

1: Capitalism - Wikipedia

A flexible social system with a monetised economy and many of the features of a modern capitalistic society is unusual among underdeveloped peoples. Such a system existed among the Tolai of New Britain long before European contact, though at the same time they were a primitive, cannibalistic people.

The Making of New World Slavery: By Robin Blackburn, Verso, Pbk, The slave population of the Americas reached 33, in , nearly three million in and peaked at over six million in During this period a million and a half died during the passage to the New World, large numbers died beforehand and between a tenth and a fifth died within a year of landing. This huge and businesslike system remains one of the great tragedies of history. In The Making of New World Slavery, now available in paperback, Robin Blackburn suggests that it points us towards the "dark side of progress" p5 in that the inhumanity of the system developed side by side with huge steps forward in knowledge and technique, such as the exploration of the Atlantic and the development of new navigational techniques. At the heart of the system lay a huge contradiction. The people who colonised the New World were largely those who rejected most strongly the old order in Europe. Yet just as unfree labour was dying out in Europe it began to develop on a massive new scale in the Americas. This contradiction was only resolved by the complete racialisation of New World slavery so that skin colour and slavery became inextricably linked. Apologists for the system argue that slavery had always existed. This may be true but history would become meaningless if reduced to such generalities. History must aim to uncover the historic specificity of social forms as well as their links with the past. The Atlantic slave system did indeed emerge from previous systems but in the process slavery was extended in scale and transformed in form. Blackburn traces the emergence of the slave trade from existing patterns of slavery in Africa. The story follows the Portuguese discoveries and the origins of the Atlantic slave trade through to the emergence of Brazilian sugar from However, it was the English colonial system which really developed and eventually dominated the Atlantic trade and the system of slave plantations. The profits of slavery were central to the primitive accumulation which paved the way for English industrialisation. The capitalist transformation of agriculture helped to create a landless proletariat which was available for emigration or for wage labour in England. The transformation of the English economy helped to create a market for the new goods of the colonies. Initially, it was wage labour which worked the new plantations in Barbados and elsewhere. British emigrants would be contracted to work as indentured servants for three, five or seven years for the plantation after which they would be free to pursue other employment. In Barbados had 2, indentured servants and only African slaves. By there were 20, slaves and only 8, indentured servants. White indentured servants faced enormous hardships on the estates. The work was extremely hard, conditions appalling and life expectancy was short. Escaped servants were made to serve double time for their master. A repeated escape could lead to branding. Like slaves, the servant was regarded as a piece of property and was valued according to the amount of tobacco or sugar which could be expected to be produced before the indenture expired. The plantation owners faced two problems. As the demand for the plantation exports rose rapidly they needed more and more labour. As emigration from Britain was, by and large, voluntary it could not guarantee to meet the needs of the system. At the same time, stories drifted back of life in the colonies which tended to discourage volunteers for the indenture system. Thus it was the growing demand for secure supplies of labour which produced the shift towards African slavery. In this context, the mid-seventeenth century saw the rapid growth of the slave plantation in the English Caribbean. This explanation of the rise of Caribbean slavery was pioneered by Eric Williams in his work, Capitalism and Slavery. Williams outlined the shifts from enslavement of the local Indian populations, to the use of white convict or indentured labour to black slavery. Williams had argued that "slavery was not born of racism: The extremely hard conditions of the plantation colonies meant that the owners, and the colonial authorities, always faced the possibility of revolt. As long as black slaves and white servants worked alongside each other this included the possibility of joint action, however temporary. Rare as such risings might have been, they terrified those in authority. Increasingly, laws were passed to enforce racial segregation. Such laws helped to create a form of racial solidarity among the white colonists. Increasingly

