept away if the French revolution had also mobilized the English masses. This menace was only averted by the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo. This led to the establishment of regimes on the European mainland, acceptable to England. It also made it possible for the English ruling class to resume the initiative for democratic reforms which had been suspended with the outbreak of the French Revolution.⁴⁸ A crucial role in favouring conditions for democracy in England played also, from the middle of the 19th century onward, the great economic boom. The extraordinary expansion of industrial capitalism and the creation of a world market gave governments in Europe, including England, threatened by social revolution, invaluable breathing space which wrecked all hopes of fundamental transformation by the workers and their movements. The great export boom in goods, capital and men was thus vital to economic growth and expansion. Colonial conquest and expansion were in this view also instrumental in both stimulating accumulation and the integration of the European working class. The domestic market, with so many poor and being too small in size, would have acted, if it were the only market, as a serious constraint. The boom facilitated the integration of the poor as workers/producers and consumers. The gradual improvement of income served to neutralize the radical demands by the unions for new property relationships and to steer them towards integration in the free market society. It helped to narrow down their demands to the improvement of wages which the boom allowed for. The improvement of the workers' income was and which⁴⁹ were at the same time functional to the development of the internal market.

The growth of the world market as a condition for internal development of the nowadays industrialized countries would however not have been possible without the imposition of free trade on the colonies. All industrial powers today, including England, the USA, Germany, Japan, France and the Netherlands founded their industrial development on mercantilism, implying a protection of the home market against foreign products.⁵⁰ Thus, often with the use of violence and coercive means they established free trade. This ruined the prospects for the growth of the domestic markets in their political and/or economic colonies and dependencies in⁵¹ the South and became a condition for the expansion of their own industries.⁵¹ It had catastrophic effects on the possibilities for the growth of dynamic self-reliant, market societies in the South. Hamilton, the architect of USA policy of self-reliance vis-a-vis England, to which it stood in some way in a relationship as today third world towards the industrialized countries, squarely opposed the free trade "reveries of⁵² Adam Smith" and proposed mercantilism as the basis for a nationalist policy.

As pointed out earlier, in England it was the destruction of the peasant's rights which was essential to the process of modernization and the creation of parliamentary democracy. In France peasant violence was a reaction against the penetration of commercial and capitalist practices in

agriculture by the restoration of feudal rights by the nobility. This violence played in the earlier phases of the revolution a decisive part in the destruction of the Ancient Regime. The violence of the sans-culottes was a protest against the workings of the market that were producing great misery. It was a primitive way of forcing rich speculators to give up hoarded goods. Some scholars have argued that, had in France the same process taken place as in England, it might have moved without a violent revolution towards democracy. France however had a very different social structure: this ruled out the social transformation which England experienced. It is difficult to deny that in a way France, to arrive at democracy, had to pass through the fire of the Revolution, including its violent and radical aspects. The great beneficiaries of the Revolution were however not the poor but the new bourgeoisie which rode to power on the back of the radical movements. They then destroyed the organs of popular democracy that would challenge their power and the revolutionary militia set up to defend the new democracy. Also the uneven agrarian structure which had developed in the preceding centuries in which large estates coincided with small scale peasant-ownership was hardly affected and large scale ownership remained largely unimpaired by the revolution.⁵³

On 1st April 1795, a large crowd of sans-culottes rushed to the Hall of the Convention and one of their spokesmen cried, "Where are the harvests? We demand that all means are used to secure livelihood for the people and guarantee it its rights." Another spokesman shouted: "Where is all the grain of the abundant harvest of last years?" It is time that those who have made the revolution, be guaranteed subsistence." When on 20th May a group of women invaded the hall and cried, "we want bread, we want bread", the chairman of the Assembly answered: "I prefer to die rather than not secure the respect of the Convention". Upon this, the radical movement proposed direct popular democracy. It was however defeated and had to accept the social order as proposed by the elite.⁵⁴ Babeuf, one of the leaders of the radical movement, saw as a major contradiction in French society that between the great land-owners and the poverty-stricken labourers and called for agrarian reform in order to reduce inequalities. He proposed a radical sharing of property and labour. As other radical leaders he was executed.

The view of the French bourgeoisie was clearly expressed by a French bishop in the middle of the 19th century who wrote:

"Man's inequality of station concerning of which there has been so much blasphemous talk is, it is true, the fundamental law of society: without such inequality, the arts, sciences and agriculture would be doomed to perish and we would all be deprived of wisdom, for God intended the rich to find in the sufferings of the poor an opportunity to make the most generous sacrifices and the poor to find in the benevolence of the rich a powerful reason for gratitude and love, so that the unity of human society should be strengthened by the twofold bond of benevolence and need".⁵⁵

It is the same concept of functionality which inspired the thinking of the 13th century woman abbot and which underlay the conception of social relations of Adam Smith in the 19th century and his reliance on the market as the expression of providence.

A deep insight into the nature of contradictions in French and European society at the time was shown in the pre-revolutionary period by a banker in Geneva, called Necker who wrote a book in the 1770's on the legislation on

and trade in grains. Upon taking notice of the book, the king of France appointed him as his minister of finance. In practice he became the prime minister and he devised a policy to prevent a social revolution, the first rumblings of which could already be heard.

Rather than proposing a radical land reform, as Baboef did 20 years later, Necker proposed a wise corn law, regulating and preventing the speculation of basic foodstuffs. The publication of Necker's work was authorized by the king on the very day that the people of Paris looted the bakeries.

In his study Necker takes the word people "to mean that part of the nation which is composed of men and women who were born without property of parents and who, not having received any education, are reduced to rely on their natural abilities and have no possession other than this strength. From where comes their eternal wretchedness in every country, and from what source will it never cease to spring? Its origin can be traced to the landlord's power to give in exchange for the work done to please them only the smallest possible wage, in other words no more than is necessary to support life." Necker describes what becomes of the people in times of famine: "When landowners raise the prices of food and refuse to pay the prices of the labour of industrious men, there arises between those two classes of society a sort of obscure terrible combat in which it is impossible to count the number of victims while the strong oppress the weak under the cover of the law and the man of property crushes under the weight of his prerogatives the man who lives by the work of his hands..."

For Necker this violence did in fact derive from the laws governing property rights: "This power in the hands of the landlords is based upon their very small number as compared with the landless men, upon the great competition existing among the latter and principally upon the tremendous inequality which exists between men who sell their labour in order to subsist from day to day and those who buy it merely to enjoy greater luxury or comfort. Landless men are hard pressed to satisfy their immediate needs whereas men of property are not. The latter will always lay down the law whereas the former will always be forced to comply with it."⁵⁶ It was precisely at this time that Adam Smith in England proclaimed the freedom of the corn trade as the best measure against famine

Although Necker rejected an agrarian reform as unjust and impracticable, he nevertheless hinted at it as a permanent process of re-establishing equality. He thereby implicitly suggested that only a process of permanent redistribution of assets would guarantee a reasonable security of income and livelihood to all. This cyclical redistribution has been a central feature in all communal modes of production⁵⁷ and is still in some way practised in a few small remote areas of the world, although these areas are rapidly disappearing, subjected as they have become to the new property practices of the commodity economy and their devastating affects on livelihood.⁵⁸

8. The genesis of a new ideology of labour, poverty and wealth

The transformation of established conceptions of work, poverty and wealth played a crucial role in legitimizing the new pattern of accumulation. Before the process of integration into a "peaceful" society could commence, for a long period, poverty greatly expanded. At the end of the sixteenth

century, the great era of English expansion and adventure, Queen Elizabeth, after a triumphant tour of her kingdom cried: "Paupers are everywhere". Large scale land-grabbing multiplied paupers, beggars and robbers. The English Parliament tried to deal with it by containing the marginalized within their parishes to which they were tied for a pittance of relief. Wanderers were dealt with by whipping, branding and mutilation. Within the movement for modernization, a new perception of society was born in which wealth and profit were seen as the reward for a man's individual diligence and industry and poverty the deserved lot of those not willing to work. With the growth of a "mystical reverence⁵⁹ for property which is characteristic in all ages of the nouveaux riches", there grew an increasing contempt for the poor as products of their own making.

Calvin insisted on personal responsibility, discipline and asceticism. He called on the word of St Paul "if a man will not work, neither shall he eat". In the plan for the re-organization of poor relief at Zurich, Zwingli, another Reformer, proposed that all mendicancy be strictly forbidden as an incentive to work, arguing: "labour is a thing so good and godlike ... that makes the body hale and strong and cures the sicknesses produced by idleness..." In the things of this life, the labourer is most like god. One would be inclined to agree with the view that the protestant reformers broke by their teachings "man's spiritual backbone, his feelings of own dignity and pride by helping to create in him the inner compulsion to work by which man was turned into his own slave."⁶¹

"Natural law" had always been invoked by medieval writers as a moral restraint upon economic self-interest. Gradually, as a result of a complex movement of transformation which received its impetus from growth in trading and commerce, exchange, division of labour, monetarization and the disintegration of an age-old morality of self-restraint, the conception of the natural law was inverted. Submission to the divine law and providence made room for the legitimization of the untrammelled pursuit of self-interest as a natural right vis-a-vis the community. The latter was increasingly seen by a dynamic minority as an obstacle to self-realization. The pursuit of self-interest became the new "law of nature", and was more and more being identified with the operation of the providential plan which was the very law of god. The pursuit of self-interest was expressed in the maxim that everyone would do that which made for his greatest advantage.⁶² The age-old dominant conception of the "just price which should respond with the labour and cost of the producer, as the proper basis of the "communis estimatio" (the general estimate), conformity with which was the safeguard against extortion, gradually eroded until it was entirely given up, to make room for the "free market". In the same way, usury which for ages had been condemned as a serious sin, as it was considered the most conspicuous form of extortion, became gradually to be viewed in the new hegemonic perception as entirely in order, as it was indispensable to stimulate business and profit. It was generally more and more admitted that unless poor were poor, they could not be counted upon "to do an honest day's toil without asking exorbitant wages."⁶³ This view was poignantly expressed by a representative of the new school of thought who wrote in 1723 that "to make society happy, it is necessary that great numbers should be wretched as well as poor".⁶⁴ Thus, starvation became an essential condition for the creation of a labour market for which the liquidation of organic society in which no one would starve was a pre-requisite.⁶⁵

Gradually a new paradigm had emerged which served to explain the mechanisms of the commodity economy. At the same time these mechanisms were hailed. Thereby, they were implicitly legitimized as founded on the only and absolute rules governing society, as they were believed to be the very expression of "natural" reason, transcending every historical contingency.⁶⁶ Facts became norms and therefore expressions of the moral law.

Before 1700, most revolts in Europe were against excessive taxation. Since then most revolts developed around high food prices. In the centuries before, the local and central authorities saw it as their duty to prevent speculation and keep the food prices low. Since then, liberalization led to great fluctuations and numerous revolts took place as indignant people protested against the sudden high increase in prices. They often forced the owners⁶⁷ of food shops to sell their goods for what they viewed as the just prices.

The creation of a social science of wealth served as a major instrument to legitimize the new ideology of accumulation. The new paradigm to provide impetus to a society which was pregnant with rapacity, cruelty and degradation and in which life presented itself, if one looked away from the elegant lives of the leisure classes, as a brutal struggle for existence,⁶⁸ was provided by Adam Smith. He had a world in mind in which equilibrium and harmony would be the natural fruit of the growth of the market. Disequilibria were seen by him as minor exogenous irritations at the periphery which would disappear by the very blessings of the system which was inherently self-equilibrating. Thus Smith writes of the American revolutions as the "late disturbances in the American Colonies".⁶⁹ He evidently assumed that these disturbances were soon to fade away. His conception was nevertheless a revolutionary one. He staunchly believed that the new design would create wealth which would benefit all people as consumers. He was not an apologist for the up-coming bourgeoisie. Although he had great admiration for them, he looked with suspicion at their motives. He was well aware of the fact that "monopolists sell their commodities much above the natural price and raise their emoluments greatly above their natural rate" and "that⁷⁰ the price of monopoly is upon every occasion the highest which can be got" and that to widen the market and to narrow the seller's competition is always in the interest of the dealer. "This is a class of people" he observes, whose interest is never exactly the same as that of society, a class of⁷¹ people who have generally an interest to deceive and oppress the public". Also he realised that the balance of power between masters and workmen was quite uneven: "The masters being fewer in numbers, can combine much more easily; and the law, besides, authorizes or at least does not prohibit their combinations, while it prohibits those of the workmen. We have no acts of parliament against combining to lower the price of work; but many are against combining to raise it. In all such disputes a master can hold out and much longer. Masters are always and everywhere in a tacit but constant and uniform combination, not to raise the wages of labour above their actual rate. To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action, and a sort of reproach to a master among his neighbours and equals".⁷² Adam Smith recognises labour as the source of all wealth "as it is the original foundation of all property" but he restricts the patrimony of a poor man to the property of his own labour and the strength and dexterity of his own hands. Smith defined the workmen's right as the liberty to make a proper use of his hands without injury to his neighbour and "to judge whether he is fit to be employed may surely be

trusted to the discretion of the employers".⁷³ Thus the "liberty" of the worker was greatly impaired.

Beneath his optimistic vision of the market which would generate generalized wealth in an unceasing linear fashion by its very intrinsic movement, Smith was inspired by a radical inversion of the theory of "natural law". He perceived society and its law of motion as the manifestation of the same movement which could be observed in the universe, specifically in space. One of the most important essays which Smith wrote before his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and his *Enquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* is called: "The principles which lead and direct Philosophical enquiries, illustrated by the history of astronomy". This enquiry into astronomy convinced him that the laws discovered by Newton whom he greatly admired were also applicable to society. A contemporary of Adam Smith described the *Wealth of Nations* as the presentation of "a system which defines the fundamentals and operations of the most important science which are destined to become principles for an understanding of political activities in the same way as physics defines the principles which are the basis for mechanics, astronomy and the other natural sciences. It provides the principles which govern the laws of movement which rule the activities of the community".⁷⁴ In Smith's perception, society was a clock in just the same way as the universe and all men move consciously and on the basis of free decisions to create the harmony in the workings of the clock which is the product of God's wisdom. In the *Wealth of Nations*, the natural science approach of Newton was for the first time applied to the domain of human (social) sciences. Thus the view on the universe developed by Newton was at the base of the mechanistic conception of society which served as the foundation for the legitimation of the free market as a self-equilibrating mechanism. Newton has been called the first scientist of the age of reason. John Maynard Keynes also called him the last of the magicians, as he had also been deeply committed to an understanding of the universe from an esoteric perspective. Before becoming a 'scientist' in the new sense, he had first and foremost been an alchemist. Gradually however, Newton moved from his occult leanings. There is evidence that Newton's conversion into a mechanistically oriented philosopher was politically motivated as he wanted to dissociate from a vast number of radical political groupings which were inspired by religious utopian ideas and which were known for their occult inclinations.⁷⁵ They rejected any notion of hierarchies as well as the concept of sin. They implicitly rejected the puritan values advocated by the establishment. Although initially, the establishment looked with suspicion at the new mechanistic philosophy, from the middle of the 17th century onwards, it began to view the mechanical philosophy as helpful in instilling respect for law and order.⁷⁶ It served as a weapon to discredit and invalidate the worldview which was at the roots of the radical social movements. These were called "sects", vis-a-vis the officially recognised church.

In his work *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Adam Smith elaborated his vision on the inherent "properties" which individual man is endowed with and which induces him to live "with propriety" with his fellow men: as a creature of God, all men are endowed with "benevolence" towards their fellow men. That is an essential feature of a "civilized" society. Secondly he is endowed with sympathy. This makes a human society possible and workable. In Smith's conception, sympathy is the human psychological expression of and complement to a civilized society, which is based on commerce. The latter

is an expression of the natural inclination of men to trade, negotiate and exchange. These in turn wholly correspond with "the social god-given nature of men, always alive in christianity."⁷⁷ In this conception, justice is the foundation of society, but this justice is nothing more than the fact that society exists and functions. In this perspective, fellowship is identical with participation in the operations of the commodity economy.

In Smith's view, the laws of justice are threefold: the protection of lives and persons, our neighbours, the protection of the property and possessions of our neighbours and the protection of rights which derive from contractual obligations. It is in fact the right of property which is considered as the most central one and the infringement on property is viewed as the most serious crime. In Smith's conception, real poverty can hardly arise. Wealth means little, as the rich have only very limited opportunities to consume, their natural inclinations are to serve and invest and share their wealth with their less fortunate fellows (e.g. landlords and poor). Through the very workings of the system the poor will receive a share from the wealth produced through their wages. Smith argues; "Moreover, if we would carefully examine his economy (that of the labourer with the lowest wage), then we would find out that he would spend a larger part of his wage on conveniences which may be considered as superfluities and that, in exceptional cases, he can spend something for vanity's sake or to raise his prestige ... and as far as human happiness is concerned, a beggar, who enjoys the sun on the roadside, possesses that feeling of security which noblemen battle for".⁷⁸ This is to illustrate that, in Smith's conception, wealth and poverty were not to be seen as a problem, as both had their natural vocation and function which are an expression of the new "natural law". Those who deplore poverty are 'whining and melancholical moralists'. In Smith's view, the earlier unity between rights and morality and law and ethics was no more relevant. They had become separate domains. On the one hand there is science, on the other values and valuations. Although Adam Smith perceived the new world as that of "natural liberty", there was one qualification to this liberty: a man has it as long as he does not violate the laws of justice. It was the task of government to create and maintain "external" conditions for justice without which the system of "natural liberty" could not exist. Adam Smith recognized that in the history of state-formation, civil government was in fact instituted to protect the rich against the poor, in other words to protect those who had some property against the property less. The original concentration of power which characterized feudal society and created domination and dependence was, in Smith's view, basically dissolved by the very birth of commercial society in which, as a result of trade and industry, feudal patterns of control in the country-side were destroyed and the wealth of the few was replaced by a prospect of prosperity for all, thanks to the expansion of the commodity economy. This economic would unceasingly grow to everybody's benefit. Thus basically Adam Smith perceived changes in a highly static way, as a linear progression of an unchanging order in which all would continue to compete to everybody's benefit. Poverty relief was to take care of incidental poverty and the magistrates would defend the social order against those who were to challenge the laws protecting property. What counted was the reduction of the cost of production, so as to maximise accumulation. Therefore Adam Smith was also in favour of the abolition of slavery: "The wear and tear of a slave, it has been said, is at the expense of his master; but that of a free servant is at his own expense. The wear

and tear of the latter is however in reality as much at the expense of his master as that of the former. The wages paid to journeymen and servants of every kind must be such as will enable them, one with another, to continue the race of journeymen and servants, as the increasing, diminishing or stationary demand of the society may happen to require. But though the wear and tear of a free servant be equally⁷⁸ at the expense of his master, it generally costs him much less than a slave. In this perception, what does not count is the mode of production but which one is cheapest. Adam Smith's benevolent view of the gentlemen - landlords was not shared by Ricardo. He saw them, as they kept the food prices high, as a source of continuous poverty of the poor, as food prices rose after every wage rise. Ricardo also noted that the accumulation of wealth through speculation did not allow the industrialists to save and accumulate. He successfully fought for the repeal of the corn laws which the landlords, thanks to their dominance in parliament, had been able to impose.