whites, even poor whites, could identify themselves as a part of the privileged race. The privilege of their colour exempted them from slavery and granted them certain civil rights. In these ways slavery was crucial to forming the new racial identities in the American colonies. These new identities and structures tended to undermine white opposition to slavery. Slavery came to be identified with black Africans. In turn, black people were identified as slaves or potential slaves. These racial divisions were sharpest in the English-speaking colonies in the Caribbean and North America. In the Spanish, Portuguese and French territories there developed a far bigger free black population. Here blacks could begin to demand some of the rights of the white citizen. In the English colonies such a blurring of the racial boundaries was not allowed to emerge and the number of free blacks remained small. Firstly, slavery has tended to be seen as a backward and unproductive system which could not therefore have produced sufficient profits to assist capitalist accumulation. Secondly, the debate on the transition to capitalism has tended to focus on the internal economic and social changes which were necessary for capitalist development. This debate has tended to ignore or minimise the role of external factors. Blackburn draws on many recent studies of the economics of New World slavery. Using a variety of quantitative techniques, economic historians have been able to show that the slave plantation could be a profitable enterprise which could compete well with other possible investments Chapter IX. This was the case despite a variety of factors which did tend to make the plantation system resistant to innovation. The second issue, of slavery and the transition to capitalism, relates to a question raised by Marx. Marx pointed out the various ways in which capitalism reproduced the conditions for its existence. However, there remained a problem: The whole movement, therefore, seems to turn in a vicious circle, out of which we can only get by supposing a primitive accumulation. Once capitalism was established it became a continuous process of reproducing and expanding investment. What Marx asks here, however, is what was the source of the original funds for capitalist investment? Marx himself was well aware that the history of capitalism provided a number of possible sources. These idyllic proceedings are the chief moments of primitive accumulation". For example, a number of historians have revised down the growth rate of the British economy during the industrial revolution. Blackburn suggests that this would strengthen the role of colonial trade in funding industrialisation. Working on figures for , Blackburn argues that triangular trade profits may have provided anything between Plantation profits may have assisted economic development in a number of ways. By increasing the general prosperity of the economy they may have boosted the industrialisation process. They may also have eased the credit difficulties of the new industrialists. The early industrial processes involved a lengthy turnover time. In other words a capitalist might have to wait a long time to realise the profits from an investment. In such circumstances credit was vital. The profits of slavery helped to lubricate this process. Financial bills, drawn on plantation products such as sugar or tobacco, began to circulate as a form of money. In the absence of sufficient institutional sources of credit, plantation funds helped to fill the gap. Nevertheless, I found two weaknesses in the book. The first relates to what is perhaps missing. This is a fuller treatment of resistance and opposition to slavery. Slavery was never fully accepted by all parties, most obviously by the slaves themselves. Blackburn does indeed provide accounts both of a number of rebellions and forms of resistance and of European thinkers who questioned the institution and the new racism which began to emerge. I was left wanting to read more about this side of the history of slavery; about the African states which fought back and refused to participate in the slave trade; about the many forms of resistance adopted by slaves in the colonies. Just as the history of capitalism is also the history of opposition to it, so surely the history of slavery is also the history of resistance. My second reservation is, perhaps, related. It concerns the style of the book, which at times seems too scholarly and too detached. It is indeed necessary to provide the facts and analysis as Blackburn does. Marx also was not bad at analysis. On balance, however, these reservations are minor and this book will become required reading for anyone interested in the history of capitalism or of racism. I, , London, Lawrence and Wishart, Ch.

2: Primitive accumulation of capital is alive and well | The Indian Express

Story time just got better with Prime Book Box, a subscription that delivers hand-picked children's books every 1, 2, or 3 months at 40% off List Price.

Within this vast area of debate, one particular subtopic has been an object of intense scrutiny among scholars: All these things, taken together, are commonly taken to be synonymous with capitalism. It is precisely this identification that is challenged in this essay by Marxist historian Ellen Meiksins Wood, along with the notion that ascribing European agrarian origins to capitalism entails a view of Europe as a civilizing vanguard. Other writers, including the late J. A wide range of scholars of color and Third World writers have contributed to the discussion. While this discussion is only one part of developing a fuller understanding of the dynamics of liberation struggles and anti-capitalist movements, historically and today, we believe it can be a worthwhile one. What puzzles me most about them is that, without exception as far as I know, they are based on the most Eurocentric—not to mention bourgeois—assumptions. Conventional non-Marxist European accounts of capitalist development from at least the eighteenth century have been based on two fairly simple assumptions. We can call these two assumptions the commercialization model of capitalist development, and the classical theory of primitive accumulation. Instead, capitalism is conceived as a more or less natural outcome of age-old and virtually universal human practices, the activities of exchange, which have taken place not only in towns since time immemorial but also in agricultural societies. Of course, in these narratives it is the West that was most successful in removing such obstacles. How, then, do anti-Eurocentric histories differ from these classic explanations of the origin of capitalism? The critiques generally take one or both of two forms. Often this second thesis has to do with the role of British imperialism, particularly the profits of sugar plantations and the slave trade, in the development of industrial capitalism, though is also a major milestone in the earlier rise of capitalism, as it is for J. Blaut, who attributes European economic development in large part to the riches plundered from the Americas. Now clearly, no serious historian today would deny the importance of trade and technology in Asia and other parts of the non-European world, or, for that matter, the relatively modest level of development attained by Europeans before the rise of capitalism. Nor would any such historian, especially on the left, deny the importance of imperialism in European history and the tremendous damage it has done. The question, though, is what this has to do with capitalism, and on that score, the anti-Eurocentric arguments tend to fall into precisely those Eurocentric and bourgeois traps they are meant to avoid. The remarkable thing about anti-Eurocentric critiques is that they start from the same premises as do the standard Eurocentric explanations, the same commercialization model and the same conception of primitive accumulation. Traders or merchants anywhere and everywhere are seen as potential, if not actual, capitalists, and the more active, wide-ranging, and wealthy they are, the further they are along the road of capitalist development. In that sense, many parts of Asia, Africa, and the Americas were well on their way to capitalism before European imperialism, in one way or another, blocked their path. Since trade was widespread in other parts of the world, imperialism was the really essential factor in distinguishing Europe from the rest, because it gave European powers the critical mass of wealth that finally differentiated them from other commercial powers. So, for instance, J. Since Blaut does not conceive of capitalism as a specific social form, he can have no clear conception of non- or precapitalist modes of production with different operating principles, and no conception of a transition from one to the other. It was this crucial geographic advantage, Blaut believes, that gave Europe privileged access to the wealth required to jump-start their bourgeois and industrial revolutions. Once they took power, they were able to mobilize the state to facilitate accumulation and create the infrastructure for industrial development. From then on, the Industrial Revolution, though it did not happen overnight, was inevitable. In this version, the echoes of the old Eurocentric and bourgeois narrative are truly uncanny: Not only is European development basically the rise to power of the bourgeoisie, but advanced and wealthy non-European civilizations seem to be cases of arrested development because, even if through no fault of their own, they never did throw off their shackles by means of bourgeois revolution. Even at the point where they diverge most emphatically from the classic Eurocentric histories, in their emphasis on imperialism, they