The conception of property as freedom of the owners, the use of the right to use and to abuse, and the gradual growth towards political democracy had already more than a century before Adam Smith been sharply criticized by a group of peasants. They pleaded before the Council of State against the legitimacy of the seizures of their land. One of them; "Wee know that England cannot be a free commonwealth unless all the poore commoners have a free use and benefit of the land; for if freedome bee not granted, wee that are the poore commoners are in a worse case than wee were in the King's days⁸⁰ for then wee had some estate about us, though wee were under oppression. (This is ancient English spelling). Political democracy in their view was seen as deceptive if not supported by economic rights.

9. Pacification and "civilization" as conditions for the expansion of the commodity economy

When trying to comprehend the source of the dynamics of capitalist expansion within Europe itself and through the process of expansion towards the boundaries of the earth which led up to the constitution of one single world economy, in which the nature of each part is defined by its function in the total system, we may only be able to do so by looking at the total as a composite of closely interwoven structures and forms of inequality between regions, societies, men and women. "It is the inequalities, the injustice, the contradictions large and small, which make the world go round and ceaselessly transform its upper structures, the only really mobile ones. For capitalism alone has relative freedom of movement.⁸¹ But the analysis of the development of this process can only be carried out in relation to comprehending the State in its many forms which are both a cause and consequence of this development.⁸² The "new natural law" of the commodity economy could only "properly" or "freely" function to the extent that there was relative stability, that is to the extent that internal forms of active resistance or opposition to its growth and expansion were effectively suppressed and contained and new norms and form of control were developed to secure consent and cooperation. For this the creation of an efficient⁸³ bureaucracy was needed as much as armies to combat banditry and rebellion. Bureaucracies and armies were indeed crucial to provide support for the process of internal and external expansion of "freedom". External expansion

through conquest and colonization served, like in Rome, to ward off internal pressures for social transformation and deal with internal poverty and opposition. Thus it served to externalize internal contradictions and to find new sources of accumulation. Thereby the elite achieved internal peace and the cooperation of the poor and marginalized who benefitted from the new forms of accumulation, at home and by being shipped to the colonies. Thus bureaucracies and armies were crucial in securing the mobility of capital and men in a variety of forms or modes of production, co-existing side by side and interpenetrating each other in the process of the growth of the division of labour in the world economy. The division of labour which gradually emerged within this world economy was that of "free labour" in the form of self-employment and wage labour for skilled work in the core of the world economy, semi-serfdom in the semi-periphery and slave labour and other coercive forms of labour control in the periphery,⁸⁴ each suited for particular forms of production and being supported by specific social and political strategies of support and control. The realization of these strategies demanded however in the center the creation of strong States and strategies, both to ensure national homogeneity and cohesion and to legitimize and support the process of expansion. "To get the working people to pay not only for the profits, but also for the costs of maintaining and expanding the new system was not easy."⁸⁵

The slow displacement of pre-capitalist relations of production in the process of incorporation of the colonies into the capitalist world economy led to the increasing immiseration of indigenous populations which were obliged to sell their labour power at even lower prices in order to be able to bear at least part of the even more oppressive burden of ground-rent, usury and taxes. The destruction of native handicrafts and the separation of the indigenous peasantry from their land and soil was therefore accompanied in the long run by the secular growth of⁸⁶ an industrial reserve army which explains the blocking of wages and needs. It is the social structure, characterized by this integration of modes of production which is at the root of the process of "unequal exchange" and uneven development, as a result of which through this specific form of integration into the world market, development in the colonies was and is blocked. Pre-capitalist forms of production relations in agriculture then serve as a social security system onto which the cost of reproduction and maintenance of the development of the capitalist mode of production can be discharged.⁸⁷ In this way production costs can be externalised in significant ways. The partial maintenance of these pre-capitalist modes facilitates the absorption of labour, once it has been expelled. At the same time, they subsidize industry by partly securing the reproduction of the labour force, so that industry can dispense with that. The maintenance of pre-capitalist production relations may also at times be of strategic significance in helping to prevent open and active forms of opposition and resistance by labouring people who want to secure their right to livelihood. Without them, governments would face much more instability and direct forms of contestation would require more generalized and opens form of repression. This would raise costs and instability would increase. The maintenance of pre-capitalist production relations may therefore not only have an economic but also a political function⁸⁸ in the process of the central accumulation of capital. Thus the global movement of the process of central accumulation of capital in the south may be viewed as consisting of two contradictory,

simultaneous movements: a tendency towards the destruction and disintegration of pre-capitalist mode of production as well as their partial maintenance or re-activation, ⁸⁹ in so far as they are functional to the process of central accumulation.

The reconstitution of self-provisioning capacity to secure own livelihood may also be carried out by the workers themselves who use it to strengthen their bargaining position vis-a-vis the management. Then it may be seen as a mode of resistance to an externally imposed regime. To break such forms of resistance, the management may then use property law to prevent self-provisioning and in that way secure the maximum extraction of surplus value. ⁹⁰

The maintenance or re-activation of pre-capitalist modes within a social formation, dominated by the capitalist mode of production, does however not guarantee any right on or security of livelihood. On the contrary, by the very ways in which these modes become inserted and instrumentalized in function of the accumulation of capital, this right to livelihood is challenged. Its original function of securing subsistence is destroyed, as these modes become integrated into the processes of generalized exchange in the commodity economy and process of monopolization of land and other ⁹¹ resources develop which smash the basic foundation of this security. In the last decades, the process of destruction of pre-capitalist modes has been intensified, with the expansion of the capitalist mode of production in both agriculture and industry and opportunities for the exercise of the right to livelihood have declined even more. Uneven development and inequality between a minority of wealthy and a majority of poor have become more pronounced. Both processes, that of preservation and dissolution, can only be realized with the development of political and social strategies which contain the pressures by the poor to secure their right to livelihood. As a consequence, development has been increasingly linked to the concept of "national security", designed to guarantee political stability. In this conception, "development" becomes equated with all legal, institutional and ideological arrangements which secure the free expansion of the capitalist mode of production. Counter-insurgency strategies have become in recent decades an integral part of "development" in the "South". Control over the earlier colonies, today the dependent capitalist periphery, has become essential for stability in the metropolis. It is not different from the situation long ago in Rome where unrest in the towns was feared in the event that the legions would be unable to guarantee safe passage for grain ships through the Mediterranean. In ⁹² such a situation, a tendency develops to see potential enemies everywhere.

In this process of expansion, "civilized" societies were qualified as "barbarian" and "barbarian" ones were renamed "civilized" through a process of violence and coercion which secured the 'freedom' for the newly emerging power ⁹³ center of the world in the West to submit and incorporate other peoples. In fact, there is evidence that the principal civilizations of Asia prior to colonization had achieved a level of development which was technically and economically superior to that of Europe. ⁹⁴ Adam Smith formulated the new role of the West in world affairs, to which it was entitled as superior in civilization: "In ancient times, the opulent and civilized found it difficult to defend themselves against the poor and barbarous nations. In modern times, the poor and barbarous nations find it difficult to defend themselves against the opulent and civilized". The historian Carlos Cipolla observes: "In this passage of Adam Smith, readers

may perceive traces of a disturbing confusion between "civilized" and "technologically advanced", a confusion that, at least in the form in which we are familiar with it, is one of the by-products of the Industrial Revolution... If the historical analysis of this book is correct, the technologically more advanced⁹⁵ nations are bound to prevail, regardless of their degree of "civilization".

The "civilization" of other peoples could however not have taken place without a strategy of "pacification", similar to that of Rome vis-a-vis the subjected peoples and without the creation of strategies of political incorporation and control which made possible and secured the process of central accumulation of capital. Marx agreed with and stressed the "progressive" revolutionary role of the "bourgeoisie" in the 19th century, by pointing to the unceasing dynamics of its operations: "The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. All old established industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous new material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of production, draws all, even the most barbarian nations into civilization... The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the towns, Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized⁹⁶ ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West". Thus Marx shared the view of the bourgeoisie on the historical mission of the "civilized" nations, a view also entertained by Adam Smith. Even though Marx perceived the mission to "burst asunder" the fabric of barbarian nations as an inhuman violent process, he nevertheless considered it as a blessing, as it broke up despotism and backwardness. In⁹⁷ that sense England was considered by him an "unconscious tool of history". As a staunch believer in the benefits of science and technology, he assumed that the introduction of the scientific and technological progress of the West would naturally create conditions in the rest of the world for the development of bourgeois society, "in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth".⁹⁸ In this sense he was as optimistic as Adam Smith.

The present day massive violation in the societies of the South of the economic and social rights of the majority population and the deprivation of the right to livelihood for large parts of the world, as well as the large scale suppression of human and political rights in these societies are in the above view the inevitable outcome of the very nature of the dominant world economic order as it has grown and the interest configurations which rely on it and promote it. Also the systematic repression of all social and political movements which came into being to defend the right to livelihood cannot be seen as an unfortunate incident, but as a crucial condition for the dominant world economy to maintain itself and to expand. But even more optimistic was Marx in his belief that "in communist society, accumulated labour is but a means to widen, to enrich and to promote the existence of the labourer" by way of the "centralization of all capital in the hands of

the State, that is the proletariat organised as ruling class."⁹⁹ Marx's conception of a future socialist state which by its very existence as a humanist organization in which all forms of alienation would have been overcome, has been crudely shattered by the history of "real socialism". It explains also Marx's contempt for human rights as an ideological product of bourgeois society which would lose its relevance with the advent of socialism. While having an unequalled insight into the actual limitations on freedom and on the need to overcome inequality by the working people, in view of the primacy of property-rights in "capitalist" society, Marx hardly saw the need to protect the individual person in a future socialist society against an all-powerful State. He somehow believed that the latter would automatically guarantee freedom and equality. In Marx's view this was self-evident as the State would be the expression of the emancipation of the oppressed as a new democracy.

I now propose to focus on the analysis of the political ideology and social science and political strategies which supported and legitimized the development of a "free market" society, based on contractual relationships between individuals perceived as an aggregate of independent actors constituting society.

10. The politics and ideology of equilibrium theory

Myrdal has pointed out that the development of dominant economic theory in the West finds its roots in equilibrium theory which in turn has been the theoretical foundation of the notion of harmony of interests and the ideology of laissez faire and free trade: "The notion of stable equilibrium has run through our whole economic and social speculation during the past 200 years and has up to this day¹⁰⁰ determined the main concepts of all social sciences and not only economics." Contrary to this view, he proposed the paradigm of a cumulative process towards increasing inequalities and the simultaneous growth of wealth and poverty, unless substantive policies were enacted to intervene in the processes and mechanisms promoting such a growing disequilibrium.¹⁰¹

Barrington Moore has related the development in equilibrium theory of the social sciences to the tendency towards abstract quasi natural-science approaches, prominent in dominant social sciences. In his view they have increasingly become a-historical and oblivious of any reference to political struggles, oppression and social change. In his perception, this tendency is characteristic of ancient regimes. Referring to the USA and the Soviet Union, he pointed out that "the historical point of view is likely to remind us of the transitory nature of social institutions, generally an uncomfortable thought in "ancient regimes".¹⁰² Norbert Elias has shown the link between nationalism and the trend in the social sciences towards equilibrium theory in the course of the 19th century. Equilibrium theory reinforced the self-image of individuals as the "ultimate" and only "real reality", separated from community and society. Thus it became the basis for an a-historical social science. In this 19th century conception, social change as well as social and political movements for social change were inherently perceived as an exogenous disturbance which endangered homeostasis. Elias traces the roots of the growth of this trend to the mounting opposition in social science against the "infiltration" of ideological and political ideals of social and political transformation and the mounting pressures to

turn the social sciences into instruments of the status quo and the defense by the West of the gains of a historical process of growth and expansion. Once the West had reached the height of its development, it refused to allow its privileged position to be challenged. Elias traces the history of the generation of individualised self-consciousness of people in European history back to the long process of growth towards self-discipline.¹⁰³ This process marks the transition from externally imposed forms of compulsion towards the internalization of dominant values through the development of "rational" thought and "moral consciousness". The genesis of the conception of "homo economicus" and other "homines" in the social sciences may all be seen to reflect this process which received a major impetus in the renaissance and which was articulated by such philosophers and scientists as Newton, Descartes and Adam Smith. One major consequence of Adam Smith's perception of society as constituted by individuals is his radical disjunction between production and distribution. Equilibrium, in his view, would automatically take care of distribution, thanks to the dynamics of competition. Everyone would receive his/her due. The distribution or redistribution of assets, goods or services in this conception has no function. This would only obstaculize the process of growth, as Social justice is assumed to be inherent in the very operation of the system. The development of functionalist and structuralist approaches in the social sciences are intimately linked to individualism and equilibrium theory. Like individualist theory, they are based on harmoniously "integrated models which are also premised on the assumption of reciprocity in social relations in which the distribution of resources, inequality in status and in the social division of labour (except descriptively) and structurally determined differences between interests and aspirations of different strata of society all of which affect the dynamics of social change, are disregarded."¹⁰⁴ As Goldmann has observed, one cannot have knowledge of one-self without this being knowledge of the social relations one is embedded in: "the knowledge (connaissance) which a person has of him/herself" n'est pas science mais conscience",¹⁰⁵ both in terms of the social relations, at a given point of time and of the historical nature of these relations. It is precisely the absence of any conscience of contradictions which marks the development of hegemonic social sciences as an a-historical formal abstract exercise.¹⁰⁶

If the premise is accepted, that individualism as self-experience is a social phenomenon and has a genesis and history of its formation, that is to say that it has been historically constructed, then the need arises to locate the genesis and evolution of this construction in social history. It is proposed that the construction of social science as equilibrium theory, starting with Adam Smith, has abstracted from the historical and social dynamics of its constitution and from the social and political strategies which made it possible in order to legitimize itself as a technique of management of interests. In this process it has been noted, neo-classical economics turned into an opportunist ideology of vested interests¹⁰⁷ and acquired the function of a new religion which replaced the old religion.¹⁰⁸ A recent study analyses views of leading USA economists shows that the internal consistency of abstract formal models and methodology is considered more relevant than the outcome and that the views of these economists are full of contradictions and have a clearly ideological foundation.¹⁰⁹ This serves to illustrate the view that social science cannot be free from valuations. The question then arises: for whose benefit theories have been constructed? To the extent that theory formation does not care to be in

line with the outcome in practice, it could be expected to become an ideology or a religion, legitimizing vested interests, irrespective of political and moral positions.

It may be argued that the more unequal social structures becomes, the more likely it is that theories/ideologies will be constructed to suggest equality so as to conceal inequality. Such theories cannot be effective however, unless they are sustained by the promotion of values and practices which are internalized in the consciousness. These must then be integrated into society by a variety of strategies of discipline to secure incorporation and contain opposition and resistance. These strategies are thus directed towards the acceptance of dominant values, particularly those which legitimize abstinence and sobriety by the poor. In European history, the most urgent and necessary task for the construction of a rational society in which man could "properly" use his intelligence may have been the destruction of spontaneous impulsive enjoyment.¹¹⁰ This came to be seen as an essential condition for civilized life. This puritan morality which demanded the rigorous suppression of desire and the absolute subjection to the law of duty was closely related to the process of urbanization which on the European continent preceded the Reformation. The latter only served to reinforce and reconfirm the new values which had been emerging. In the new morality, the family became the cornerstone of the community, marriage replaced 'loose' customary arrangements and education into obedience and respect became a strategic tool of socialization into the new morality. Earlier customary forms of morality, in particular with regard to sexual relations, which had always been accepted and condoned as 'natural' were rejected and repressed. They were increasingly perceived as improper and illicit and as an expression of idleness. Idleness was in turn seen as a main source of misery and misery the very proof of guilt of people who did not behave according to the dictates of morality.

The development of this new morality was rooted in the cultivation of a sense of self-contempt and self-abasement of the individual and especially of the poor. Essential to this new morality was the implicit condemnation of the human body as a source of evil. In sermons and otherwise the people were taught to distrust and look down on their body which was in need of control and discipline. This sermonizing played a crucial role in the domestication of the masses and their conversion into a willing labour force.¹¹¹ It has been pointed out that the puritan view of life which repressed sexual energy and sublimated it into brutalizing labour force helped to create the model personality of our time - a personality that is docile and subdued in the face of authority but fiercely aggressive towards competitors and subordinates.¹¹² There is also evidence that the trend towards domestication of women in the course of the 15th and 16th century may be seen as a dimension of the process of conditioning of consciousness and values vis-a-vis sexuality which preceded and accompanied the rise of protestantism with its glorification of puritanism and asceticism as crucial human values. In this context the persecution of women as witches may also be seen as an essential dimension in the struggle to impose a new morality.¹¹³ The repression of pleasure and the exaltation of abstinence appears in this context as a crucial instrument in the socialization of the labouring people.¹¹⁴

There is evidence that in the great movements in Europe which ushered in the new bourgeois dominated order and for which the common people were mobilized in the name of freedom and happiness, philosophers, political as

well as spiritual leaders like Savonarola, Luther, Calvin, Robespierre and many others preached austerity, duty,¹¹⁵ abstinence and distrust in happiness and pleasure as the moral ideal. With the early beginnings of class society and the growth of contradictions between rich and poor, the until then persecuted Church became an ally of the State at the time of Empire of Byzantium. Social practices, originally expressing the solidarity and unity among the poor were then ritualized and came to express the equality and unity of all Christians before God, irrespective of status and class. Thus while polarization sharpened, ritual served to conceal growing contradictions and promote the feeling among oppressed to belong to one family, together with the wealthy.¹¹⁶ This ritual celebration of unity may be seen as a fundamental feature of institutionalized religion. One may argue that over the centuries, it played a crucial role in European history to promote conformity of the labouring people to their oppressed condition.

11. The development of strategies for control over labour

The destruction of the medieval communities with their various forms of relative democracy in the towns and the networks of solidarity was not easy. It required "an unceasing struggle to destroy the foundations of the subsistence economy and to replace it by commodities produced within the framework of the new nation state. During this struggle, popular cultures were devastated on all levels. The report of this war has only been written on the part of the winners. It reflects the belief by Marxist, as well as by liberal historian that it helped the poor toward progress."¹¹⁷ The process of capitalist modernization, as it developed from the time of the Crusades, which so decisively contributed to the growth of wealth and the beginning of the commodity economy in South as well as in Northern Europe, implied at the same time an incontestable process of destruction of all forms of "organic economy" and of all social and political forms of resistance, revolt and rebellion, both in its ideological forms of expression and in the social practices of the common people.

With the unceasing large scale expulsion of people from the niches of the subsistence economy, the right to livelihood or the right to subsistence, which had always been a self-evident right, came under heavy pressure. Thomas Aquinas, a prominent medieval philosopher and theologian, had argued that the poor had the right to seize what they needed for their survival from the rich. He did not qualify this as theft in case of extreme need.¹¹⁸ This view, which reflected the dominant ethos of the time, was increasingly rejected, as more and more pressures developed to protect the new property relations.

As was pointed out earlier, the process of agrarian transformation, leading towards the growth of concentration in landed property and the disintegration of peasants' rights as well as the ascendancy of commercial capitalism led to a sharp polarisation in early modern Europe in which the rise of wealth and dire poverty and destitution went hand in hand.¹¹⁹ The rapid growth of paupers, beggars and gangs of outlaws grew with the development of commercial society and banditry became often indistinguishable from social revolt.