simply invert an old Eurocentric principle. So here again there seems to be no conception of capitalism as a specific social form, with a distinctive social structure, distinctive social relations of production, which compel economic agents to behave in specific ways and generate specific laws of motion. And here again there is no real transition. There is no explanation of how a new social form came into being. Instead, the history of capitalism is a story in which age-old social practices, with no historical beginning, have grown and matured—“unless their growth and maturation have been thwarted by internal or external obstacles. There are of course variations on the old themes, most of all the attack on imperialism. But whatever variations are introduced into the story, basically capitalism is just a lot more of what already existed in protocapitalism and long before: Challenging Eurocentrism This kind of argument seems to me a regression, which forfeits much of the progress historians have made in challenging the Eurocentric model. By insisting on the historical specificity of capitalism, they have dealt a fatal blow to the most Eurocentric principle of all: There, the origin of capitalism was not so much explained as presupposed, as a new social form waiting to be released by the rising bourgeoisie when it finally threw off its feudal shackles. Here Marx did decisively break with the old paradigm and laid a foundation for important elaborations by later Marxist historians. In the new agrarian relations, landlords increasingly derived rents from the commercial profits of capitalist tenants, while many small producers were dispossessed and became wage laborers. This meant that capitalism had a historical beginning and therefore a conceivable end. Capitalism was not the product of some inevitable natural process, nor was it the end of history. It had emerged in very specific historical conditions. In that debate, historians such as Maurice Dobb and R. Hilton challenged the commercialization model. At least, they showed how the dissolution of Western feudalism and the transition to capitalism was not brought about by the expansion of trade, by urbanization, or by the increasing monetization of the economy. Even the spread of money rents, instead of rent in kind or labor services, did not fundamentally change the logic of feudalism. Instead, the critical factor in bringing about the transition was the social property relations and class struggle between lords and peasants. This was an important challenge to the commercialization model of capitalist development, but it still shared significant assumptions with that old model. Although these Marxist historians had moved the center of gravity from the city to the country, and from the expansion of trade to relations and struggles between exploiting and exploited classes, they were still assuming too much of what needed to be explained. Freed of their feudal impediments, they could, according to this explanation, start taking advantage of commercial opportunities and bring about the transition to capitalism simply by growing from petty commodity producers into full-fledged capitalists. Robert Brenner built on the foundation created by these Marxist historians and especially their emphasis on the class relations between lords and peasants. In other words, Brenner set out to explain a real transition from one mode of production to another. He laid out a detailed explanation of how social property relations were transformed so that they set in motion a new historical dynamic, the imperatives of competition, profit-maximization and a tendency to relentless and systematic development of the productive forces. But he has since elaborated an argument seeking to show that in parts of the Netherlands, there was a different route to market dependence. He clearly conceives of capitalism as a system of market imperatives—that is, as a system in which the market functions not just as an opportunity to exchange some goods for others, or even to make profit and acquire wealth, but as a necessity, a compulsion, which imposes on production and social reproduction certain inescapable requirements of competition, profit-maximization, and increasing labor-productivity. Like other Marxist historians such as E. The so-called Industrial Revolution was the outcome of an economy already structured by capitalist social property relations, which shaped the development of both agriculture and industry. His argument is significant also because it broke with the old Eurocentric habit of treating the development of capitalism as a general European process, as if it were somehow the product of European racial or cultural superiority. Brenner not only insisted on the specificity of capitalism as distinct from other commercial societies outside of early modern Europe but also identified the social conditions that distinguished one European society from another, giving rise to capitalism in England but not, say, in France. The issue, of course, was not the superiority of England over France, or of Western Europe over Eastern, or of Europe over everywhere else. It was simply a question of the very specific historical conditions in which a very specific

social form emerged, the historically specific social property relations of capitalism. There is, in my view, much more to be done. We need, for instance, to explain the dynamics of highly commercialized societies that did not become capitalist, at least not until they came under pressure from already existing capitalist economies elsewhere. Various kinds of non-capitalist commerce existed both in Europe and elsewhere, long before capitalism and well into the capitalist era. Some commercial powers achieved great wealth and cultural richness, and trade in these centers was sometimes associated with substantial production, both at home and in colonies. Yet in the absence of certain transformations in social property relations, which made competition, profit-maximization and relentless development of the productive forces necessary conditions of survival and systemic reproduction, even the wealthiest and most advanced of these commercial societies did not set off the self-sustaining process of economic development which, in part of Europe, gave rise to capitalism and eventually its industrial form. What makes these cases even more interesting is that in some of them, the level of commercial, cultural, even technological development substantially exceeded that in England at the point where it took off on its distinctive path of capitalist development. China, for instance, was for a long time far ahead of Europe in general, not least in technology and its achievements were, by the way, never more lavishly acknowledged than in the Eurocentric Enlightenment. Even conventional economic histories will acknowledge the importance of the Indian economy and especially its textile industry. Nor would it be news to even the most reactionary Western historian that Europeans in the medieval period borrowed massively from the Arabs, whose scientific accomplishments in particular were far superior. This catalogue of non-European superiority could go on and on, citing accomplishments of various kinds in Africa and the Americas. And even within Europe itself, late medieval and Renaissance Florence, on any measure of commercial sophistication, domestic manufacture or cultural achievements, was well ahead of the backwater that England was before its capitalist transformation. But the point is precisely that superiority in cultural, technological, or even commercial development had nothing to do with the specific conditions that generated capitalism in one place and not in another. Anti-Eurocentric historians are right to emphasize the backwardness of Europe, and especially of England. But that argues against, not for, the basic assumptions of the commercialization model and the classical theory of primitive accumulation, in both the old Eurocentric model and its anti-Eurocentric inversion. Capitalism and Imperialism But if we still have a long way to go, the basic elements of a serious challenge to Eurocentric history are already there, and it seems to me a backward step to give up the gains we have made. The irony is that the standard anti-Eurocentric arguments tend to hinder our understanding not only of capitalism but also of imperialism. The first and most obvious point is that all the major powers in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe were deeply engaged in colonial ventures, conquest, plunder, oppression and slavery. Yet these ventures were associated with very different patterns of economic development, only one of which was capitalist. Instead, Spain expended its massive colonial wealth in essentially feudal pursuits, especially war and the construction of its Habsburg empire in Europe. Having overextended and overtaxed its European empire, it went into a deep and long-term decline in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It seems to me very hard to avoid the conclusion that much, if not everything, depended on the social property relations at home in the imperial power, the particular conditions of systemic reproduction associated with those property relations and the particular economic processes set in motion by them. The wealth amassed from colonial exploitation may have contributed substantially to further development, even if it was not a necessary precondition of the origin of capitalism. And once British capitalism, especially in its industrial form, was well established, it was able to impose capitalist imperatives on other economies with different social property relations. By contrast, the truly enormous wealth accumulated by Spain and Portugal had no such effect because they were unambiguously non-capitalist economies. The New Colonial Model There is, though, more to the story. If England was a late bloomer in overseas ventures, it did get an earlier start closer to home. This pattern also became the model for English colonization of the New World. The point here is that, in Ireland and then elsewhere, the English developed a form of colonialism different from the imperialism of its European rivals. Compared to other European empires, the British was notable, first of all, for the prominence of white settler colonies, as distinct from other forms of imperial domination, such as trading empires or conquests for the purpose of appropriating precious

commodities like silver; and there are some clear connections between this kind of colonization, in its specifically British form, and the development of capitalism at home. The settlement of Ireland differed even from other European colonial settlements and reflected the logic of early agrarian capitalism. The Spanish had their *encomienda* system, subjecting local populations to a form of slavery. The French in New France had their quasi-feudal *seigneuries*. The Dutch had their trading posts and settlements to facilitate commerce and provision merchant ships. Slave plantations for the production of highly marketable commodities like sugar became a common feature of both the old and the new imperialisms. The English in Ireland spelled out quite explicitly their intention of displacing traditional indigenous property forms and social relations with the property relations of south-eastern England, the birthplace of agrarian capitalism. They did this partly by imposing the new system on Irish tenants, but more particularly, by dispossessing the Irish altogether and replacing them with English and Scottish settlers, who were supposed to transplant a productive and profitable commercial agriculture.

3: Capitalism, primitive and modern : some aspects of Tolai economic growth - ANU Press - ANU

Capitalism is an economic system based on private ownership of the means of production and their operation for profit. Characteristics central to capitalism include private property, capital accumulation, wage labor, voluntary exchange, a price system, and competitive markets.