The proposals of Thomas More in his Utopia for an egalitarian society also included the prohibition of begging and obligatory work for all the poor. The inspiration for Utopia was, it would seem, not only a moral but

also a political one. Surely More condemned the injustices of the newly emerging society but his radical proposal was also inspired by the fear for an overturn of the social order. In 1527, 11 years after the publication of Utopia, More makes this feeling explicit when he wrote on the dangers of "men who rebel against all laws, rule and government ... For they shall gather together ... and under the pretext of reformation ... shall essay to make new division of every man's land and substance, never ceasing ... till they make all beggars as they be themselves, and at last bring all the realm to ruin and this not without butchery and foul bloody hands".¹²⁰ More is only one of the many intellectuals of his time who saw forced labour as essential to the solution of poverty. The proposal of forced labour was legitimized by the glorification of labour as a religious duty. It rested on the qualification of poverty as a manifestation of an anti-social disposition and laziness. This philosophy lies at the root of the establishment and expansion of "Houses of Discipline" in a variety of forms all over Europe in which poor were to be turned into a docile and profitable labour force. These houses of discipline also were called houses of terror, as they were designed to instill fear among the poor to be put in them, in case they were caught vagabonding at the expense of the community.¹²¹ The Dutch humanist Coornhert opposed the prevailing form of corporal punishment as inadequate. He proposed new forms of social control. Loss of freedom and forced labour were seen by him as ways to end idleness through discipline and exercise.¹²² What by leading intellectuals, concerned with progress, was perceived as laziness and idleness were in actual fact deeply-rooted forms of resistance against new dependent forms of work for a new kind of owner. As the latter were bent on maximizing profit, they had little regard for the pre-existing form of protection of the right to livelihood, which had characterized the feudal production relation, between patrons and clients. There is evidence that those willing to labour and become workmen for a wage in England in the course of the eighteenth century were repeatedly persecuted at the hands of their comrades. As a result of their rage about the new conditions which ruined the customary forms of livelihood, they set out to destroy the new tools with which the willing workers would carry out their jobs.¹²³ In the towns, there was fierce resistance towards the growth of wage labour, as a form of dependence. It was held in deep contempt, as it was heavy as well as undignifying. Particularly for women, "public work", implying to offer one's own body for "public" use, had the connotation of prostitution. Another essential element in this resistance was the fact that in wage labour production and consumption would become separated from each other, with the consequent loss of control and the rise of insecurity.¹²⁴

The new conception and practice of labour as a dependent painful activity had its origins in the callous working conditions in the mines which were crucial in the accumulation of large merchant capital. The English and French word "travail" has its origin in the latin verb "tripaliare" which meant "to torture on the trepail" which in the sixth century was for the first time mentioned as an instrument of impalement, made out of three wooden sticks. By the twelfth century the word both in Spain and France expressed a painful experience to which man is subjected; only in the sixteenth century the verb 'trabajar' (to labour) was used interchangeably with 'labour' (to work) and 'sudar' (to sweat).¹²⁵ In the Concise Oxford dictionary of current english the word 'travail' stands for painful or laborious effort.

Torture was common practice to teach "unwilling" and "lazy" people to labour. The House of Discipline, founded in Amsterdam in 1589, was notorious all over Europe. Rounded up men were brought into a cellar with water, composed of two compartments. Victims had to pump the water out of one compartment into the other. If they stopped working, the water would flow back and they would drown. This cruel form of "educating" poor people to labour was only abolished by the regents of the House of Discipline when too many drowned, as they preferred to die rather than to submit to the cruelties and misery.¹²⁶ The decision to abolish this torture was however not inspired by compassion but because it turned out to be counterproductive. A parallel may be drawn with the earlier need to abolish slavery and substitute it with serfdom as a cheaper and more profitable form of labour. In the view of the manufacturers of Lyon in France in the 18th century, degradation and torture of their labourers was necessary: "Only an overworked and down-trodden labourer who would receive a low wage would forgo association with his comrades and escape the condition of personal servitude under which he could be made to do whatever his master required of him."¹²⁷ To make workers 'willing' to labour, compulsion through the threat of hunger (by keeping the wages to a minimum), rigorous rules and the threat of corporal punishment were indispensable.

The appraisal of "labour" as a salutary solution to the problems of idleness and lawlessness cannot be interpreted from an exclusive moral perspective. It was crucially related to the rising need for social and political control. The latter was engendered by the growing urge for security which was the concomitant of the gradual concentration of property and wealth and the search for effective protection. Submissive labour, was essential to that security.

In this sense, it may be argued that the economic process of accumulation which characterized the development of the commodity economy required new methods of control and subjection of those who actually or potentially could challenge it. It may be argued that the changes in techniques and technology which made possible an economic "take-off" could only be realized to the extent that they were preceded and accompanied by a technology of power, or techniques for the "accumulation of men" by way of disciplines which would ensure the "free", unhampered pursuit of the former.¹²⁸ These disciplines could be viewed as techniques or mechanisms of power to prevent or contain the emergence of any form of countervailing power by the self-organization of the actually or potentially marginalized. They also facilitated the registration and control over the mass of poor through the homogenization, standardization and regulation of techniques of intervention and surveillance. While contractual relations provided a semblance of equality at the surface, only the development of disciplines could make the operation of the laws of contract effective, as they backed up the formal juridical norms favouring the new distribution of power. In this way, they pressed individuals to integrate into the new demands of the commodity economy, to accept inequality as inevitable and functional and become resigned to the exclusion of time-honoured traditions or relative guarantees for the right to livelihood.

It has been observed that the genesis of social science in Europe as a technique of empirical investigation in function of the powerful is connected with that of the inquisition to which all individuals could be subjected and through which a minute account could be established of the

history and behaviour of each individual in the community through the surveillance of his daily connections and activities.¹²⁹ Its genesis is also rooted in a new conception about nature and the universe which finds a clear expression in the pioneering work by the English scientist Bacon. In his view, nature has to be "hounded in her wanderings, bound into service" and made a "slave". She was to be "put in constraint" and the aim of the scientist was to "torture nature's secrets from her". As attorney general of King James I, Bacon was quite familiar with the methods of prosecution practised in his time. His view of nature as a female is strongly suggestive of the widespread torture of women whose secrets had to be extracted from them with the help of mechanical devices.¹³⁰

The shift from the sense of sacredness of the earth and the unity between (wo)man and the cosmos towards one in which the cosmos and the earth were looked at as separate from each other and the organic view of matter was replaced by a vision of the world as a machine was completed by the great scientists Newton and Descartes. The scientific method which Descartes developed was based on the assumption that all complex phenomena can be understood by breaking them up in their constituent parts. Thus by reducing the whole to its parts and then capturing the nature of each of the parts in mathematical formulas, the truth about the whole could be discovered. It is his emphasis on rigorous mathematical logic and analysis which lies at the root of the extraordinary development of science and technology in the West. They may be regarded as the core of western scientific materialist culture, the foundation of which has however been shaken by the new discoveries in physics at the beginning of this century.

The radical separation between mind and matter which underlay Descartes's scientific view, also had far-reaching implications for peoples' self-perception, in which the mind was seen as a reality radically separate from the body. The latter was not in any way different from that of an animal and a machine. Leading European psychiatrists in this century such as Carl Jung and Wilhelm Reich, have pointed out that the Cartesian/Newtonian duality and dualization between body and mind is at the root of the schizoid alienated nature of Western civilization and the epistemological premises on which it rests. It would indeed seem that in Western civilization, there has been a growing disregard and devaluation of all those forms of perception and experience which are not functional to the analytical, discursive linear mind, as if the intellect could function in separation from the human being as a psycho-physical unity.¹³¹ Jung, Reich and others, such as the founder of Gestalt, Pearl, a student of Freud, and the founder of bio-energetics, Lowen, a student of Reich, have done much to break the spell of the Cartesian/Newtonian paradigm and to suggest ways to overcome the alienating implications of its reductionist position. The new insight into the essential unity of body and mind, which is gaining ground, has far-reaching implications for the understanding and practice of science. It points to the need to recuperate and re-integrate those modes of perception and experience which have been devalued in the historical process of modernization through new forms of socialization and education.¹³² This newly gained insight is now spreading, although not without stiff opposition from the scientific and academic establishment. The latter tends to defend the superiority of their epistemological premises as the only ones which allow legitimate access to genuine knowledge. To the West the new discovery may serve to develop ways to recover those dimensions of being and experience which have been relegated and repressed in the process of

modernization. Those peoples, who have been incorporated into the dominant world order, it may help in becoming critical of the basic premises of dominant Western thinking, while selectively benefitting from the Western advances in science and technology. It may bring about an awareness of the destructive implications of reductionism to their own ways of life and help them to seek a new appreciation of their own forms of being which have been destroyed in the process of incorporation. It may also stimulate them towards the pursuit of self-reliance and to enhance their own approaches to human self-realization, creatively making use of their own past. Both, people from the East and the West, can learn from each others civilizations. This is however, only possible if history is not merely understood as an evolutionary process of linear progression towards ever higher stages as reached by the West, in which past stages are to be understood as backward and primitive but in which cultures are understood as strategic options which, precisely in view of the reductionist implications of each choice, always remain complementary to each other.¹³³

Newton's conception of the universe in which all physical phenomena could be reduced to the motion of physical particles and in which reality can be reduced to a mechanical equation, also served as the theoretical foundation of both natural and social science. It decisively influenced a number of philosophers of that time, among whom John Locke and Adam Smith, whose reliance on Newton's work I mentioned before. It was the identification of the properties of the individuals, constituting society, which would secure an understanding of the laws of the movement of society as a whole. The right of freedom and equality and the right to property was linked to a conception of a harmonious society governed by a free market which could be guaranteed by a representative government.¹³⁴

The radical separation between spirit and matter, which inspired Descartes and others after him, implied a devaluation of both the human body and of the environment. Both came more and more to be experienced in terms of instrumental rationality. The progressive destruction of the earth as well as the instrumentalization of human beings who could be and were reduced to a mere input became of strategic importance to the process of accumulation. The question arises whether the violence which this process entailed and legitimized, has not been essential to the development of European civilization. Has it not been the growing instrumentalization of (wo)man and nature which have been at the roots of the patterns and ways of life which at present threaten human survival at large?¹³⁵

The growth of property through the investment in commodities and machines presupposed a systematic armed protection against illegality. This was made effective by the bourgeoisie by introducing new legislation, declaring illegal attempts by the poor to continue to their old right to livelihood. The growth in wealth and property, coupled with the large demographic expansion, heightened the demand for security which required increased severity of the law.¹³⁶ This in turn could only be effected by the growth of the police apparatus. Politics served as a technique to ensure internal peace and order, supported both by the expansion of armies and the projection of military methods onto society as a result of which, the generalization of disciplines became co-extensive with the State itself.¹³⁷

The control over labour was not only forced upon the poor by the "houses of discipline" but also through the hospitals and prisons in which the poor were forced to labour. Finally, the establishment of "manufactures" was proposed with the idea to put the poor to work.¹³⁸

The organization of charity or poor relief also served as an instrument to secure political stability and control. It served to prevent social unrest and inroads on property as well as to force the poor to accept the working conditions, stipulated by local governments and entrepreneurs. When and where economic crises developed, poor relief or welfare tended to be re-organised to the detriment of the poor.¹³⁹ Essential to poor relief was its political regulative control function. Religious groups and charity organizations had for a long time, before local governments and merchants also started to take charge of welfare, been involved in imposing discipline on the poor. They inspected and supervised their clients, to see to it that they would behave in line with the required behaviour, according to prescribed norms.

One way in which in the course of the 19th century in England, the cradle of the industrial revolution, the growing contradictions between capital and labour were counteracted was through the revival of the medieval code of chivalry. This revival was cultivated by leading writers and politicians, representing the establishment. It played a leading role in promoting an ideal image of the English elite.¹⁴⁰ This elite, like King Arthur and his knights and other noble heroes in medieval legends, would, by virtue of its adoption of the knightly code of honour, exercise its patronage over the people in a merciful, selfless, generous and honourable way, so that the common people could entrust their own destiny and that of the nation to this elite without any reservation. Thus the gentleman became a modern knight. This 'ideological strategy' to give the elite a new image, revealed the resistance of this elite to give in to the demands of the working class for democracy and full rights as citizens. The attempt to revive the medieval ideal of patronage and its supposed virtues was also inspired by the need to counteract the ideals of the French Revolution and to prevent them from inciting rebellion and revolution in England. Half a century later, it definitely influenced British "christian socialism", which prompted among the elite the ideas of service and solidarity with the poor so that structural reforms could be dispensed with. The knightly virtues which were meant to serve and protect the poor, were also inculcated within the school system, supposed to prepare the elite and later on the middle classes for this role. It also served to train the colonial administrators who were taught to see themselves as the benevolent protectors of those peoples who were deemed too weak and incapable of governing and developing themselves. Finally, the ideal of the gentleman-like behaviour was also promoted to give a sense of dignity to the working class, by suggesting to them that by behaving 'properly' they could also become 'gentlemen'. This could be realized by recognizing that, like fighting (the noble activity of the knights) working was also a noble deed. Thus the propagation of the ideal of the gentleman as the modern knight was designed to contain and overcome the growing contradictions between the owners and workers, between the rich and the poor.

There is enough evidence to argue that in general in Europe schools served with the coming of industrialization as an instrument of socialization into submissiveness and obedience. The school became a machine for learning through the development of techniques of dressage and the instilment of conformity, submissiveness and docility through the internalization of standardized norms of behaviour, in accordance with the Law.¹⁴¹ This view on education is poignantly expressed in a plea around the middle of the 19th century in the Netherlands to make schools accessible for children of

the poor: "Our schools for the poor merit all support. They are nurseries for duty and order. The poor have to learn to read, as otherwise they will not understand the will of their masters and they will not be able to obey the regulations. One should not be afraid that the poor will go wild. The only science that will be taught is the doctrine of dependence and service; it is the knowledge to be useful to one's city fellows, the fatherland and the king;¹⁴² it is the science that everybody has to keep his place in society".

Perhaps the major and most crucial form of discipline which made the growth of the market economy possible was the expulsion of women from society and their enclosure into the household, based on the spurious separation¹⁴³ of "productive work", reserved for men and "non-productive" work for women.

The separation between "public" and "domestic" life and that between work of men outside and that of women inside the house appears to be a product of an ideology which involved a radical break with previous forms of social organization. There is plenty of evidence that until the Industrial Revolution, women were fully and equally involved in all forms of economic activity and that only upon a fierce struggle, the process of expulsion could be realized. The "natural vocation" of women to devote themselves to the family was in the 19th century only confined to a small group of privileged women. There is evidence that the large majority of workers in the first phases of the Industrial Revolution consisted of women and children.

The relegation to unpaid "unproductive" work in the household appears however to have become an essential condition for the production of goods and services in an industrial society, that is to say that "shadow work" became a pre-requisite for wage labour. It appears that with the development of capitalism the "crypto-servant role of women as administrators and managers"¹⁴⁴ has been critical for the expansion of consumption. This critical service role to the maintenance and expansion of the capitalist economy was hidden by the production of a morality in which the quality of a woman was defined by the degree of devotion and sacrifice to family life. The restriction of women to this role was in turn legitimized by the ascription to women of the sacred vocation of motherhood.

The new forms of labour exploitation which were devised in the course of the Industrial Revolution and the disciplines which were developed as a strategy for containment and the instrumentalization of marginalized people, to suit the requirements of accumulation, generated multiple forms of protest and resistance. Social practices, emerging from them were then declared illegal by new legislation, proposed by land-owners and employers and by the extension of the techniques of societal surveillance.¹⁴⁵ The growth of "illegalities" was seen by owners as a dangerous sign of the rise in criminality and an indication of the inferior human "properties" of the law breakers which required increased control and surveillance. Thus one perceives a process of an accumulative nature in a society marked by contradictory interests in which the law breeds "illegality" and "illegality" new laws which in turn breed new forms of active and passive resistance. Thus the new institutional arrangements and disciplines which were being designed became breeding grounds for new forms of "criminal" and "delinquent" behaviour. The increase in "formal" illegalities" may be said to conceal the "material delinquency" of the owners which was protected by

the law but which by those who were marginalized was experienced as fundamentally unjust and contrary to the "moral law" which in their eyes should govern human relations. In the creation of new laws, the State which over the centuries had acquired a monopoly over the exercising of juridical power, played a crucial role. In the course of this process, ancient and customary law was slowly replaced by formal State law, and the earlier forms of people's right came to be increasingly regarded as inadmissible and incompatible with the demands of new forms of economic organization and its associated norms.

12. The Rationality of Socialist Labour Control

Although in political and ideological theory and practice, capitalist and socialist positions have as a rule been perceived as sharply contradictory and antagonistic, I propose in this essay that they nevertheless may be said to have a common origin in their valuation of labour.

It is not surprising that Thomas More in whose Utopia labour discipline and regimentation are essential to the elimination of poverty and the creation of security of livelihood for all, has been seen both as a precursor of capitalism and socialism.¹⁴⁶ More's Utopia is only one among many writings from the 16th century onwards which served to combat ancient legends about an ideal society. In these legends society is a place of leisure where labour has no place. They were for centuries quite popular among the common people who resisted and rebelled against any form of wage labour. Official history writing has hardly given any attention to the popular struggles in defense of people's own cultures, the traditional networks of people, their domains of subsistence and their eradication by force, a process which by Illich has been called "a 500-year war to destroy the environmental conditions for human survival."¹⁴⁷

Marx forcefully challenged the foundations of capitalist development by pointing to the exploitative and alienating nature of wage labour as a condition for the growth and concentration of property and capital. Yet at the same time, he also, more than any philosopher before him, glorified labour as the only source of wealth and the foundation on which the proletariat would bring into being a new society, free from exploitation and based on human dignity and freedom. In actual fact, Marx praised the bourgeoisie for revolutionizing the productive process and raising labour productivity. Although on the one hand Marx viewed communism as the movement towards the reign of freedom, in which labour would have been abolished, as the highest ideal, he looked at the same time at labour as a necessity and a supreme value. Free labour would be the natural fruit of revolution which would allow the proletariat "to use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e. of the proletariat organised as a ruling class, and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible."¹⁴⁸

Marx and Engels foresaw a long transitional period in which all the means of production would be centralized in the hands of the State. They took over from the French utopian Louis Blanc¹⁴⁹ the idea of conscripting agricultural and industrial reserve armies.

Thus it can be argued that, rather than viewing Marx's socialism, in its initial conception, as an extreme alternative to capitalism, it might be

more appropriately viewed, with regard to its valuation of labour, its emphasis on abstinence, discipline, the negation of self-indulgence and other puritan values, as the perfection of an ideology of labour which had only been imperfectly formulated by the intellectuals who provided the moral legitimation for wage labour under capitalism.¹⁵⁰ Marx saw as the primary rational objective of the human being maximizing production by achieving total control over the transformation of the earth and its resources to secure the most effective forms of its exploitation.¹⁵¹ His vision on progress was identical to the view on growth which had inspired the dynamics of capitalist expansion which he admired so much as the "historical mission" of the bourgeoisie.

In the initial stage of the Russian revolution, the old capitalist forms of labour discipline were denounced, to be replaced by a new comradely labour discipline. As Bukharin and Preobrazhensky argued, this new discipline was not to be imposed by masters making use of the capitalist whip, but it would be sustained by the labour organizations themselves. Henceforth, labour discipline would be inspired by the class consciousness of every worker. Those who would fail to be responsible by slackness or carelessness would be considered a contemptible loafer, a blackleg and a traitor to his class.¹⁵²

Anarchist ideas about self-management, workers' autonomy and control over production were at the roots of the establishment of the Soviets, the workers' councils which came into being as the fruit of spontaneous uncoordinated movements by workers during the 1905 revolution. With the outbreak of the 1917 revolution, the workers once again spontaneously took over the factories and the Soviets were revived at their own initiative, taking the Bolsheviks by surprise. Lenin admitted that the masses of peasants and workers were a hundred times further to the left than the Bolsheviks. The prestige and popularity of the Soviets was however so great that it was only in their name and at their behest that the October resurrection could be launched.¹⁵³ It was by launching the slogan "All power to the Soviets", that the Bolshevik Party was able to rally the soviets behind it, as they saw it as the instrument to bring about a recognition of their own ideals of self-management. At the Trade-Union Congress in the spring of 1918 Lenin still described the factories as self-governing communes of producers and consumers.