Written by Nissim Mannathukkaren Updated: May 5, Some of the words that Marx uses when describing capital comes to mind when looking at this irony: Take for instance, one of the crucial concepts of Marx in Capital: Moreover, the relationship between human beings becomes reduced to a relationship between commodities: At present, interestingly, research from across the world shows that rather than consumerism being pitted against religion, religion itself has become commodified. As Marx put it: Modern colonialism of the Americas, Africa and Asia with its devastating consequences are the biggest examples of the primitive accumulation of capital. But primitive accumulation is hardly history. It is a daily terrifying reality for the most marginalised populations of the world. The plundering of the most valuable natural resources by MNCs and in the process the destroying of the economic and cultural habitats of the Adivasis is one example in India. The phenomenon of land grabbing from the time of the food price crisis through large-scale acquisitions of land in developing countries by agricultural investors and speculators is another global example. As much as 70 percent of the land grabs occur in Sub-Saharan Africa. The only difference between the past and present types of accumulation is that the latter happen under the cloak of free trade and democracy. The most important element of this new social structure is the emergence of labour from the clutches of personal dependences and unfreedoms that characterise feudalism to become free wage labour. Thus, for the first time in human history, labour itself becomes a commodity, to be bought and sold in the market. We suffer not only from the living, but from the dead. The religious and the magical nature of capitalism has reached its apogee under our present conditions. An unregulated global financial capitalism rules the roost. The speculative tendencies visible from the s exploded in the recent decades. As early as , the economist Susan Strange warned us: What marks out him from other philosophers is his call to translate theory into practice. As he famously put it: That is the implication of reading Karl Marx in the th year of his birth.

4: Eurocentric Anti-Eurocentrism

Search the history of over billion web pages on the Internet.

S government would have you believe. So the goal here is to key in on one or two cause and effect relationships. Once anyone starts to become familiar with how the economic pieces fit together and affect each other, it may start to sound redundant when changing the subject of focus precisely because of the interplay, interdependence and overlap of the various aspects which influence economic conditions and circumstances at any given time. Just as the capitalist system today dictates the large majority of U. S citizens, regardless of ambition, talent or qualifications, must remain in the lower and middle echelons of the economic structure, the same system also dictates that a certain small percent of participants will exist in the top income brackets. Legislation and policies pertaining to economics are firmly in place to facilitate the accumulation of wealth and investing capital by causing the money to flow predominantly upwards toward the top income levels, where a very small percent of people end up accumulating a very large disproportionate amount of all existing wealth. Regardless of law and policy, pure capitalism will generously and automatically favor those who are born with, or are able to accumulate investment capital or wealth. It could be argued that those at the top income echelons are smarter than those at the bottom or middle of the structure, or possibly those at the top are more persistent than others. At the present time this tailoring of laws and policies has gone to the extreme with no consideration for maintaining the well-being of the majority in our society. And although the world and amount of what can be produced are finite and limited numbers, our laws have set no limits on the amount of wealth any person or group can accumulate. Capitalism as practiced in the U. The laws and policies pertaining to the economy, combined with human nature, dictate that people will go without fulfilling basic needs today. But if financial security and basic needs are beneficial to civilized society, then a healthy economic structure should strive to provide as much financial stability, security and freedoms for the greatest number of people. So why does American society have such a difficult time discussing political and economic realities affecting our entire individual, familial and societal well-being as a whole? The simple truth is a great deal of human psychology plays into our political-economic system, and for our purposes psychological effects can also be termed as the effects of human nature while the two overlap and interplay to a large degree. Greed is definitely part of our human nature and is much stronger in some when compared to others. This deceitfulness can and often does include self-deception of an individual or group as a whole. Extreme wealth makes it possible to corrupt others and this corruption has actually become a game for many who control and manipulate the U. In the case of the extremely wealthy, greed is completely irrational as many already have more than they can reasonably spend in multiple lifetimes. And beyond irrational, this same greed has some innate destructive and restrictive qualities working against the overall well-being of our society and the advancement of mankind in general. This hard core ideological dogma necessitates denial or complete lack of concern regarding the actual cause and effect of certain conditions and other realities which occur in our economy. As the wealthy have continued to accumulate more wealth over recent years, the large majority of Americans are losing wealth and have less actual purchasing power and less freedoms than in other periods of our history. Just think of all the time and labor which would have been saved if computer and robotic sciences had been developed fifty, twenty or even ten years earlier. That time and labor which would have been saved is indisputable, and could have easily been applied to education and research for even more advances in medical science or energy saving technologies, or the development of completely new sciences in the production of clean energy is not out of the question and certainly worth pursuing. One medical solution has the potential to spare the life of the one innovative person who could go on to discover that formula for clean and available energy. This fear again is irrational for several reasons. We will say that less poverty and desperation in our society would automatically reduce crime which can also reduce court and prison expenses. A more comfortable financial situation for all concerned would also reduce stress for individuals, as well as stress in our entire society, and thereby provide health benefits which can lead to greater productivity. Financial comfort can also reduce other types of stress related crimes such as domestic violence and various