From its very inception however, the Bolshevik Party opposed anarchism as a threat to the need for central control and planning of society and the economy which required in its view a single concentrated power and direction. Already in 1918, Lenin pronounced himself in favour of a single will in the management of enterprises and the unconditional obeisance of the workers to the direction of the enterprises. In June 1918, he told the Congress of Factory Councils: "You must become basic cells of the State".¹⁵⁴

The change from support for the recognition of the power of the Soviets as organs of basic democracy of the workers towards their instrumentalization as organs of the State was not surprising to those who were acquainted with the political philosophy of the Bolshevik Party. From its inception, it had conceived of the State as the "dictatorship of the proletariat" or as "a bourgeois State without the bourgeoisie"¹⁵⁵ as Lenin defined the new State organization in his State and Revolution, at the eve of the October Revolution. The transition to communism which would imply the withering away of the State would in Lenin's view be a slow process of long duration.

To construct a new socialist society, the Party only had to free the State from its capitalist character "to give direction to the uncivilized masses, so as to educate them for socialism and maximally enhance in this way the development of productive forces".¹⁵⁶

Lenin had little confidence in the creativity and capabilities of the common people. He considered the peasantry backward and barbarian as a result of what Engels had called oriental despotism.¹⁵⁷ Lenin viewed the Bolshevik Party as the only legitimate instrument of the Proletariat which could give leadership through the State and the Bureaucracy to a process of accelerated modernization along the lines of Western Europe and the United States of America.

The need for the subordination of the workers to the Bolshevik Party was forcefully argued by Trotsky at the 3rd Congress of Unions in April 1920 where he said: "Without various forms of governmental coercion which constitute the basis for the militarization of labour, the replacement of the capitalist economy by a socialist economy would remain a fiction. Is it really true that obligatory work has always been unproductive?.... The organization of serfdom has under certain conditions meant progress, and has led to an increase of production and productivity of every worker".¹⁵⁸ This vision of Trotsky was based on the presumption that man was basically a lazy animal and that force had to be relied upon to make him work. In that sense Trotsky's views on the working people were identical to those of the Tzarist landed aristocracy and bureaucracy. Lenin was inspired by the model of German state capitalism, with State monopoly of public services and the promotion of "iron discipline".¹⁵⁹ In 1918 Lenin argued: "It is our task to learn State capitalism from the Germans, to adopt it with all our force, not to eschew any dictatorial means to speed up its introduction, just like Peter the Great carried through the transfer of western culture by barbarian Russia, without being afraid to use barbarian methods of struggle against barbarity".¹⁶⁰ Basically Lenin relied on a mechanistic transfer into socialist society of dominant concepts and forms of science, technology and organization, as they had been developed and used in Western industry. Once these had been brought under socialist management,¹⁶¹ he thought the main problem was solved and the road to socialism was open.

From December 1920 on, with the start of the 10th Congress of the Bolshevik Party, the movement in defence of workers' autonomy and self-management was repressed. It was argued that formal democracy had to be made subordinate to the interest of the revolution and that the aims of this movement were at least partly inspired by counter-revolutionary ideas and would lead to anarchy. It was also at this Congress that new rules for internal discipline within the Party were adopted which, upon Lenin's death, were used to restrict open discussion and sanction any members of the Central Committee of the Party who would dissent.¹⁶²

Within the Party itself, a workers' opposition arose which demanded a return to the democracy of the Soviets and to self-management. The leaders of this opposition were the first ones, threatened by the new procedures, Alexandra Kolontai, one of the leaders of the Opposition, distributed during the Congress a pamphlet, asking for freedom of initiative and organization for the trade unions and for a "Congress of producers" to elect a central administrative organ for the national economy. Her brochure was confiscated and banned.¹⁶³ At the 11th Congress of the Bolshevik Party in March 1922, the Opposition was officially condemned in view of its anarchist, petit-bourgeois tendencies which favoured those who opposed the revolution. In

her brochure, Kolontai vehemently denounces the elitist bureaucratic tendencies in the Party which, in order to secure know how, relied on administrative and technological cadres, which in her view, were wholly alien to the interest of the common people. She also fustigated Lenin, Trotsky and other leading members of the Bolshevik Party for exclusively reserving power to the Party and turning the unions into mere instruments of education.¹⁶⁴ Indirectly she accused the Party of betraying the revolution, by excluding the masses from initiative and participation in the making of their own society.

13. The rationality of socialist accumulation:

The need for the emergence of an authoritarian state in which power in all its dimensions would be wholly centralized was at the very roots of the vision on social transformation. This view was, from its inception, dominant in the Bolshevik Party. It was judged essential in order to crush internal opposition and rebellion and control labour so as to secure rapid accumulation. In this interpretation, the terror, applied by Stalin against his opponents within the Party, in the collectivization campaigns and in the organization of forced labour, was not the outcome of a personal deviation and immorality. Rather Stalin was the faithful executive of a dominant conception in the Party on the question how to secure the necessary conditions for economic growth, that is how to create suitable conditions for surplus appropriation and concentration by maximizing labour control and the concentrated application of science and technology to production.

The implication of this choice was that the Russian workers had to be subjected to the same kind of suffering which characterized the emergence and development of the process of primitive accumulation in Europe.¹⁶⁵ The expropriation of the peasantry in Western Europe and the development of concentrated forms of private accumulation took centuries. In Russia, this process was hastened and at the same time legitimized by the threat of internal and external enemies and by the refusal of Western Europe to support the Revolution. Given the dominant view of the Bolshevik Party, it had to be carried out in a very brief time span. Centralization of control and management to secure accumulation "was never paid for with so much sweat, tears and blood by peasants and workers".¹⁶⁶

The development by the State of a vast array of methods and techniques of oppressive control and surveillance may at the same time be seen as a direct consequence of the failure by the Party and the State to obtain legitimacy.¹⁶⁷

In the absence of any form of cultural hegemony by the Communist Party, which would secure the free and active consent and support by the large majority of the population, in the sense defined by Gramsci, the Party was forced to create a language, culture and doctrine, based on an enforced morality of loyalty and obedience. This was in turn rooted in a strictly utilitarian ethic, formulated by Lenin in his dictum: "We recognize neither freedom, nor equality, nor labour democracy if they are opposed to the interests of the emancipation of labour from the oppression of capital".¹⁶⁸

The priority given to the development of productive forces thus tended to condition the social process and came to play a role similar to that of accumulation under capitalism. In Western Europe, accumulation as a process over centuries resulted from changes in the structure of domination as the bourgeoisie replaced and grew out of the feudal aristocracy. The industrial

revolution only emerged as the final phase of the process of social transformation. In Marx's thinking, socialism would emerge as the fruit of the fullest development of productive forces in capitalism. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party appropriated Marx's conception to suit the need of their country. They inverted the relationship between accumulation as scientific and technological rationality and the process of social transformation, inspired as they were by the ideology of "scientific socialism" which then required its own forms of social and political rationality.¹⁶⁹

The legitimation which the Bolshevik Party sought in advocating maximum accumulation as the foundation for progress and as the condition for wealth was identical to that, promoted by Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations*. This choice of strategy made it no longer necessary to seek legitimacy in its origins, like it had been the case with the bourgeoisie in Western Europe, but in a future seen as a promise of plenty for all. However, like in Western Europe, the idea of progress through accumulation was to serve to secure stability and unify social classes and groups with contradictory interests, by educating them to understand their "true interests" and prefer harmony over chaos.¹⁷⁰

Rather than judging the subordination and oppression of labour from a moral perspective, it is more enlightening to look at it, I propose, as the outcome of a rational choice within the parameters, set in the eyes of the Bolshevik Party by the backwardness of the workers and the peasantry, the weakness of the development of the productive forces and the external threat. In this context, the bases for accumulation had, in the absence of significant foreign aid, to be created by expropriation and the concentration of surplus on the one hand and large scale proletarianization on the other. The process of proletarianization was both an expression of the deep seated contempt for the working people by the Bolshevik leading intellectuals and the strategy of accumulation, geared to priority for heavy industry. As a result of this, the livelihood of the masses had to be kept at a minimum. In this view, forced labour in its various forms, including camps, were essential to the strategy pursued.¹⁷¹ The first decree establishing concentration camps to isolate class enemies to protect the Republic dates from 5 September 1918. The idea was launched by Lenin who proposed that "doubtful people had to be closed up in concentration camps".¹⁷² The idea of the re-education of labour was launched to legitimize a development strategy which allowed the regime to make use of a labour force whose vital needs were limited to a strict minimum.

After liberation in 1949, China initially followed the same approach to industrial accumulation as the Soviet Union but had to give it up after the Soviet Union's withdrawal. Subsequently, the Party turned necessity into virtue and under the leadership of Mao, embarked on another approach to achieve the aim of industrial accumulation. From the beginning, however, its rural policies had been radically different from those of the Soviet Union. While in the Soviet Union, collectivization served to establish centralised state control, over collective farms, in China collectivization was rooted in decentralization and self-management. The different path which China took in its rural policies, has its roots in the qualitatively different genesis of the revolutionary process in China where the social revolution which started in the 1920s was above all a peasant revolution. The Communist Party achieved its mass support for the Revolution by promising a radical land reform. It was called the 'sharing property Party' by the rural peasantry. At the same time, it was clear to the Party that in

the absence of capital and in view of China's very large population, taking on the Russian approach of centralized accumulation would have disastrous implications. It, therefore, rejected the option of giving primacy to the development of productive forces at the expense of the peasantry. This policy was fully articulated by the creation of the communes based on the conception that the optimum transformation of production relations, combined with an all out emphasis on ideological persuasion would by itself serve as a source of creativity which in turn would enhance the development of productive forces. The transformation of the State, culture and ideology would create for China the best conditions for accumulation. The compound effect of a multiplicity of small scale investments would be higher than that of limited number of large concentrated investments.¹⁷³ Upon the death of Mao, the Chinese leadership chose a radically new direction. It was herein supported by many intellectuals who suffered from the implementation of Mao's policies as well as by significant sections of the workers and the peasantry. The support for the new strategy suggests that the accumulation strategy followed by Mao had generated considerable resistance and that the Party, bent on speeding up economic growth, decided to abandon it. It seems probable that Mao's strategy, in spite of its avowed attempt to improve the livelihood of the masses, and at the same time secure central accumulation although through decentralized management, met more and more opposition. The new leadership gave up the centrally planned and controlled strategy and created conditions for free market economy, relying on foreign capital, science and technology. It has been argued that Mao's strategy failed, precisely because he tried to prevent a massive process of proletarianization by the creation of the communes and implicitly secure a relative high degree of equality and security of livelihood.¹⁷⁴

China was able to secure a rate of economic growth that has been higher than that of most third world countries over the period 1950-1978. This growth was largely achieved through the mobilisation of domestic resources, unlike in most other countries which mainly relied on foreign aid and whose economic structures became increasingly distorted by their dependent incorporation into the world economy. Contrary to earlier 'socialist' experience, accumulation in China was realized by the communes for two thirds while only one third was taken care of by the central state.¹⁷⁵ In this sense China's policies have been unmatched. Yet from the middle of the 1970s onward, a gradual change in policy orientation became visible which accelerated since 1978. This change led to a radical break with the premises and political practices which had become dominant in China's strategy and policies since liberation until the mid 1970's.

This break was sealed at the third plenary session of the eleventh Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in 1978. It was based on the following three propositions:

- consumption and living standards had to be urgently raised and correspondingly rates of accumulation had to be reduced.
- unemployment and underemployment had reached serious proportions which required a change in the structure of the economy.
- existing production relations had become a fetter to the development of productive forces and had to be changed.

What initially seemed as a continuous attempt to promote development of the private economy within a framework of the collective economy, gained momentum since 1978 through the step by step dismantling of the collective rural economy, so as to create room for private initiative and higher rates of

growth by raising productivity through technical advance and higher efficiency.

There is evidence that the rural rate of net investment and the degree of self-finance in the 1960s and the 1970s were higher than was assumed by many outsiders. In hindsight, it appears likely that accumulation in the communes would have been much lower, if the peasantry had been free to make their own choice. In other words, if they had not been pushed into favouring accumulation over consumption by the cadres who were in charge of putting Party policy on income distribution into effect, a policy which stressed capital accumulation at the expense of absolute levels of consumption. This policy could only be realized by maintaining a highly egalitarian approach through collectivization and the undisputed control of the Party over the economy and the mechanisms of accumulation and distribution at the expense of private initiative. In the philosophy of the new approach, this control has been called, 'bureaucratism' and 'commandism', which stifled freedom and initiative. There is however evidence that the new policies are inspired by the same commandism which inspired earlier policies in which the "imperious" bureaucracy dictated to the peasantry what they must do.¹⁷⁶

It could be argued, in hindsight, that it was the very success of the collective economy in terms of accumulation which generated all the pressures for change within the party as well as amongst the masses, as it was felt that no acceleration in growth could be expected unless the collective economy could be relaxed, among the peasantry, since it was the very sacrifice which the peasantry had been pushed into which engendered pressures for a better life.

As a result of these pressures, little has been left of the Maoist approach, with private initiative taking precedence over collective effort, personal income and wealth over collective income and wealth, capital (in the form of science and technology) over collective labour mobilization, division of labour and specialized exchange over self-reliance and self-sufficiency and mobility of labour over attachment of labour to existing production units.

As a result of these radical changes in policy, short term growth may be considerable, but it is also inevitable that with the rapid growth of capital¹⁷⁷ and income differentiation, social and economic inequality will grow. Along with the concentration of wealth in the hands of a new class of landlords and new rich farmers, landlessness and poverty will grow. Chinese planners have recently advocated that cropland should eventually be concentrated in the hands of 30 or 40% of the peasant households. Such a plan implies that the rest or 60 or 70% of all peasants should find employment in other ways either through rural industrialization or other branches of production. Present policies are however hardly geared to the realization of such alternative policies. On the contrary these permit unchecked private accumulation and are in no way designed to prevent massive polarization which will result from these policies.¹⁷⁸ As a result of this, there may also be an upturn in birth rates as poor people seek new ways of social security for old age with the disintegration of the security provided for by the collective economy.

At the same time, with the growth of personal accumulation and wealth, and with the disintegration of the communes and even more primary forms of collective organisation (brigades and teams), there is likely to be a decline in rural capital formation and the production of rural capital

goods. Thus long term growth may be sacrificed at the expense of short term gains. Under the present conditions, the central State will not be able to make up for the decline in collective accumulation by and within communes.

Maoist policies had many coercive features and were at times characterized by large scale violence against particular groups of the population who resisted conformity or were distrusted as actual or potential opponents. Although formally, there was, as observed before, a high degree of decentralization and self-management, these had been designed as such in function of its suitability to facilitate and intensify the process of central accumulation. This entailed both pressure for ideological conformity on people and to labour. Sympathizers of Maoist policies in the West, who stressed its egalitarian features and its guarantees of livelihood for the large majority, tended to undervalue its coercive features and the violence they generated, as these were seen as "inevitable" and to be condoned in view of the higher good (bonum commune) they would lead to.

Although different in form, one might argue that to secure maximum growth and catch up with the West, both China and the Soviet Union were inspired by the same objective. Post-Mao China shifted its policies to be in a better position to reach that objective. This implied also a radical change in the conception of human rights and social justice, as economic growth, with the eradication of the Maoist approach, has, like in the Soviet Union and in the capitalist North has become the overriding objective. Closely associated with this approach is also the re-appearance of the orthodox Marxist view on the backwardness of the peasantry which also inspired Lenin and Bolshevik policies and which can be traced back¹⁷⁹ to the view of Marx himself, as he expressed it in the Eighteenth Brumaire.

The resurgence of private property as a central basic right and its legal enhancement and protection inevitably entails the break up of the acquired "socialist" rights by peasants and workers during the Mao period. As they are bound to resist this challenge on their acquired rights, the government will in turn be obliged to take measures against the rise of "illegalities" which will result from attempts to protect or effectuate their acquired rights on livelihood. This in turn will press the government to protect the new social arrangements and institutionalized forms of inequality, not only by the expansion of a protective apparatus (new forms of control and surveillance, expansion of the police) but also by the production of a new hegemonic value system which will legitimize the new order. The revitalization of the confucianist tradition which is part of the new policies may be of crucial importance for this purpose both in terms of its support for an authoritarian structure of social relations based on the recognition of status, duty discipline and obedience as well as with regard to the revaluation of science and technology, which are seen as crucial to China's present modernization by its leadership.¹⁸⁰

14. Marx, Social justice and human rights

In Marx view, human rights as they developed in Western Europe as a fruit of the hegemony by the bourgeoisie contained the very negation of these rights. He saw all human rights as merely an extension of the inalienable right on private property which challenged the very foundation of a society, based on solidarity as the expression of man's nature as a social being. Like it is expressed in the Roman dictum "summum ius, summa iniuria", he saw in the full exercise of the right of private property the violation of all other rights. In this sense, Marx viewed human rights in bourgeois society as the very instruments to sanction and legitimize ruthless profit seeking and limitless egoism.¹⁸¹ Marx pointed out that the ideals of freedom and equality of the French revolution, and which were formally expressed in equality and freedom of all citizens before the law, in actual fact concealed the absence of equality in the social and economic domain. Thus Marx viewed human rights as the ideological manifestation of bourgeois society concealing the class nature of it. In his view, formal equality before the law and freedom of contract as cornerstones in the evolution of Western democracy actually sanctioned the class asymmetry of the capitalist market. It might indeed be argued that the early emergence of individual freedoms and equality before the law in Western Europe could be considered part of the very creation of capitalist society, as they served to consolidate the class structure of capitalism.

As to the realization of political rights, the result of the struggle by the West European working class for universal franchise and their rights on political organization and representation through the creation of social democratic parties was not to weaken but to stabilize and complete the institutional mediation of power in capitalist society. Concerning the realization of social and economic rights, it has been pointed out that the growth of welfare rights which followed the introduction of universal franchise and the emergence of social democracy was initiated in order to diminish opposition by the working class and that the extension of welfare provisions of which the costs are largely born by the working class themselves, have served the interests of the dominant class as they helped to maximize workers' efficiency.¹⁸² In that sense the working population has itself contributed to the creation of mechanisms used to control it and which served to postpone and mitigate situations of crisis.

At the same time, the right of citizens under capitalism to be freely critical of existing socio-economic arrangements and undertake transformational action in order to change the prevailing order has always been seriously limited by the unjust and unequal distribution of economic, social, cultural and political power. Since the times of Marx, the capacity for control has immensely grown with the growth of the range of instruments for manipulation. Among these, especially worth mentioning are the recent means of mass communication which have revolutionised the techniques of the manipulation and management of human consciousness. These have helped to give the capitalist class a vital tool in its struggle against countervailing movements. It is hardly controversial to observe that, since Marx, political emancipation through the rule of Law, originally designed as a guarantee for citizens to secure freedom against the arbitrary use of State power and against the abuse of State power by governments and the servants of the State, has shown severe limitations, in view of the class nature of society. But this critique, as has been the case in Marxist orthodox

circles, should not serve to argue the absolute incompatibility of bourgeois and socialist democracy. How could socialism develop as a movement towards freedom through social and political emancipation and liberation, if it is based on the repudiation rather than the deepening and completion of the civil and political rights which are the fruit of the bourgeoisie democratic revolutions.¹⁸³

As for the societies in the South of the capitalist periphery, there is abundant evidence that the destruction of democratic governments and freedoms, which derived their legitimacy from mass support for nationalist inspired policies of self-reliance, has been crucial to the establishment of military dictatorships. These were in many cases established with the strategic support and intervention by the capitalist core countries and in particular the by USA as a condition for the protection and expansion of interests of the 'free world'.¹⁸⁴

It could be argued that the indifference and at times even the outright hostility of the 'left' towards democracy has very much contributed to discredit the ideals of socialism.¹⁸⁵ It has greatly helped the 'right' to appropriate and champion the cause of democracy in theory, while in practice it promoted the destruction of freedom in the name of the 'free world'.

The above analysis supports the view that the separation of economic and political spheres was made necessary in Europe by the growing concentration of capital and the need to diffuse class conflict. On the other hand the actual decline of laissez faire, in spite of the ideological insistence on its prevalence, and the growing role of the State in intervening and regulating the economy in the industrialized capitalist societies, can only be explained as a response to the need to prevent the growth of class conflict, as an inherent feature of capitalist society. The rightly critical view by Marx on the inadequacy of social and economic rights gave much impetus to workers' movements in the West. Their fights however paradoxically promoted their more effective integration into capitalist society. This was not only accepted but even welcomed by the bourgeoisie, as capital concentration advanced and the internal market had to be developed. The institutional critique by Marx on the inadequacy of social and economic rights had its counterpoint in his uncritical utopian view on the nature of a future socialist state. In view of its socialist character, upon the transformation of private into social property and the disappearance of alienation, the State would have no need, in Marx's view, to protect human rights, as these were mere bourgeois rights. The critical stance on the dubious nature of human rights which Marx had on Western bourgeois society was shared by the Bolshevik leaders. They had the same contempt as Marx for civil liberties and parliamentary democracy,¹⁸⁶ in capitalist society. Democracy, in the view of Marx, could only be a fruit of socialism.

In its strategies, the Bolshevik leadership undercut any prospects for a new democratic socialist society which would be established upon the transitional period of total power by the vanguard party. The latter as "the representative of the proletariat" would run the State and secure central accumulation. In order to guarantee the unhampered appropriation of surplus and neutralize any challenge to its tasks, the Party had to destroy from the outset any institutions which would empower the working people to achieve mastery over their conditions, abolish the division between rulers and ruled and enable the direct exercise of democratic power by the working people through their own councils and communes.

Although one may disagree with Marx on his outright rejection of the validity of human rights and bourgeois democracy, one may still recognize the validity of his fundamental critique on the limited nature of these rights.

The view on the socialist State which inspired Marx was intimately related to his conception of socialism as a social formation marked by a superior form of rationality. This rationality was achieved through central control and planning which was absent in capitalism and which would replace the uncontrollable market. Socialism in his conception, by its rational control over economic life, would complete the process of rationalization at the individual plane, initiated by capitalism, through the overall organization of man's life at the collective level. It was also this vision of Marx which has decisively contributed to the emergence of the authoritarian socialist state. At the same time however Marx viewed socialism as the transition towards the withering away of the State by the liberation of men from the coercion, imposed on them by capital so that, as he formulated it in *The Communist Manifesto*, "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all." This premise by Marx on the transcendence of the State was based on the expectation that the abolition of private property in the economic sphere would result in the fusion of the "political"¹⁸⁷ and the "economic" and "political" power as such would disappear. The evolution of socialist societies showed however a development in the opposite direction: the centralization of political control in a Party which held monopolistic power, and the growing separation of the State from society as an independent centre of power, run by an unaccountable bureaucracy. It is this bureaucracy which runs the State, under the control of the Party, on behalf of all. In that sense, there was little scope for the development of the utopia in socialist society Marx dreamt of in spite of his deterministic overtones in his main writings. At the core of this Utopian vision which inspired Marx in his early writings like in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of 1844 was a view of people's alienation from his real being which had and has radical social and political implications for any regime in power. It also inspired him to denounce in his theses on Feuerbach the Materialist doctrine that "men are merely products of circumstances and upbringing and to argue that it is men who change circumstances and that the educator must himself be educated". The return in China to an exclusive emphasis on the deterministic strands in Marx's thinking, which also inspired the Bolshevik Party, logically have led the Chinese Communist Party to repudiate "the fallacy of egalitarianism" in a way reminiscent of Stalin's campaigns against egalitarian strivings, only worthy in his view of "a primitive sect of ascetic monks".¹⁸⁸ Thus inevitably social justice is to be viewed as inherent in the functioning of the system in which the prevalence of human rights is understood to be there, without further questioning.

In the capitalist "North", the dream of freedom from alienation ideal has more recently inspired multiple movement groups to search for personal self-realization, in the face of the new techniques and pressures for increased integration into monopoly capitalism, through the extension of State control and the monopoly of transnational capital. This search for personal self-realization, has its juridical ground in the inalienable rights of self-determination vis-a-vis State power¹⁸⁹ and the concentrated power of multi-national capital, which have in multiple ways become more mutually

dependent and supportive. The realization of these rights is also an integral part of the aims of major social movements in the North for a fundamental transformation of society. In their radical implications, the ecological, the women's, the peace and the anti-racist third world movements challenge the very foundations on which the development of capitalist society has been built.¹⁹⁰

15. Recent patterns of accumulation

The ideology of unilinear development as economic growth through the rational and systematic application of science and technology is both at the roots of the dynamics of capitalism and at the core of socialist development philosophy, with its overriding emphasis on the development of productive forces.¹⁹¹ The very pursuit of this ideology has been propagated by the North in the South and has led towards the latter's dependent integration into the economies of the industrialized capitalist societies. As a result of this, already existing patterns of uneven appropriation of surplus, created during the colonial period, were intensified, due to the growing cooperation between Northern and Southern elite, in the pursuit of accelerated accumulation and profit.

The mounting disequilibrium in the "peripheral" societies resulting from uneven patterns of production distribution and consumption has had catastrophic implications for the conditions of livelihood of the majority. They are condemned to mass starvation and poverty. These cannot be seen as incidental phenomena due to unfortunate mismanagement and lack of capability but as the very condition on which the survival of capitalism hinges, although at the same time it increases its instability and vulnerability.

The massive growth of indebtedness has enabled the capitalist industrial countries to impose measures which aggravate dependency. It enhances their power to dictate internal policies which weaken the autonomous capacity of the dependent States and which dramatically worsen the plight of the masses. A major instrument of the Industrialized countries to secure their domination over the South is the International Monetary Fund (IMF) whose measures invariably include devaluation, controls over public spending, restrictions on subsidies to compensate for the declining incomes of the poorest sections of the population and further openings for foreign investment.¹⁹²

The growing capacity of the West to intervene in the national economies of the South is illustrated by the recent suggestion of the President of the Bank for International Settlements which as the leading "central" Bank of the industrial countries has actively participated with the IMF in debt-negotiations: "One possibility for the countries in question, as an alternative way, to reduce their debt burden, would be to "sell some of their national assets to their creditors."¹⁹³

The rise of mass poverty as a result of the expansion of monopoly capital through the process of the transnationalization of capital has not resulted in mass poverty in the North, as Marx expected. Labour was integrated into the capitalist venture, although the basic antagonism between capital and labour did not disappear. This antagonism tends however to rise again as a result of the new spurs for intensified accumulation. These result from pressures for technological change and the attempts by transnationals to recoup their share of the surplus, which is challenged by labour, faced with rising prices.¹⁹⁴

The rise of authoritarian governments in the South cannot be disconnected from the need of Northern transnational capital and the associated industrial States, which back them up, to increasingly control its resources and labour, to offset its crisis of continuous rises of cost by new avenues of profit. The vision by some radicals in the USA of their democracy as predatory, a view which might be extended to the other capitalist industrialized countries as well, seems legitimate insofar as counter-revolutionary foreign policy, based on an enormous and terrifying military establishment, has been essential to defend and promote corporate interests.¹⁹⁵ One of the major ways by the North to offset downturns and loss of profit is through weapons' production. It has been pointed out that it was not the New Deal that pulled the United States out of the depression but the Second World War and that since that time military expenditures played a crucial role in sustaining aggregate demand, thereby preventing a major depression.¹⁹⁶ Both the Korean War in the 1950s and the Vietnamese War in the 1960s were crucial in triggering off a boom in the leading industrial countries as well as in many third world countries.¹⁹⁷

With the growing pressure on transnational capital to control resources and cheap labour in the South, the need of the leading industrial democracies to press and support governments in the South to quell internal revolts and rebellions which respond to the quest for survival and livelihood by the rightless and impoverished masses, also increases. At the same time also the struggles for social justice, democracy and livelihood engender new ideological forms of legitimation of authoritarian rule in defense of the "free world".

Although it is quite true that liberalism in practice has often been a cloak for oppression, this cannot be a reason to simply reject liberal democracy and more particularly the liberal ideals of tolerance and the protection against the arbitrary abuse of authority. But awareness of it helps to develop a more sober and realistic view of the nature of what is considered as a most precious heritage. The preservation of this heritage and its development by new forms of economic and social democracy will crucially depend on the transformation of capitalism towards systems of more direct forms of democratic control. These require the creation of new forms of consciousness and creativity which go beyond the ones which have been the foundation of Western rationality, as it crystallized in the pursuit of science and technology as the basis for accumulation. What is known as formal democracy - which it would be wrong to deride for its marked great progress - has in many ways become obsolete, as it is no longer capable of providing people with the possibility to enhance the quality of life and develop their own potential for creative self-realization.¹⁹⁸ Distributory and participatory justice demand a radical restructuring of control of the unprecedented concentration of power by way of the democratization of control over science and technology.¹⁹⁹ They also call for a radical transformation of hegemonic social sciences, rooted in the Baconian/Newtonian/Cartesian world view which has become obsolete in view of the rise of new paradigms in science since Einstein. Based on ever continuing and expanding economic growth, they are bound to bring about social catastrophe and environmental disaster.²⁰⁰

Economic theories which legitimize the present pattern of "development" are still rooted in the persistent myth of equilibrium. They refuse to recognize that surplus is a historical category which is essentially based on inequality and corresponds to a specific power structure,²⁰¹ alien to any

kind of equilibrium in a real sense. Historically where labour has tried to improve its real income, enterprises have defended the maintenance and increase of their share of the surplus by the search for cheaper labour, new technology and higher prices, rendered possible by the development of oligopoly and monopoly, with the support of the State. Thus inflation reflects the power of the corporations to offset rising costs and discharge them on to society²⁰² by way of settling disputes by passing the costs along in higher prices. In this way Keynes theory to secure equilibrium was absorbed by the corporations and the recognition²⁰³ by governments of corporate interests as representing the general interest. Keynes focussed on the domestic market. Since then the global dynamics of capitalism and the growth of the political power of the mega-corporations have challenged the applicability of his theory.

With the attack by the corporations on the incomes of workers and their acquired social welfare and security rights, so as to enhance their own share of the surplus and increase²⁰⁴ the cashflow, to secure technological development, essential to survival, the ideology of equal opportunities, in the face of a rise in social and economic inequality, acquired ever more strategic importance. It is this ideology which originally provided the justification for the theory of the "free" market on which individuals as equals would compete. Social service and social welfare provisions were essential to the creation of political stability and the development of the domestic market but they have never had any lasting redistributive effects serving to overcome inequality. The theory of equal opportunities which inspired classical liberalism has in reality proven to be the best instrument to legitimize and reinforce the principle²⁰⁵ of social inequality, as the foundation for capitalist development.

It is closely linked to that other ideological instrument which served to legitimize the position of the bourgeoisie: the theory of abstinence and the reward for sacrifice as the moral basis for the uneven distribution of surplus between capital and labour. It is frequently those who claim the rich to be the bearers of abstinence that are loudest in their assertions that, if incomes were less equally distributed and the incomes of the poor were raised, capital accumulation would decline. If the latter was true, then it would seem that the final incidence of this cost of saving must lie not upon the rich, but upon the restricted consumption of the poor which alone²⁰⁶ permits high incomes to be earned from which the bulk of investment is drawn.

Whatever may have been the moral and political implications of inequality, manifest in the mechanisms of ideological and institutional control over the labouring people, investment was always conditional upon prior accumulation and could not exceed it, with as a result a relative state of equilibrium.

With the large-scale creation and expansion of bank-credit however, this situation has been reversed and investment has come to precede capital accumulation. Due to the resulting inflation, the majority of people under present-day capitalism are expropriated daily of a fraction of their real income without due process of law or an equitable indemnification, as the gap between monetary incomes in²⁰⁷ the form of wages and salaries and real income/purchasing power widens. This contemporary form of legalized theft by way of the institutionalization of the "right to steal" by the controllers and suppliers of capital, science and technology increasingly draws the whole world into an incontainable process of inflation. This

stimulates both the expropriation of assets and income and the subsequent centralization and concentration of capital and power.

The common people everywhere, irrespective of social systems, whether in the North or the South, in East or West, tend to resist austerity measures which challenge their basic right to livelihood. Without the growth towards new societies in which the majority of people acquire effective capacity to gain democratic control over the mechanisms of accumulation and the production of science and technology which feed it, the spiral towards authoritarian forms of State control, the repression and curtailment of labour and social and economic rights and the further destruction of nature is unavoidable. The confrontation between classes and groups over the allocation and distribution of surplus takes place through the control over the State as the main instrument of power and force to regulate the redistribution of political power, the changes in the social structure and the distribution of wealth and income in alliance with transnational capital.²⁰⁸ The transformation of control over the State and its democratization is therefore also essential to strike at the roots of the massive violation of human rights, producing and reproducing mass poverty.

The economic crisis and the very nature of the capitalist development process press however for the maintenance and further build up of strong States, able to secure social and political "equilibrium" in the face of the continuing and deepening trend towards mass impoverishment, reflected in the exclusion of the poor from society both as producers and consumers. This very process generates pressures for democratization which are at times, like in Latin America, reinforced by the blatant failure of authoritarian regimes to perform. They have discredited themselves, not only in the eyes of the labouring people but also among sections of the middle class and even segments of the bourgeoisie which used the military before as a shield against popular demands. This new democratic ideology is anti-state and inspired by visions on self-government and the socialization of power as well as by the expansion of spheres of life that are under personal control. Its focus is on the conquest by and restitution to the collectivity of personal capacities and potentialities.²⁰⁹ The search for new democratic forms of society in which socialization of power and room for the development of personal potentialities go together is also stimulated by the loss of credibility of revolutionary seizure of State power as a precondition to development.²¹⁰

The course on which the Soviet Union embarked implies a long period of increased material inequality at the benefit of a privileged minority which is firmly rooted in power and has developed effective ways to preserve and to protect its vested interests against mass invasion from below.²¹¹ Not only the historical origins but also the social character and the structure of this rule exclude the open admission and defence of existing inequalities and the elite is bound to portray itself as the representatives of the general interest.²¹² In China which tries to realize an accelerated process of accumulation through liberalization in order to catch up with the West, the Party also is bound to authoritarian rule. How would it otherwise be able to protect this process from the pressures of all those who would challenge the new trend and try to defend their newly acquired rights on livelihood? The latter are likely to resist the challenge to their rights on a basic income and social security which are no more recognized, as these rights are deemed incompatible with the new approach to accumulation.

16. The Quest For a New Paradigm:

The history of development as the history of modernization and the incorporation of mankind into "industrial civilization" may be read as a process of adaptation to the every time new requirements of accumulation and of the institutional, scientific and technological changes imposed by the logic of capital. This may be said to have implied the progressive subordination of all forms of creative activity to instrumental rationality and the logic of means.²¹³ The pressures for the reduction and incorporation of all forms of human consciousness and creativity towards instrumentality is manifest in the evolution of production patterns and the new forms of mass communication and education. These have brought about pervasive estrangement, indispensable to the maintenance of the industrial political and social order of the North. It is dramatically manifest in contemporary art, as the expression of pain, solitude and despair.

Processes towards the democratization of cultural, social, economic and political power can only take place with the massive emergence and resurgence of direct political activity as the principal source of creative social change through a transformation of political and economic structures which block the development of social and personal freedom. The progressive demobilization of labour in the history of the struggle of European labour unions for an equitable more human society powerfully suggests that the struggles by labour cannot be limited to the improvement of the material conditions of life only. They will have to focus at the same time on new forms of democratic control over accumulation, science and technology. The struggles by the progressive streams of the ecological movement seek to refrain capital from finding illegitimate ways out of its crisis. Capital attempts to do so by ever more externalizing its rising costs on the environment, so as to maintain and enhance profitability and survival, at the expense of the survival of mankind. The ecological movement has a close relation with the women's movement as a world-wide movement which challenges the power structure which in the development of capitalism has promoted the continuous rise of instrumental rationality. It is in this process that the earth/cosmos and human beings came to be perceived as mere objects and machines to be operated and manipulated.²¹⁴ In the women's movements there are also attempts to infuse into political and social life a new sense of responsibility for the preservation of life and the opening up of new dimensions of consciousness and creativity which have been repressed in the history of Northern development and its expansion. The pressures by it for full participation of women in political, economic and social life cannot be absorbed within the prevailing institutional and ideological framework, neither in terms of work and income nor in terms of social and political participation. The movement demands a far-reaching democratization of power in all domains. It therefore will understandably, in view of the fear and resistance it inspires, be the target of strong critique as it puts pressure on age-old patterns of hegemony in social relations and consciousness. The peace-movement challenges another way out States seek, in order to offset the decline in economic growth and legitimacy; by the massive production and sale of armaments. Its objectives also challenge the very process of instrumental rationality which is the foundation of power and accumulation. Its growth is therefore looked at with suspicion as either communist-inspired (in the West) or anti-patriotic (in the East).

Third-World movements in the West hardly show any ability to exercise effective pressure on parliaments and governments to reverse relationships with the Third World. For government, development cooperation has mainly been a mechanism for the protection and promotion of national corporate interests. This situation is tacitly accepted by the majority, as all classes and strata are incorporated in a societal constellation for which continued exploitation of the Third World is vital. The rights on livelihood there by the majority population have been replaced by the reality and prospect of mass poverty. Charity is organized at the occasion of famines which are the very consequence of integration in the dominant world economy. The production and export patterns which have resulted²¹⁵ serve to conceal the mechanisms which produce and reproduce mass poverty.

I emphasize the crucial role of socio-political movements in the West beyond class and party-bound activities and ideologies, as I see them as the streams through which new creative and transformational energies can flow to enter and change prevailing dominant social configurations. They challenge the hegemonic ethos which diminishes people's capacities of imagination and their will to seek new avenues beyond their own knowledge and the prevailing socio-economic processes which only give a materialist one-dimensional meaning to life. The exclusion of new forms of creative consciousness, values and institutions tends to lead, as Lorenz has observed, to a process of destructive involution, which is in actual fact discernable in the history of modernization, if the human species, like the animal species only admits one single criterion of adaptation to the environment.²¹⁶

The new vision of reality underlying the search for new social relations and a new relationship to the cosmos is based on the awareness of the essential inter-relatedness and interdependence of all phenomena. It transcends current disciplinary and conceptional boundaries.²¹⁷ This new paradigm is visible in many recent movements, networks and groups all over the world who strive for a new way of life by the search for and practices of new forms of awareness and solidarity with fellow women and men and with the universe. This very search demands as Michael Foucault observed liberation from the double bind which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization inherent in prevailing power structures. It presupposes the liberation of the individual persons both from the State and from the type of individualization which is linked to the State.²¹⁸ In this concept, individualization stands for the historical process of adaptation, fragmentation and alienation people have been subjected to by the development of strategies of discipline, surveillance and control which have unceasingly expanded with the growth of instrumental rationality and the rationalization of society since the early beginnings of industrial society. Its roots can be traced to the Roman empire and its expansion, in the emergence and growth of private property and the concomitant disintegration of communal modes of life discussed in the earlier part of this essay.