forms of abuse. Those health and crime-reducing benefits, along the exponential gains due to scientific advances from accelerated learning and research, are being denied to our entire society simply because of personal greed, or excessive accumulation of wealth if you prefer. Again, I refer back to how the excessive accumulation of wealth, into the hands of relatively few people, works as an anti-stimulus in our finite general economy. The irony in our case today is that the laws and policies currently pertaining to the economy do not promote capitalistic-democracy as those in power incessantly profess; but instead promote excess for the relative few while promoting exclusion, or limited success at best, for the vast majority. Citizens are being prohibited from exercising their right to have an equal democratic say and equal representation in the workings of our entire political and economic structure. Living under financial duress is unhealthy for individuals, families and society as a whole. And yet those in power who legislate our two party political system, while having the power to change it, cling to and profess the false-reality that the system as implemented is the best that can possibly exist, with no room or need for change. It cannot be overstated how U. S. Psychological programming over multi-generations through propagandized ideological dogma is a powerful instrument indeed and it appears we may have outsmarted ourselves concerning economic ideology. When it comes to cases of continued denial concerning human or legal rights, fear of change can transform into an extremely destructive force which at times manifests itself in the realities of war, be it civil or foreign. To unleash the destructive forces of war, or violent conflict, it only takes unreasonableness on one side and the human nature to resist transgressions against human or legal rights on the other. That line of transgression against the American people has, by any honest accounting, long been crossed by mutually corrupted-intellects in the symbiotic collusion of extreme wealth and D. If patriotic Americans would now arm themselves with truthful informational facts while mobilizing to effect peaceful political change with the overwhelming force of moral intellect, the positive effects to our overall society will more than compensate for the investment of time and energy required to make those changes. Mark Weiser was thrown into this world without any say as to when, or where, and to whom he would be born. He says his story is the same as all others in that respect as we all come from this same earth and began the same way. This article was posted on Tuesday, September 9th, at 2:

5: Slavery and the rise of capitalism, Issue 33

*Capitalism, Primitive and Modern: Some Aspects of Tolai Economic Growth [T. Scarlett Epstein, Raymond Firth] on www.enganchecubano.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Book by Epstein, Scarlett.*

You can help by adding to it. February The gold standard formed the financial basis of the international economy from to Capitalism was carried across the world by broader processes of globalization and by the beginning of the nineteenth century a series of loosely connected market systems had come together as a relatively integrated global system, in turn intensifying processes of economic and other globalization. Industrialization allowed cheap production of household items using economies of scale while rapid population growth created sustained demand for commodities. Globalization in this period was decisively shaped by 18th-century imperialism. Also in this period, areas of sub-Saharan Africa and the Pacific islands were colonised. The conquest of new parts of the globe, notably sub-Saharan Africa, by Europeans yielded valuable natural resources such as rubber , diamonds and coal and helped fuel trade and investment between the European imperial powers, their colonies and the United States: The inhabitant of London could order by telephone, sipping his morning tea, the various products of the whole earth, and reasonably expect their early delivery upon his doorstep. Militarism and imperialism of racial and cultural rivalries were little more than the amusements of his daily newspaper. What an extraordinary episode in the economic progress of man was that age which came to an end in August The United Kingdom first formally adopted this standard in Soon to follow were Canada in , Newfoundland in , the United States and Germany de jure in New technologies, such as the telegraph , the transatlantic cable , the radiotelephone , the steamship and railway allowed goods and information to move around the world at an unprecedented degree. The postwar boom ended in the late s and early s and the situation was worsened by the rise of stagflation. The extension of universal adult male suffrage in 19th-century Britain occurred along with the development of industrial capitalism and democracy became widespread at the same time as capitalism, leading capitalists to posit a causal or mutual relationship between them. Moderate critics argue that though economic growth under capitalism has led to democracy in the past, it may not do so in the future as authoritarian regimes have been able to manage economic growth without making concessions to greater political freedom. Moderate critics have recently challenged this, stating that the current influence lobbying groups have had on policy in the United States is a contradiction, given the approval of Citizens United. This has led people to question the idea that competitive capitalism promotes political freedom. The ruling on Citizens United allows corporations to spend undisclosed and unregulated amounts of money on political campaigns, shifting outcomes to the interests and undermining true democracy. According to Hahnel, there are a few objections to the premise that capitalism offers freedom through economic freedom. These objections are guided by critical questions about who or what decides whose freedoms are more protected. Often, the question of inequality is brought up when discussing how well capitalism promotes democracy. An argument that could stand is that economic growth can lead to inequality given that capital can be acquired at different rates by different people. In *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* , Thomas Piketty of the Paris School of Economics asserts that inequality is the inevitable consequence of economic growth in a capitalist economy and the resulting concentration of wealth can destabilize democratic societies and undermine the ideals of social justice upon which they are built. Singapore has a successful open market economy as a result of its competitive, business-friendly climate and robust rule of law. Nonetheless, it often comes under fire for its brand of government which though democratic and consistently one of the least corrupt [66] it also operates largely under a one-party rule and does not vigorously defend freedom of expression given its government-regulated press as well as penchant for upholding laws protecting ethnic and religious harmony, judicial dignity and personal reputation. Hall and David Soskice argued that modern economies have developed two different forms of capitalism: Germany, Japan, Sweden and Austria. Those two types can be distinguished by the primary way in which firms coordinate with each other and other actors, such as trade unions. In LMEs, firms primarily coordinate their endeavors by way of hierarchies and market mechanisms. Coordinated market economies more heavily rely on non-market forms of interaction in the