The search for new forms of social, economic and political organization by way of self-management as an institutional approach which offers optimum scope for participatory democracy and for the expression of the inalienable rights of self-determination is quite incompatible with the growth of strong States needed to weather the economic crisis and ensure political stability as a condition for economic growth. Yet with the declining feasibility of the present dominant economic world order and with the games of power rivalry, the quest for new democratic uses of power such as by way of self-management is more than an ideal. Its embryonic manifestations are oriented

to communally inspire forms of living in which new social relations, forms of association and solidarity are being explored. It may be observed that where self-management as an institutional practice in history has made headway, it has always been in response to long-standing pressures for centralized control and subordination, like in Yugoslavia. They are closely linked to the theory and practice of self-reliance. However, wherever in recent history self-reliance became the source of inspiration to nationalist and socialist inspired governments, the latter were opposed and undermined, as their philosophy was judged incompatible with that of the "free world".

In international law the legal validity of the concept of international public property²¹ of resources is accepted. They are the patrimony and heritage of mankind. This development of international law reflects both a need and desire by the majority of mankind. It implies the tacit recognition that there are resources over which no individual property or sovereignty can be established. This recognition maybe seen as a manifestation of a new consciousness of the necessity to share those resources which are considered vital for the survival of all. In that sense this recognition may be seen as a confirmation of the validity of the ancient practice of tribal law in which communal property was upheld to guarantee the ancient right to livelihood for all, referred to in the beginning of this essay. The very process of the monopolization of capital with its concomitant trend towards concentration of property, in the form of resource control, cries for new legal and institutional mechanisms to bring back resources under people's direct democratic control, "in patrimonio populi". These can however only come about under massive pressure for democratic control. This pressure may be helped by the very process of disintegration of the prevailing dominant order, as it exhausts itself and its legitimacy. Marx proposed that no social order would ever perish until all its production forces would have fully developed; and new higher relations of production would not emerge before the material conditions for their existence had matured in the old society itself.

It would seem that this view by Marx has never been taken seriously, neither by those who actually carried out a socialist revolution nor by those who hoped on a revolution in the industrialized countries (the North) or in the incorporated South and saw it "around the corner", every time a crisis occurred. It may be argued that the nature of the present crisis is symptomatic of a profound and prolonged upheaval which manifests a long-term structural crisis of the very style of transnational capitalism. It should nevertheless be recognized that capitalism has always proved to be highly creative and resilient, although a new Keynes who gives an effective answer to Marx on the trend towards self-disintegration by capital has not yet appeared. On the contrary, the old growth paradigm reigns in full force, without any attention to deep structural reforms which would be required to overcome stagnation, and the threat to mankind's survival.

It is generally recognized that the present economic crisis reflects a more fundamental spiritual crisis. Views on ways to overcome it differ. Some see it as the natural outcome of the very nature of Western development and would argue that its transcendence will result from the inevitable societal transformations. Others inversely tend to see spiritual transformation as a condition for societal transformation. As a rule, political commitment and personal growth have in "progressive" circles in the North been seen as contradictory concerns. In these circles there has been often a good deal of contempt for concern with personal growth and transformation,

as if they constituted a luxury, if not a sign of decadence. With the loss of old values and the growing disorientation and sense of meaningless and alienation which present day industrial society characterizes, there is a notable upsurge for a new search for meaning. On the one hand, it has stimulated a world-wide fundamentalist-oriented wave of religious revivalism. At the same time it has brought about an awakening to the realities of the present predicament and the search for new forms of religiosity, the promotion of awareness and of personal spiritual growth. Fundamentalism tends to lead towards retrenchment into old securities, to ward off insecurity. In most instances, it has led to support for reactionary forces, calling for moral crusades both against evil forces in capitalist modernization like in Iran as well as against socialist-inspired policies of transformation like in the USA. Movements for awakening have been and are often rooted in a radical questioning of the prevailing order and seek a way out not by first of all emphasizing structural reforms as a prior condition for a new world but through a radical confrontation with and transformation of the personal self. They are based on the premise that for a new more peaceful and harmonious world to come about, personal self-transformation is essential, so that persons as individuals become aware of their own contradictions, resolve these and can begin new relationships with others and with the universe. In politically "progressive" and "radical" circles, the often hesitant and grudging admission of the relevance of the value of personal growth and transformation is closely related to the declining attraction of existing socialism and their mechanically assumed function as models for new liberating social relations. This hesitation is explained by the often one-sided spiritualistic focus, the elitist character and the disregard²²⁰ for the realities of power within such movements as the "new age" movement.

Yet at the same time, this hesitation reveals a refusal to look afresh at the universe and ways to recognise new approaches to conflict resolution, as they emerge in the face of the growth of the longing for survival and genuine peace which underlies the new popular movements which are no longer organized in terms of class as the overriding mobilizational instrument or along conventional political party lines.

17. Beyond Accumulation

Although Marx perceived development as a process towards self-realization and self-fulfilment, he tended at the same time to look at the individual person as the mere product and outcome of the totality of social relations of which she/he is part, "human nature" being defined by him as that "totality of social relations". It is this latter view which as a rule has inspired socialist movements in which human happiness is seen as a fruit of changing the world as a reality which is external to people as individual persons. In putting all the emphasis on the social nature of the human being, Marx implicitly suggested that, if individual persons would be "properly" socialized by appropriate forms of social engineering in a socialist state/society, alienation would be overcome and the road to happiness was guaranteed. The approach which emphasizes personal growth gives primacy to the individual person who however can only come to actualize her/himself by discovering the own self as being one with mankind and the universe. It is the responsibility of the human being to become aware of her/his nature, transcend constraints and become available to her/his true nature.²²¹ Self-actualization in this sense implies the recognition of the interdependence and unity of all phenomena and an uncompromising respect for life in all its forms. It is inspired both by the acceptance of the fundamental premises on life and the universe in ancient religious traditions as well as the findings of modern physics since Einstein. Both are mutually supportive.²²² It also leads to the insight that the forms of consciousness which development, exclusively inspired by instrumental rationality, has produced preclude and destroy an understanding of other forms of knowing reality. The latter have their own criteria for validity and can, unlike the restricted scientific approach, only be acquired in the practice of self-transformation.²²³

In this view, (wo)man is not simply a product of her/his environment and the conditionings of external social forces and circumstances. He/she is of infinite value in and for him/herself as a manifestation of universal being and his/her inner condition and contradictions are reflected in and contribute to shape the (external) world. Processes of accumulation, power concentration, rivalry, greed, suspicion and other attitudes reflect inner processes of attachment to accumulation. Solely if people are willing to engage in a process of creative "self-effacement", freeing themselves of their attachments, the vicious circle which sustains the unceasing spiral of competition and rivalry for power and wealth can be broken. The willingness to give up self is intimately related to the recognition of self in the others and the others in self. The awakening to this understanding will enhance awareness of the fundamental unity of mankind and will create room for compassion as true solidarity. The growth of such an awakening presupposes a radical transformation of daily, conventional forms of consciousness which serve to adapt to the prevailing (dis)order. In this view, by the very fact of being born, one is responsible for the world as it is and one contributes to its making by one's own way of being. In this sense personal transformation is essential to social transformation as the creation of relations in which to speak, in Marx and Engels' words "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all." Marx hoped that classes and class antagonisms would vanish with the emergence of the socialist state, i.e. of the proletariat, organized as the ruling class. His expectation that in such a way conditions would be created for personal

freedom and freedom for all has not been born out. Also Marx' prediction that with the growth of rationality, the need for the transcendental would vanish has not come true. On the contrary, it would seem that with the rise of alienation and the desacralization of life and the universe, there is a new awareness growing that life can only regain meaning with the recognition of the sacredness of human life and of the universe of which it is part. This new sense of recognition of the sacredness of life and its source in being is closely connected with the growing intuition that this may be the only way to secure mankind's survival. ²²⁴

There is ample evidence that in history institutionalized religion and philosophy have been instrumentalized as ideology to legitimize power and exploitation and that in particular abstinence from which they exempted themselves has always been preached by the powerful and rich through their intellectual and ideological circles to the poor. ²²⁵ But must the call of the Buddah and of Jesus to detachment by liberating oneself from one's own attachments and exercise compassion and solidarity be given up, because it has been appropriated to legitimize power and exploitation? Is this call not a fortiori relevant to-day as an invitation to free oneself from these conditions? Is it not infinitely relevant in the face of the present predicament which negates to the majority of mankind the right of livelihood and condemns it to misery and starvation?

The emphasis on personal growth and transformation as an essential condition for development, as a process of humanization and self-fulfilment, is not perceived by me as in opposition to development as creative collective action for societal transformation, but as serving for it as a source of inspiration and orientation. Creative political action for societal transformation remains always essential for creating a climate in which the free development of the individual person can flower. Collective freedom and personal freedom as dialectical processes of emancipation and liberation are however fundamentally incompatible with all present-day dominant forms of societal organization. It is the very resistance and opposition to them which sets in motion the pursuit of both personal transformation and collective political action towards new forms of life, the contours and contents of which are as yet only visible in its embryonic forms as they grow in and from praxis.

This praxis has its dynamic transformational impetus in the right to freedom by peoples and people as a historical process of increasing practical self-determination. ²²⁶ As we all know from history, no status quo has lasted indefinitely, not even the most partial and localized ones. ²²⁷ As such, this process of self-determination demands the transformation of the status quo to make way for human emancipation in its political, economic, social, spiritual and cultural dimensions. Essential to this transformation are mass movements for democracy in West and East, North and South. It cannot be assumed that anywhere the growth of freedom will spontaneously come about or would ever be simply granted by governments and elites. It can only be achieved through incessant struggles by broad coalitions of emancipatory movements and these movements can only count on lasting support, if they promote and protect the opportunities for individual freedom and self-fulfilment as well as communal and collective interests at large. The failure of both capitalism and socialism to meet the basic needs of the majority of the world's population has created large scale suffering, dissent and opposition which have been repressed in a variety of ways. All emancipatory movements, including the human rights movement, reflect the

pressures for survival and freedom, both materially and spiritually. With the loss of credibility of capitalism and "existing socialism", pressures for transformation are mounting every where.

For Western industrialized societies it implies the recognition that, what is known as formal democracy, while the marked progress of freedom it has brought is affirmed, has become obsolete.²²⁸ Although the delegation of authority for a fixed period has had and still has the advantage of protecting citizens against the arbitrary exercise of power and provides them with a minimum of juridical guarantees, it is however not capable of providing them with an adequate share of the benefits of expansion and much less with the possibility of influencing their fate in a world of continuous flux and change nor does it allow them to develop their potential to own advantage. On the contrary, in spite of their basic rights the capacity to influence the conditions and circumstances which shape their life tends to erode more and more with the growing concentration of capital and political power.

For the societies of "existing socialism", it means recognition of the need to give up one of the central tenets of marxist-leninist orthodoxy which arrogates to a single party as the vanguard and representative of the proletariat the right on the monopoly of power and the introduction of genuine forms of participatory democracy both at the local and national level.

The pressures for transformation also grow in the South where dictatorial regimes, set up in order to make capitalism work, are suppressing the majority of the population. The growth of popular pressures for social transformation and political democracy in the South inspires the North and in particular the USA to bring about political constellations which are only democratic at the surface and operate with a semblance of popular approval. This attempt is designed to counteract the emergence of governments supported by broad-based nationalist anti-imperialist, genuinely democratic movements. Such governments, to the extent that they are capable of effectively withstanding pressures by Northern governments and multinationals, in particular from the United States, are however bound to have a precarious existence, as they are perceived as a major threat by the "free world", and its ideology of "interdependence". In this ideology, all societies and states from North and South are assumed to be partners in equality and with harmonious interests. Northern interests may also wish to have democratic governments in the South, in order to arrange for popular support for the unpopular demands they impose on them through such agencies as IMF. They can however not allow these governments to give in to popular demands and operate in a genuine democratic way. If they would do so, the very nature of the dominant economic world order would be in jeopardy, as it would lead to a radical redistribution of surplus at their own expense. The creation by oligarchical groups and elite coalitions in the South of surface democracies to prevent the upsurge of genuine democratic governments is therefore actively supported by the United States and multinational corporate interests at large. This move also eases the pressures at home by progressive groups of citizens, who feel embarrassed by their governments' support for dictatorial regimes. To the United States especially, it may serve to regain its image in the eyes of the constituency as a champion of the "free world". The creation of pseudo democracies however should not be used to squarely denounce democracy as an incorrigible source of corruption and manipulation. It is bound to lead to a deepening of pressure for genuine democracy by the mass democratic movements and the transformation of

elections and other instruments of democracy into genuine exercises in the creation of democratic power.²²⁹

Democratic regimes which emerge from the anti-imperialist struggles will only be able to recover a reasonable measure of autonomy in economic and social policies against the world centres of power, if they are able to form a united front to effectively curtail the power of multinationals, combat protectionism and negotiate debt servicing in such a way that fulfilment of the basics needs of the majority population can be given strict priority.

The need for a central direction in societies of the South which is able to organize resistance against the outside pressures for incorporation and dependence and to promote the necessary internal social and economic transformations is however likely to remain in a state of permanent contradiction with the needs which emerge from and are defined by democratic institutions. While the central direction will have as its task to manage the socialization of surplus and distribute sacrifices in ways which are generally experienced as fair (this includes the prevention of undue concessions of a redistributivist or corporatist nature to various pressure groups), it is the task of the democratic institutions at all levels as autonomous critical institutions to continually²³⁰ challenge the power structures and the technobureaucracy which may emerge.

The proper management of the "natural resources", an expression which connotes the freedom to exploit them at will, also implies a radical end towards that²³¹ type of economic growth in which costs are discharged on the environment. Also in this respect the colonial era of free exploitation of natural resources has reached its limit. A new multi-disciplinary approach is called for in which the role of economic needs is reduced to the task to estimate the social and environmental costs so that they are internalized within²³² the accounts of the enterprises, be they public or private, big or small.

If I speak of a movement towards a new way of life, I mean to say that there is only one way out for mankind to survive: that of equality and sharing both between peoples and among people. It must therefore necessarily be rooted in a world wide movement towards democracy. If we qualify socialism by demanding that it has a human face, it is a demand to ourselves in the West to give up our alienated condition which obliges us to protect our own interests and promote our own interests and ego at the expense of others. Thus a struggle to achieve a new way of life for ourselves inevitably implies joining the struggles for emancipation and liberation of other peoples and people. But at the same time, it demands a radical transformation of our needs, shaped by the requirements of accumulation and its expansion for wealth, power and status. Is exterminism, as Rudolph Bahro suggests, an inherent feature of Western civilizations as it has been shaped by the logic of capital expansion and can it be overcome? The life of human beings like Jesus, the Buddah and Francis of Assisi demonstrates that it is possible to overcome an aggressive and competitive disposition which has been understood as "natural" in Western hegemonic thought upon the break down of the communal social formation, a disposition which came to be seen as inherent and beneficial to mankind with the rise of capitalism. By divesting themselves of the condition of their birth, Jesus and the Buddah sought to create a new man/woman.²³³ To realize such a new way of being, is the challenge of the present day.

The present hegemonic pattern of development with its growing parasitism and exploitation by the capitalist industrialized countries (the "North") of the South has brought about a pattern of resource use which has resulted in a total inapplicability of the Northern model of accumulation to the South as well as to its continuity in the North itself.²³⁴ The very pattern of accumulation calls for a far-reaching redistribution of resource control, wealth and power. Will this be enough to set into motion cultural revolutions which will transform hegemonic patterns of accumulation theory and practice so that, to speak with Marx, pre-history can be overcome and conditions for genuine human freedom can arise?

Development will, however, never reach an end term. A dynamic conception of history implies that new ways of life will never arrive at an ultimate form and will always remain in the process of becoming, individually as well as collectively.

It would seem that the process of human development and self-realization can only genuinely advance to the extent that (wo)man becomes available to his true self and that of others and becomes capable of transcending self-interest, learning to practice solidarity in the process of overcoming the egoic drives which underly and reproduce and intensify self-contradiction. In that sense human beings may only find their true self and the peace and joy which are the fruit of this in the transcendence of their egoic drives which have been at the root of the historical process of the structuration of Western culture, values, science and technology. Through the policies and strategies of socialization and education, they have marked the West and have been transferred and imposed in the course of colonization on the rest of the world.

Are there ways to transcend the deeply rooted drive towards accumulation and the unceasing pursuit of one-dimensional instrumental rationality which works as its engine?

On one of his travels to the United States of America, Carl Gustav Jung, the great Swiss student of human nature, paid a visit to the Pueblo Indian people in New Mexico. He met a man with the name Ochwia Bianco (meaning mountain lake) with whom he could speak, in Jung's own words, as he seldom had done with a European. "Look", said Ochwia Bianco, "how cruel white people are in their appearance.....They always have an inflexible expression on their face. The white people always want something. They are always restless and agitated. What do they seek? We don't know what they want. We don't understand them. We believe they are all crazy". Jung then asked him why he thought they were crazy. He answered: "They say that they think with their head". Jung, surprised, asked him: "Of course, but tell me, where do you think?" He said then: "We think here" and he pointed to his heart. Jung tells how he sank into deep reflection and he remarks: "For the first time in my life, it seemed to me, somebody had shown me the image of the white man as he really is. It was as if until then I had only seen sentimental colour photographs of ourselves, trying to picture reality more beautiful than it was. This Indian had touched our weak spot and pointed to something for which we are really blind".²³⁵ Jung then saw in his imagination a whole series of images arising: of the Roman conquest of Europe, of the alliance of the Church with Roman power and Charles the Great, of the plundering and murdering crusaders and of Columbus and Cortez and other conquistadores and of the decimation of the peoples in the Pacific, dying from small pox, alcohol and syphilis. He then continues: "With that I had seen enough. What we called colonization, christianization

and civilization, has yet another face: that of a bird of prey which with cruel concentration seeks its prey. All land thieves and pirates have a similar expression on their face. All eagles and other birds of prey which decorate our coats of arms seemed to me to express our true nature".²³⁶ Jung viewed the encounter with the Indian as an opportunity which opened for him a new gate to a primordial nearly entirely forgotten form of consciousness (by people of Western culture) which could be revived. In an earlier passage in his autobiography, he narrates a dream which he had during a visit to an Arab country in North Africa which deeply touched him. In this dream he had to fight for his survival and felt obliged to murder a young aristocratic Arab who tried to kill him. Jung interpreted the dream as a struggle between his own repressed unconscious (his shadow) which sought to be recognized and accepted and his own conscious dimension of being which felt threatened by the unsuspected attack by the young man. He then observes: "In my unconsciousness, I was in no way aware of such a situation; on the contrary I could not undo myself of a feeling of superiority as, at every step I did, I was reminded of my being a European. I could not escape. It accentuated a certain distance, a sense of being alien to people of a different nature. But I was not prepared to meet the unconscious forces in me which emerged with such an intensity on behalf of the opposing party and which led to such an intense conflict.²³⁷ The dream expresses this conflict with the image of a situation of murder".

Only a few years later Jung began to understand the deeper nature of the disturbing dream. He then began to see in the dream the resurgence of primordial structures or patterns of being in himself (which he called archetypes) from a wellknown past but which he had forgotten. He perceived the resurgence of these images as the renewed awareness of a still available potential for life which was overgrown by civilization, a potential, a possibility for life which one prefers to forget and which had been repressed and marginalized into the subconsciousness. What at first sight seemed to have been lost would not have re-emerged without a reason. In Jung's view, the largely rationally oriented people of the West have become alienated from much of what is human and they boast of their superiority without realizing that this is at the expense of meaningfulness and intensity of life and that the primordial dimension of their personality is thereby condemned to live underground.

It was about half a century ago that Jung reviewed his own life experience in connection with his experiences with people from what we now call the "South". Since then, the existential crisis in the Western world has greatly intensified, manifest in a wide-spread sense of pervasive meaninglessness of life. With the unceasing growth of instrumental rationality and the subordination of all other dimensions of life to it, it has intensified. The striking advances in material wealth for a minority of nations and people in the world have gone hand in hand with the growth of spiritual and moral misery. This decline in meaningfulness is, it would seem, closely connected with the loss of a sense of life as being of a sacred transcendent nature. Jung related the sense of dignity which he found in the Pueblo Indian people to their sense of transcendence. It was this, he observed, that gave meaning to their lives which they experienced as living in unity with the cosmos. He observed in this connection: "If we compare the motivation of our own lives with theirs, the meaning of our lives, then we cannot avoid being impressed by its poverty. We cannot but smile about the naivete of the Indian people, if only by our sheer sense of

jealousy. We feel far superior to them by our cleverness. Then we will not have to realize how impoverished and degenerate we have become.²³⁸

I have tried to achieve some understanding of the genesis of the theoretical premises on which the Western materialist interpretation of the universe rests and with it the growing separation of mind and matter, body and mind and thinking and intuition. Yet although the basic paradigm which legitimized this materialist interpretation of reality has now become obsolete, it is still in full force and continues to inspire hegemonic social science, directed to support prevailing forms of instrumental rationality and control over people and over the universe of which they are part. In the present situation, only those forms of consciousness which serve the advance of instrumental rationality and which are geared towards linear analytical discursive thinking, are recognized as valid to arrive at truth. I have also pointed out in the above essay how and why alternative streams of consciousness and interpreting the world which were of an esoteric nature were repressed.²³⁹

With the expansion of the West and more recently with the neo-colonial wave of incorporation of the South which only received or was granted in a pseudo-way political independence, hegemonic forms of socialization and education toward instrumental rationality were extended and intensified, at the expense of indigenous forms of valuation and interpretation of reality which in the process of modernization came to be viewed as inferior and an obstacle to "progress".

Thus within hegemonic thinking and social science, experience is only valued in causal materialist-mechanistic terms at the exclusion of other forms of perception. Thus science was and is only regarded as legitimate and genuine, in so far as it focuses on and receives its findings from that part of reality which is directly observable by the senses.

It may be argued that the arrogance and disrespect characteristic of Western hegemonic culture, science and technology and the ideology which inspires and legitimizes them have tyrannical implications vis-a-vis peoples with other cultures, other values and other forms of rationality.²⁴⁰ Such arrogance and disrespect and the consequent tyranny may only disappear to the extent that the West will start to recognize the absolute necessity for its own radical transformation. In my view, the core of this needed transformation concerns the relationship and balance between what may be called the female and male dimensions of being and consciousness, what Jung called anima and animus, both in the individual consciousness and collective unconsciousness, between which they are as a bridge.

In the above essay I have reviewed some of the ways in which the male dimension of being in Western history in the course of socialization and the structuration of perceptions and values with regard to property, law, security, labour, religion, relations between men and women and the conversion of these perceptions and values into social science took place. I have in particular focussed on the nature of violence and its forms of development, vis-a-vis nature (the universe) and people as a result of the masculine orientation Western culture in the service of accumulation, leading to ever more intensive forms of control and manipulation over nature and human beings. In my view the deep human crisis at present, reflected in the exasperating increasingly violent contradictions in the political, economic, social and cultural domains, is at its heart the manifestation of a growing imbalance between the one-dimensional growth of a hegemonic manipulative,

expansive, abstracting, discursive, male orientation of life and the intuitive feeling receptive imaginative, concrete, caring, female dimension of life.

It seems to me that both represent modes of being and consciousness which are essentially complementary to each other. Whereas the male mode is linear, focussed and analytical and directed towards discriminating, categorizing, measuring and thereby geared towards fragmentation (of which the history of the evolution of the social sciences may be seen as an illustration), the female mode tends to be inspired by and oriented towards synthesis and is non-linear, intuitive and holistic. To the extent that the female mode of being and consciousness is "integrated" in the hegemonic male mode and becomes subordinated to it, it is bound to lose its power of transformation and becomes part of the established hegemonic forms of control. With the attempt at present to resolve the prevailing world crisis through the intensification of a variety of instruments pertaining to the male mode of being, both in the material and spiritual domain (through new more intensive forms of ideological control and manipulation like in the field of religion, mass communication and education at all levels, including the academic level), the female mode of being and consciousness is further repressed and marginalized. This at first sight regressive tendency however gives an impulse to new initiatives which advance the female mode at the periphery of established institutions. It is the very nature of the growing crisis, with its threat of total destruction of human life, which generates multiple searches and forms of creativity towards new ways of life.

In the above view, male "activity" and female "receptivity/passivity" are not perceived as absolute contradictions but as fundamentally complementary ways of being and forms of energy. They are also seen as inherent in and available to all peoples and to all human beings, irrespective of their sex.

In the above conception, receptivity/passivity is not understood as non-action but as representing forms of action which are not contrary to nature, or in other words which are in harmony with nature, like in ancient Chinese Taoist philosophy in which this way of being is expressed in the concept "Wu Wei".²⁴¹ Thus in the above vision, the female dimension of being refers to a state of "active passivity" or a state of active receptivity or openness to the totality of life. It is rooted in self-awareness and the related awareness of the cosmos which we bear in the very cells of our bodies, minds and memories. In this sense all consciousness is rooted in our unconsciousness, in the experience of our body, our senses, sensations, feelings and imagination. In this view, only in the experience of the unity of our intellect and our intuition or our mind and body which exists at every level of our being,²⁴² can Western(ized) (wo)man become "whole" again, can we again heal ourselves and overcome duality and alienation.

A mode of being and consciousness inspired by and oriented towards harmony with the universe can only grow with the development within Western culture of feminine intuitive awareness in which "the rational mind is no longer the master, but submits itself to a higher law of its own being and transcends its limitations".²⁴³ Such a process of transformation can only grow with the awakening to the essential unity of mind and matter, spirit and nature, unconsciousness and consciousness, revealed by the discoveries in modern natural science and which have always been at the heart of all ancient mystical traditions and perceptions of the universe.²⁴⁴

A slight thought in ending these reflections is that the West may only be able to overcome its spiritual and moral stagnation and its present thrust towards self-annihilation, if and when it becomes aware of and re-integrates into its life stream the female dimension of being which it repressed in the historical process of internal colonization in function of instrumental rationality and which it further relegated from its own being in the process of colonial expansion. One might compare the relationship between West and East (North and South) with that between a man and a woman (man and woman standing for qualities of being), the woman being the mirror of the man in whom he meets his own source of life.

This essay has been written in the belief that with a new consciousness dawning about the nature of the universe and with the growing recognition of the need for radical personal and social transformation towards a new way of being of mankind, the forces for life will prevail over those leading towards total annihilation, inherent in the further pursuit of male-oriented instrumental rationality. It has been said "that the age of Western domination is over and that the future of the world is not in Western Europe and America but in Asia, Africa and Latin America".²⁴⁶ This may well be necessary for the West to recover its humanity. This also does not mean that the Western heritage and its contributions to human advance through the development of democracy, science and technology have to be rejected, but they do not represent absolute values in themselves. These are only meaningful in so far as they serve human emancipation and liberation in the world at large, in accordance with human development towards the creation of harmony within (wo)man, harmony among human beings and a life by people and peoples in harmony with the cosmos.²⁴⁷

One of the ways in which oppressive structures are given permanence is by the promotion of toughmindedness.²⁴⁸ The link between authoritarianism and the unwillingness to engage in critical self-examination is glaringly evident in the way dictatorial regimes in the South today repress opposition and dissent with the tacit consent or active support of the North for which such regimes are essential, as long as it wishes to retain its privileges and refuses to share, thereby making itself directly responsible for the repression and material and spiritual suffering of the majority of mankind. Willingness to undertake a critical self-examination is seen as a danger which undermines the power of the authority and its righteousness and moral duty. It is also likely to be seen as a form of disloyalty and betrayal to the cause of keeping the world safe from evil. With the refusal to examine own authenticity and integrity goes the tendency to exteriorize evil and attribute the causes of human suffering to outside forces, on which the own shadow which one does not see as one refuses to see it, is projected. Once the outside evil is identified, it can then be effectively combatted. This further weakens the willingness and capacity towards critical self-enquiry. Victims who legitimately defend their right to life then tend to be viewed as people who disturb law and order who deserve to be punished or eliminated. This calls for further measures of control to eliminate the causes of evil. Subsequently, it becomes even more difficult for agents of oppression to become aware of the decivilizing brutalizing ways which they have internalized and which they attribute to their opponent. Thus the non-recognition of one's own destructive tendencies leads to the destruction of the other and oneself as human beings. Own forms of terrorism tend then to be presented as legitimate forms of self-defence against the terrorism of the victim.

There is an ancient christian tradition in which the right to rebel against an oppressive regime, which denies the elementary rights of life, has always been recognized as legitimate. Yet, the use of violence, even if legitimate and understandable, tends to tie the oppressed to the oppressors. The use of violence by the victims or those who take up violence on their behalf tends to socialize both of them into the very values and practices which they reject and for the elimination of which they struggle.²⁴⁹ Oppressor and oppressed may then change roles; when the latter are successful. As history suggests, it is then difficult for the victims and their defenders not to engage in the same violence as the earlier oppressors. How to avoid that once again masculine instrumental rationality and power will prevail?

It would seem that the only way out of this vicious circle of violence is for the victims to refuse to accept the prevailing society and its values and choose, on the basis of massive non-cooperation, for an alternative world where there will be room for a way of life, exempt from the values and practices which have inspired the oppressor and in which they can regain and develop their capacity for peaceful living with themselves and with others. It is difficult to perceive a world which is not ruled by the hegemonic values and forms of life which have emerged in the process of the formation of Western society and its expansion. Such a new world can in my view only be born in the transcendence of those basic values which are at the genesis and growth of Western society and its culture.

I see a radical spiritual revolution as an essential source of inspiration to social movements and transformations in the cultural, social, political and economic domain. Without it, the drive to egoic self-contraction and its deep internalization into the Western psycho-physical way of being, in which the dynamic process of human transformation, set in motion by²⁵⁰ the dynamics of accumulation, manifests itself, cannot be overcome. The call to give up power and self-interest is a call for radical self-transformation through the practice of love and compassion. The time that such a call could be considered, especially by those yielding power, as a sentimental precept has passed. The time has come that self-sacrifice can no more be considered a mere pious exhortation. It indicates the watershed between a movement towards mankind's survival and a perspective on a new age in human evolution or towards self-destruction. The movement towards a new world, characterized by genuine freedom and solidarity, will be protracted and painful for the haves but as painful or even more so for the have nots, when they become aware that they cannot reproduce the mechanisms and instruments, which were used to control and oppress them so that a minority could safeguard its privileges, as in such reproduction the previous pattern of violence would return and would be likely to generate even more violence. Therefore the call to self-sacrifice is directed to all human beings and every human being, as the potential for violence as well as to overcome violence through the practice of love and compassion is also inherent in every human being.

To become aware of one's own shadow would seem essential for coming to genuinely accept and develop towards one self love and compassion. This in turn is essential to avoid projecting one's shadow on others and work on self-transformation. It would also create room for the practice of solidarity with others, as one recognizes in them both one's weaknesses and qualities. In that climate a longing for peace may be converted into the practice of peace.

Footnotes and references:

1. de Ste. Croix G.E.M., The class struggle in the Ancient Greek World, Duckworth, London 1983, p. 331.
2. de Ste. Croix, op. cit., p. 490
3. Bahro Rudolf, From red to green, Verso Editions, London, 1984, p. 183.
4. Walinsky Louis J., editor, Agrarian Reform as Unfinished Business, the Selected Papers of Wolf Ladejinsky, published for the World Bank by Oxford University Press, 1977.
5. de Ste. Croix, p. 342.
6. ibid., p. 368.
7. Anderson Perry, Passages from antiquity to Feudalism, Verso Editions, London, 1978, pp. 22/23.
8. Karl Marx, Pre-capitalist Economic Formations, with an introduction by Eric Hobsbawn, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1964, p. 126.
9. Murray Margaret Alice, The Witchcraft in Western Europe, Oxford University Press, 1921. Murray was the first to present the view, now widely accepted, that witchcraft represented in part the survival among people of pre-christian religion.
The thesis of two antagonistic worlds is argued in the work of the distinguished Dutch historian in his major work on Dutch history : De Lage Landen bij de Zee, (The Low Lands at the Sea), De Haan, Utrecht, 1934, p. 174.
10. Ehrenreich Barbara and English Deirdre, Witches, Midwives and Nurses, A History of Women Healers, The Feminist Press, Old Westbury, N.Y. 1973.
11. Cohn Norman, Europe's Inner Demons, Sussex University Press, London 1975.
12. Thomas Keith, Religion and the Decline of Magic, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 19 , p. 561.
13. Thomas, ibid., pp. 562/567.
14. Thomas op. cit., p. 582.
15. Balandier George, Antropo-logiques, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1964, p. 57 and Godelier Maurice, La Production des Grands Hommes, Fayard, Paris, 1982, p. 44.
16. Romein, op. cit., pp. 142 and 143.
17. Duby Georges, Les trois Ordres ou l'Imaginaire du Feodalisme, Gallimard, Paris, 1978.
18. Romein, op. cit., pp. 179.
19. Cohn Norman, The Pursuit of the Millenium, Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 14 and p. 56.
20. Theun de Vries, Ketters, Veertien eeuwen Ketterij, Volksbeweging en Kettergericht, (Heretics, Fourteen centuries of Heresy, Popular Movement and Inquisition, Querido, A'dam, 1982, p. 167.
21. ibid., pp. 227/278.
22. Umberto Eco, The Name of the Rose, Picador, Great Britain, 1980.
23. Teun de Vries, op. cit., p. 553.
24. Barrington Moore Jr., Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, Bacon Press, Boston, 1966, pp. 465.
25. Cohn Norman, op. cit., p. 246.
26. Barrington Moore, op. cit., p. 466.
27. Scott James C., The Moral Economy of the Peasant, Rebellion and Subsistence in South East Asia, Yale University Press, 1976.
28. Romein, op. cit., p. 186.

29. Farweck F.E. North European Mysteries and their Traces until the Present (in Dutch), Kluwer, Deventer, Netherlands, 1970, pp. 180/181.
30. op. cit. pp. 182/183.
31. op. cit. pp. 255.
32. Sen Amartya, Poverty and Famines, An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1981, p. 156 and p. 166.
33. Mandel Ernest, Marxist Economic Theory, Vol. 1, Monthly Review Press, N.Y./London, pp. 30/31.
Robinson Joan, Freedom and Necessity, An introduction to the study of society, Allan and Urwin, London, 1970, pp. 28-29.
Polanyi Karl, The Great Transformation, Octagon Books, N.Y., 1975, p. 163.
34. Spitz Pierre, Silent Violence: Famine and Inequality, International Review of the Social Sciences, Vol XXX, 1978, no. 4.
George Susan, How the Other Half Dies, The Real Reason for World Hunger, Penguin Books, 1976.
Moore Lappæ Frances and Collins Joseph, Food First, beyond the Myth of Scarcity, Balyntine Books, N.Y. 1976.
Wessel James, Trading the future, Institution for Food and Development Policy, San Francisco, 1983.
35. Dolman Anthony, Resources, Regimes, World Order, Pergamon Press, 1981, p. 227.
36. Bedjaoui Mohammed, Towards a New International Order, Unesco, Paris, 1979, p. 239.
37. Moore Thomas, Utopia, Penguin Classics, 1983, pp. 46/50.
38. ibid., p. 65.
39. ibid., pp. 71, 75/76.
40. ibid., pp. 84/85.
41. Cheneaux Jean, Peasant Revolts in China, 1840-1949, Thomas and Hudson, London, 1973, p. 27.
42. Smedley Agnes, The Great Road, The life and times of Chu Teh, Monthly Review Press, New York/London, 1956, pp 29 and 31.
43. Snow Edgar, Red China today, Pelican Books, 1970, p. 101.
44. Aleavy McHenry, The Modern History of China, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London 1971, pp. 36-55.
45. Tawney R.H., Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, Pelican Books, 1975, p. 70.
46. Barrington Moore, op. cit., pp. 21/78 30.
47. ibid., p. 30.
48. ibid., p. 31.
49. Hobsbawn E.J., The Age of Capital, 1848-1875, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1975, pp. 31, 34 and 37.
50. Bairoch Paul, Le Tiers-Monde dans l'Impasse, Gallimard 1971, Paris, pp. 81/91.
51. For Latin America, see Bartolomeo de les Casas, Brevissima Relacion de la destruccion de las Indias Orientales, Sevilla, 1552 and Eduardo Galeano, Open Veins of Latin America, Monthly Review Press, New York/London 1973. For Africa, see Rodney W., How Europe underdeveloped Africa, Bogle, London, 1972 (Beverly Mills, London, 1976) and Gutkind Peter C.W. and Wallerstein Immanuel, The Political Economy of Contemporary Africa, Sage Publication. On Asia, see K.M. Panikkar, Asia and Western Dominance, George Allen and Unwin, London 1955.