coordination of their relationship with other actors for a detailed description see Varieties of Capitalism. These two forms of capitalisms developed different industrial relations , vocational training and education , corporate governance , inter-firm relations and relations with employees. The existence of these different forms of capitalism has important societal effects, especially in periods of crisis and instability. Since the early s, the number of labor market outsiders has rapidly grown in Europe, especially among the youth, potentially influencing social and political participation. Using varieties of capitalism theory, it is possible to disentangle the different effects on social and political participation that an increase of labor market outsiders has in liberal and coordinated market economies Ferragina et al. This signals an important problem for liberal market economies in a period of crisis. If the market does not provide consistent job opportunities as it has in previous decades , the shortcomings of liberal social security systems may depress social and political participation even further than in other capitalist economies. Academic perspectives on capitalism In general, capitalism as an economic system and mode of production can be summarised by the following: High levels of wage labour.

6: Modern Capitalism | Dissident Voice

Of all published articles, the following were the most read within the past 12 months.

Karl Marx proposed that Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and bourgeois modes of production are epochs that mark the transitions of societies. Also, the changes in the mode of production from primitive communism through slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and socialism to communism are due to the method of dialectic, and the theory of materialism. The dialectic method involves the meeting of extreme forces that merge into synthesis. At the early state of primitive communism, primitive forms of hunting gave way to primitive forms of agriculture and cattle rearing. Also, dialectic changes of the matriarchate to the patriarchate types were recognized. In the matriarchate form, women played a dominant role in production under primitive agriculture, while the men roamed the forest after game. In the patriarchate form, men played the dominant role in the hunting and cattle-rearing stages because they were efficient with a bow, arrows, spears, and lasso. The actual process of analyzing the changes of modes of production follows a materialistic theory. Through evolution, human beings developed a consciousness that became sensitized to material change. In primitive societies, production was in the simple form of adapting to nature. Land was cultivated before it was divided, and the consciousness was communal. One purpose of studying primitive communism is to understand how the three major classes—wage-laborers, capitalists, and landlords—have developed under capitalism. During primitive communism property belonged to the community and labor owned all the product of its labor in the absence of capital- and land-owning classes. If one tribe was conquered by another, the conquered tribe became propertyless, as was the case with slavery and serfdom. A tribe and its property formed a sort of unity that originated from the mode of production where individuals related to one another and to nature. The object of production was to reproduce the producer. For Marx, production is not possible without capital. In primitive communism capital could be just the hands of a hunter-gatherer. Strictly speaking, capital is specific to the bourgeois mode of production. Tools are not capital outside of capitalism. And production is not possible without human labor, not tools, which are a product of human labor and natural resources. Primitive communism dissolved when the mode of production changed. In specific forms of primitive communism, one finds two major forms of unity between labor and production conditions. This unity was observed in Asiatic communal systems and in small-scale agriculture Rosdolsky, p. Marx appraised the small and ancient Indian community as possessing common ownership of land, blending agriculture and handicraft, and possessing an invariable form of division of labor. As the market was unchanging, the division of labor could not evolve to, for instance, the manufacturing level. If population increases, a new community is formed on vacant land. Production is governed by tradition, rather than by command or markets. These simple relations explain how production, distribution, and consumption are conducted within all societies. These activities are in turn subsumed under relations of production and forces of production. The “Ethnological Notebooks containing his study of the ethnologists Lewis H. Morgan sourced property rights in primitive societies to personal relationships and Maine to impersonal forces, but to Marx the source is from the collective. He studied primitive groups for the origin of civil society and the state and he traced the production mode from these primitive groups to modern society. Morgan discovered a kinship system among the Iroquois Indians that was common to all the aboriginal inhabitants of the United States. He found that the system was common to Asia, and to some extent to Africa and Australia. Morgan introduced the concepts of the matriarchate and patriarchate to characterize primitive communes. The order of primitive communes originated with the production of food, or subsistence needs. The human race has progressed from lower to higher forms to modern civilization as lower forms of savagery and barbarism have progressed to higher forms. The arts of subsistence advanced as inventions and instruments evolved. Property, government, and family progressed in this natural process. For instance, evolution bequeathed group marriage for savages, pairing marriage for primitive communes, and monogamy for civil societies. Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations, ed. The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx: Studies of Morgan, Phear, Maine, Lubbock, ed.