52. Lichauco Alejandro, The IMF-World Bank Group, The International Economic Order and the Philippine Experience, Manila, September, 1976, p. 13.
53. Bloch Marc, French Rural History, Berkeley, 1966, p. 149.
54. Guérin David, Bourgeois et Bras Nus, 1973-1795, Gallimard, Paris, 1973, p. 302.
55. Spitz Pierre, op. cit., p. 873.
56. ibid., pp. 874/875.
57. Jacob Erich H., Man and Land, Andre Deutch, London, 1971, p. 89.
58. As an example of the break-up of communal social formations and a contemporary "enclosure movement", see Kuitenbrouwer J.B.W. The Dialectics of Class and State Formation and of Development Policy in Papua new Guinea, ISS, The Hague, 1981.
59. Tawney, op. cit., p. 148.
60. ibid., p. 123.
61. Fromm Erich, The Fear of Freedom, Routledge and Kegan, London, 1950, pp. 95 and 80.
62. Tawney, op. cit., p. 257.
63. Heilbroner Robert L., The Worldly Philosophers, the Lives, Times and Ideas of Great Economic Thinkers, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1972, p. 37.
64. Heilbroner, op. cit., same page.
65. Polanyi Karl, op. cit., pp. 164/165.
66. For an analysis of the ideological rationalization of this process, see Godelier Maurice, Rationality and irrationality in Economics, Monthly Review Press, N.Y./London, 1972, p. 304.
67. Dekker R.M., De morale economie van de "kraak" - beweging, (The moral economy of the "seizure" movement), De Gids, no. 2, 1982.
68. Heilbroner, op. cit., p. 41.
69. Heilbroner, op. cit., p. 49.
70. Skinner Andrew, editor, Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations, Pelican Classics, p. 164.
71. Quotation from Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations in Karl Marx, The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, edited by Dirk J. Struik, International Publishers, New York, 1972, p. 82.
72. Skinner Andrew, op. cit., p. 169.
73. ibid., p. 225.
74. van Leeuwen Arend, De Nacht van het Kapitaal, door het Oerwoud van de Economie naar to Bronnen van de Burgerlijke Religie, (The Night of Capital, through the Jungle of the Economy to the Sources of Civic Religion), Sun, Nijmegen, 1984, p. 57.
Capra Fritjof Capra, The Turning Point, Science, Society and the Rising Culture, Bantam Books, 1983, p. 200.
75. Berman Morris, The re-enchantment of the World, Cornell University Press wit Bantam Books, Bantam Edition, May 1984, p. 113.
76. Berman, ibid, p. 116.
77. Van Leeuwen, op. cit., p. 225.
78. ibid. p. 129.
79. Skinner Andrew, op. cit., p. 183.
80. Barrington Moore, op. cit., p. 499.
81. Braudel Fernand, Capitalism and Material Life, 1400-1800, Harper and Row, New York, 1967, p. 445.
82. Braudel, op. cit., p. 444.

83. Wallerstein Emmanuel, The Modern World System, Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the sixteenth Century, Academic Press, N.Y., San Francisco, London, 1974, pp. 13-145. Also Braudel Ferdinand, After-thoughts on Material Civilization and Capitalism, John Hopkins U.P., Baltimore/London 1977, pp. 92.
84. Wallerstein, The Modern World System p. 87 and p. 349.
85. Wallerstein, op. cit., p. 357.
86. Mandel Ernest, Late Capitalism, Verso, London, 1978, p. 364.
87. Meillassoux Claude, "from Production to Reproduction" Economy and society, Vol. 7, no. 1, 1972.
88. Kostas Vergoulopoulos "Capitalisme difforme", Le Question Paysanne et le Capitalisme, Editions Anthropos, Paris, 1974, pp. 69-72.
Wallerstein Immanuel, The Capitalist world Economy, Cambridge 1979, pp. 288-291. Kuitenbrouwer Joost J.W., The New Capitalist World Order: implications for the Development of North and South East Asia, ISS, The Hague, 1981, p. 16.
89. Bettelheim Charles, "Theoretical Comments", Annex 1, Unequal Exchange, by Arghiri Emmanuel, Monthly Review Press, N.Y., 1972.
90. Mintz Sidney, Caribbean Transformations, Aldine, Chicago, p. 132.
91. Payer Cheryl The World Bank, a critical analysis, Monthly Review Press, N.Y./London, 1982, pp. 216-245.
Kuitenbrouwer Joost B.W., The Dialectics of Class and State Formation.
92. Bahro Rudolf, op. cit., p. 141.
93. Paul Bairoch, op. cit., pp. 123-146.
94. Paul Bairoch, op. cit., p. 125.
95. Cipolla Carlo M., European Culture and Overseas Expansion, Penguin Books, 1970, p. 108.
96. Marx Karl and Engels Fredrick, The Communist Manifesto, Monthly Review Press, N.Y./London 1968, pp. 7/9.
97. Marx Karl and Engels Frederick, On Colonialism, Articles from the New York Herald Tribune and other writings, International Publishers, N.Y., 1972, p. 41.
98. *ibid.*, p. 87.
99. Marx Karl and Engel Frederick, op. cit., p. 29 and 39.
100. Myrdal Gunnar, Economic Theory and under-developed regions, London, 1965. Against the Stream, Critical Essays an Economic Theory, New York 1975.
101. Myrdal Gunnar, The Challenge of World Poverty, outline of an anti-poverty programme, N.Y., 1970.
102. Barrington Moore, Political Power and Social Theory, Harvard University Press, 1958, pp. 136-139.
103. Elias Norbert, The civilizing Process, State Formation and Civilization Vol. 1, 1982, pp. 221-263, Urizen Books, New York, 1978, pp. 221-263.
104. Alavi Hamza "Peasant Classes and Primordial Loyalties", The Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 1 no. 1, 1973 p. 34.
105. Goldmann Lucien, Sciences Humaines et Philosophie, Pour un Structuralisme genétique, Editions Gonthier, Paris 1966, p. 44.
106. *ibid.*, p.72
107. Myrdal Gunnar, Against the Stream, Critical Essays on Economics, N.Y., 1975 Galbraith John Kenneth, Economics and the Public Purpose, Andre Deutsch, London 1973.
108. van Leeuwen Arend, op. cit., p. 16.
109. Klammer Arjo, The New Classical Macro-Economics, Wheatsheaf Books, 1984.

110. Weber Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Unwin University Books, London 1967, p. 119.
111. Romcain, op. cit., pp. 184/185.
112. On strategies of protestant socialization, see also Thompson E.P., The Making of the English Working Class, Penguin Books, 1970 (p. 385-410).
113. Tussen Heks en Heilige, Het Vrouwbeeld op de Drempel van de Moderne Tijd, (Between Witch and Saint, the female image on the threshold of the modern era), Publishing House the Sun, Nijmegen, Netherlands, 1986. This study contains a number of contributions by a group of women organized in a workshop called "Science and Society".
114. Horkheimer Max, "Egoism and the Freedom Movement, on the Anthropology of the Bourgeois Era", Telos, No. 54, Winter, 1982-1983.
115. Horkheimer, op. cit.
116. Ossowski Stanislaw, Class structure in the Social Consciousness, Routledge and Kegan, London 1963.
117. Illich Ivan, Shadow Work, Marion Bayars, Boston, London, 1981, p. 139.
118. Achterhuis Hans, Arbeid, een eigenaardig Medicijn, (Labour, a curious Medicine), Ambo, Baarn, Netherlands 1984, p. 61.
119. Lis Catharina and Soly Hugo, Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-industrial Europe, Humanities Press, New Jersey, 1979, p. 71.
120. *ibid.*, p. 86.
121. Lis and Hugo, op. cit., p. 117.
122. *ibid.*, p. 118.
123. Weber Max, op. cit., p. 63.
24. Achterhuis Hans, op. cit., pp. 62/63.
125. Illich Ivan J., Tools for Conviviality, Calders and Boyars, London, 1973, p. 30.
126. Achterhuis Hans, op. cit., p. 78.
127. Polanyi, op. cit., 165.
128. Foucault Michel, Discipline and Punish, Peregrine Books, 1979, pp. 220/221.
129. *ibid.*, op. cit. p. 105.
For the sophistication of the techniques of surveillance by the Inquisition, see Roy Ladurie E., Montaillou, Cathars and Catholics in a French Village, Scholar Press, London, 1978.
130. Capra Fritjof, op. cit.
131. Berman Morris, op. cit.
132. Pathbreaking work in this domain has been carried out by Jean Houston who was associated with Jung. See among others Life Force, the Psycho-Historical Recovery of Self, Delta Books, 1982.
133. Peursen van C.A., Strategie van de Cultuur, een Beeld van de Veranderingen in de Hedendaagse Denk-en Leefwereld, (Strategy of Culture, a Picture of the changes in the Contemporary World of Thought and Life), Elsevier, A'dam, 1970.
134. Capra, op. cit., p. 56.
135. Vishvanatan Shiv, "From the Annals of the Laboratory State", Lokayan Bulletin, (no. 3/4 1985) Special Double Issue on Survival.
136. Foucault, op. cit., pp. 76, 88 and 213
137. *ibid.*, p. 215.
138. Lis Catharina and Soly Hugo, op. cit., p. 120.
139. *ibid.*, p. 95.
140. Girouard Mark, The Return to Camelot, Chivalry and the English Gentleman, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1981.

141. Foucault, op. cit. pp. 165/168, p. 182, pp. 184/192.
142. Hoefnagels, Het ontwikkelingsvraagstuk als de internationale uitdrukking van de sociale kwestie, (The development question as the international manifestation of the social question), Aspecten, Development Review of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Hague, April 1984.
143. Illich Ivan, Shadow Work, p. 107.
144. Galbraith John Kenneth, Economics and the Public Purpose, Andr  Deutsch, London 1974. p. 37
145. Foucault, op. cit., p. 257-292, and Thompson E.P., pp. 515/659.
146. Achterhuis, op. cit., p. 69.
147. Illich Ivan, Shadow Work, Shadow Work, quoted in Achterhuis, op. cit., 83.
148. Marx Karl and Engels Friedrich, the Communist Manifesto, the Monthly Review Press, New York/London 1949, p. 39.
149. Gu rin Daniel, Anarchism, From Theory to Practice, Monthly Review Press, 1970, p.43.
150. Anthony, P.D., The Ideology of Work, Tavistock Publications, London, 1978, p.45.
151. Duintjer O.D., Producers en andere Wijzen van Mens-zijn, een krities onderzoek naar uitgangspunten bij Marx die liggen in het verlengde van de heersende Traditie, (Producing and other modes of being human, a critical investigation of the premises of Marx and their alignment with the hegemonic tradition), Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Philosophie (The Dutch Review of Philosophy), September 1983.
152. Anthony, op. cit., p.193.
153. Guerin, op. cit., p.83.
154. ibid., p.91
155. ibid., p.87
156. Dutschke Rudi, Versuch Lenin Auf die Fuszhe zu stellen, Publishing House Klans Wagenback, Berlin, 1974.
157. Bahro Rudolph, Die Alternative, Zur Kritiek des real existierenden Sozialismus (The alternative, a critique on real existing socialism), European Publishing House, Berlin, 1979, pp. 105/106.
158. Kolontai Alexandra, L'opposition Ouvri re, Edition du Seuil, Paris, 1974, p. 26.
159. Gu rin, op.cit., p. 87.
160. Bahro, op.cit., p. 117/118.
161. Piccone Paul, "Gramsci's Marxism", Theory and Society, Vol. 3, No. 4, Winter 1970, pp. 498/499.
162. Bettelheim, Charles. Class Struggles in USSR, first period, 1917-1923, Monthly Review Press, 1976, pp. 397/399.
163. Gu rin, op.cit., p. 93.
164. Kolontai, op.cit., pp. 68/70.
165. Bahro, op.cit., p. 118.
166. Castoriades, La Societ  Bureaucratique, Union Generale d'Editions, Paris, 1973, p. 309.
167. Feh r Ferenc, Heller Agnes and Markus Gyorgy, Dictatorship over needs, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1983, pp. 137/151.
168. Feh r, op.cit. p. 207.
169. Furtado Celso, Accumulation and Development, Martin Robinson, Oxford, 1983, p. 75.
170. Furtado, op.cit., P. 72.

171. Ellul Jacques, Changer de Révolution, L'inéluctable Proletariat, Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1982, p. 65.
172. Ibid., p. 61/.
173. Schramm Stuart, editor, Mao Tse Tung Unrehearsed, Talks and letters, 1956-1971, Penguin Books, 1974, pp. 62-65.
174. Ellul, op. cit., p. 98.
175. Ghose Ajit Kumar, "The New Development Strategy and Rural Reforms in Post-Mao China", Working Paper, ILO, Geneva, 1983.
176. Nolan Peter, "Decollectivisation of Agriculture in China 1979-1982: a long term perspective", Cambridge Journal of Economics, no. 3/4, September/December, 1983.
Unger Jonathan, "The Decollectivization in the Chinese countryside", Pacific Affairs, Vol. 53, no. 4, Winter 1985-86.
177. Nolan Peter and White Gordon, "Socialist Development and Rural Inequality: the Chinese countryside in the 1970's" The Journal of Peasant Studies, vol. 7. no. 1, October 1979.
178. Unger Jonathan, op. cit., p. 605.
179. Meisner Maurice, "The Chinese Rediscovery of Karl Marx: Some Reflections on Post-Maoist Chinese Marxism", Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars, Vol. 17, no. 3, 1985.
180. Ronan Colin A., Science and civilization in China, Vol. 1, An abridgement of Joseph Needham's original text, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1987, p. 95.
181. Herpen van Marcel, Marx en de Mensenrechten. (Marx and Human Rights), Het Wereldvenster, Weesp, Netherlands, 1983, p. 121.
182. Giddens Anthony, The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies, Hutchinson University Library, London, 1973, pp. 157-158.
183. Belgrade Praxis Group, "The meaning of and the struggle for civil and human rights", Telos, no. 35, Spring, 1978.
184. Chomsky Noam and Herman Edwards., The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism, The Political Economy of Human Rights, Vol. 1, South End Press.
185. Ahmad Egbal, "The challenge of Democracy", Conference Paper, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, November 1984.
186. Egbal, ibid.
187. Giddens, op.cit., p. 281.
188. Meisner Maurice, op. cit., p. 14.
189. Wolfe Marshall, "Towards democratic alternatives", Bulletin of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Santiago de Chile, November 1984.
190. Capra Fritjof, The Turning Point, Bantam Books, 1983, p. 213.
191. Kuitenbrouwer, Joost, B.W., The New Capitalist World Order: Implications for development in North and South East Asia, ISS, The Hague, 1981, p. 36/41.
192. Danaher, Kevin, "Banking on Hunger, the International Debt Crisis", Food First News, No. 18, Summer 1984.
193. Sunkel Osvaldo, "Past, present and future of the international economic crisis", CEPAL Review, No. 22 Santiago de Chile, April 1984 p. 155.
194. Prebisch Raul, "The global crisis of capitalism and its theoretical background", same Review, No. 22. Santiago de Chile, April 1984, p.161.
195. Moore Barrington, Reflections on the Causes of Human Misery, Beacon Press, Boston 1972, p. 117.

196. Moore, op. cit., p. 106.
197. Kolko Joyce, America and the Crisis of World Capitalism, Beacon Press, Boston, 1974, pp. 5, 84 and 85.
198. Faure Edgar and others, Learning to Be, UNESCO, Paris, 1973, Preamble pp. XXIV/XXV.
199. Illich, Tools for Conviviality, p. 43.
200. Capra, Fritjof, op, cit., 221/222.
201. Prebisch, op.cit., p. 160.
202. Galbraith, op.cit., 191/193.
203. Ibid., p. 183.
204. Levinson, Charles. Capital Inflation and Multinationals, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1971, p. 166.
205. Attali, Jacques and Marc Guillanme, L'Anti-économique, Presses Universitaires de France, 1974, pp. 218/222.
206. Dobb Maurice, "The Trends of Modern Economics", in Hunt E. K. and Schwartz Jesse G., A Critique of Economic Theory, Penguin Books, 1972, p. 55.
207. Rugina Anghel N., "Towards a third revolution in economic thinking", International Journal of Social Economics, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1983, p. 15.
208. Sunkel Oswaldo, "The development of development thinking" in: Villamil José J., Transnational capitalism and National Development, Harvester Press Ltd., 1979, pp. 27 and 29.
209. Wolfe Marshall, op. cit., p. 2.
210. Ibid., p. 26.
211. Huberman Leo, and Paul, M. Swezey, "Lessons of Soviet Experience", 50 years of Soviet Power, by the same authors and others. Monthly Review Press, N.Y./London, 1967, p. 16/17/
212. Fehér, op.cit., p. 114.
213. Furtado, op.cit., pp. 84, 173 and 183.
214. Capra, op.cit., Chapter 2, pp. 53-74.
215. See the Food First Resource Guide, Documentation on the Roots of World Hunger and Rural Poverty, Institute for Food and Development Policy, San Francisco, 1979.
216. Attali, op.cit., p. 228.
217. Capra, op.cit., 265.
218. An interview with Michael Foucault, in Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Robinson Paul, Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics, University of Chicago Press, p. 216.
219. Christopher Pinto, "Towards a regime governing international Public property", in Dolman, Anthony, J., Global Planning and Resource Management, Pergamon Press, 1980.
220. Huizer Gerrit, "Spirituality and Oppression, strength or weakness of the Poor" paper presented at a conference in Harare, Zimbabwe, January, 985, Third World Centre, Catholic University, Nijmegen.
221. Wilber Ken, No Boundary, Eastern and Western approaches to Personal Growth, New Science Library, Shambala, Boulder and London, 1981.
222. Capra, Fritjof. The Tao of Physics, Boston Books, New York/London, 1984.
223. Wilber Ken, Eye to Eye, The Quest for a new Paradigm, Anchor Press, Double Day, New York, 1983.
224. Kuitenbrouwer, J.B.W., Statement at the Opening of the Seminar on Religion and Development, ISS, The Hague, March, 1985.
225. Horkheimer, op. cit.

226. The Belgrade Praxis Group, op. cit. 227. Mészáros, István, The Necessity of Social Control, Isaac Deutscher Memorial Lecture, p. 12, The Merlin Press, London, 1971.
228. Fauré Edgar and others, Learning to be, The World of Education Today and Tomorrow, p. xxiv, Unesco, Paris/Ontario, 1973.
229. Constantino Renato, The Post-Marcos Era, an Appraisal, Speech delivered at the Ateneo de Manila University on December 4, 1984, Karrel Inc., Quezon City, 1985.
230. Wolfe Marshall, op.cit., pp. 29.231.
Giarino Orio, Dialogue on Wealth and Welfare, An alternative View on Capital Formation, Pergamon Press, 1980.
Commoner Berry, The Poverty of Power, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1976.
Henderson Hazel, Creating Alternative Futures, the End of Economics, Perigee Books, Princeton Center for Alternative Studies, 1987.
232. Capra Fritjof, op.cit., p. 393.233.
Bahro Rudolf, From red to Green, p. 216.234.
Caldwell Malcolm, The Wealth of Some Nations, Zed Press, London, 1977, pp. 125-129.
235. Jaffé Aniela, editor, Memories, dreams and thoughts, by Carl Gustav Jung, second edition Rotterdam, Lemniscaat 1978, pp. 214 and 215.
236. ibid., pp. 215 and 237
ibid., pp. 212 and 213-238
ibid., p. 238.239.
Dessaur C.I., De Droom der Rede, (The dream of Reason), Querido, Amsterdam 1984, p. 67 and 157.
240. Fuglesang Andreas, About understanding, Ideas and Observations on cross-cultural Communication, Dag Hammerskjold Foundation, Uppsala, 1982, p. 17.
241. Capra Fritjof, op. cit., p. 37.242.
Griffiths Bede, The marriage between East and West, Fount Paperbacks, London, 1983, pp. 15 /155.
243. ibid., p. 27.244.
Capra Fritjof, The Tao of Physics, Berkeley, Shambala, 1975.245.
Jung Emma, Animus and Anima, Over het Mannelijke in de Vrouw en het Vrouwelijke in de Man, (On the Masculine in Woman and the Feminine in Man), Lemniscaat, Rotterdam, 1980, p. 62.
246. Griffiths, op. cit., p. 150.247.
Stikker Allerd, Tao, Teilhard en het Westerse Denken, (Tao, Teilhard and Western Thinking), Bres, Amsterdam, pp. 121/124.
248. Nandi Ashis, "Oppression and human liberation: towards a Third World Utopia", p. 151 in Walker R.B.J. Culture, Ideology World Order,
249. Ibid., pp. 158/159.250.
For an illuminating critique of both outward oriented Western materialist culture and science and inward directed Eastern spiritualism as manifestations of egoic self-contraction, see Da Free John, Scientific proof of God will soon be announced by the White House, the Dawn Horse Press, Middle Town, California, 1980.