7: Full text of "Capitalism, Primitive And Modern"

Modern Capitalism Two developments paved the way for the emergence of modern capitalism; both took place in the latter half of the 18th century. The first was the appearance of the physiocrats in France after ; and the second was the devastating impact that the id eas of Adam Smith had on the principles and practice of mercantilism.

They see primitive accumulation as a process happening in the transition from the feudal "stage" to the capitalist "stage". In part, trade grows incrementally, but usually the establishment of capitalist relations of production involves force and violence; transforming property relations means that assets previously owned by some people are no longer owned by them, but by other people, and making people part with their assets in this way involves coercion. In his preface to *Das Kapital* Vol. The less developed countries also face a process of primitive accumulation, it is an ongoing process of expropriation , Proletarianization and Urbanization. Marx comments that "if, however, the German reader shrugs his shoulders at the condition of the English industrial and agricultural labourers, or in optimist fashion comforts himself with the thought that in Germany things are not nearly so bad, I must plainly tell him, "De te fabula narratur! Marx was referring here to the expansion of the capitalist mode of production not the expansion of world trade , through expropriation processes. He continues, "Intrinsically, it is not a question of the higher or lower degree of development of the social antagonism that results from the natural laws of capitalist production. It is a question of these laws themselves, of these tendencies working with iron necessity towards inevitable results. Like Mandel, Harvey claims that the word "primitive" leads to a misunderstanding in the history of capitalism; that the original, "primitive" phase of capitalism is somehow a transitory phase that need not be repeated once commenced. Instead, Harvey maintains that primitive accumulation "accumulation by dispossession" is a continuing process within the process of capital accumulation on a world scale. Because the central Marxian notion of crisis via " over-accumulation " is assumed to be a constant factor in the process of capital accumulation, the process of "accumulation by dispossession" acts as a possible safety valve that may temporarily ease the crisis. This is achieved by simply lowering the prices of consumer commodities thus pushing up the propensity for general consumption , which in turn is made possible by the considerable reduction in the price of production inputs. Should the magnitude of the reduction in the price of inputs outweigh the reduction in the price of consumer goods, it can be said that the rate of profit will, for the time being, increase. The implication is that non-capitalist territories should be forced open not only to trade which could be helpful but also to permit capital to invest in profitable ventures using cheaper labour power, raw materials, low-cost land, and the like. The general thrust of any capitalist logic of power is not that territories should be held back from capitalist development, but that they should be continuously opened up. If it belonged to the public sector, that profit would not have existed. In that sense, the profit is created by dispossession of peoples or nations. Destructive industrial use of the environment is similar because the environment "naturally" belongs to everyone, or to no one: By doing so, multinational pharmaceutical companies can now sell the medicine to the natives who are the original source of the knowledge that made production of medicine possible. That is, dispossession of folklore knowledge, wisdom, practice through intellectual property rights. David Harvey also argues that accumulation by dispossession is a temporal or partial solution to over-accumulation. Because accumulation by dispossession makes raw materials cheaper, the profit rate can at least temporarily go up. Because the latter is equated by Harvey with the separation of the direct producer mostly smallholders from the means of production land , Harvey assumes this results in the formation of a workforce that is free. By contrast, Brass points out that in many instances the process of depeasantization leads to workers who are unfree, because they are unable personally to commodify or recommodify their labour-power, by selling it to the highest bidder. In liberal economic theory , the market returns to each person the exact value she added into it; capitalists are just people who are very adept at saving and whose contributions are especially magnificent, and they do not take anything away from other people or the environment. Liberals believe that capitalism has no internal flaws or contradictions; only outside threats. To liberals, the idea of the necessity of violent primitive accumulation to capital is particularly incendiary. Schumpeter wrote rather testily: Schumpeter

argued that imperialism was not a necessary jump-start for capitalism, nor is it needed to bolster capitalism, because imperialism pre-existed capitalism. Schumpeter believed that, whatever the empirical evidence, capitalist world trade could in principle just expand peacefully. If imperialism occurred, Schumpeter asserted, it has nothing to do with the intrinsic nature of capitalism itself, or with capitalist market expansion. The distinction between Schumpeter and Marx here is subtle. Marx claimed that capitalism requires violence and imperialism—first, to kick-start capitalism with a pile of booty and to dispossess a population to induce them to enter into capitalist relations as workers, and then to surmount the otherwise-fatal contradictions generated within capitalist relations over time. Imperialism is the object-less disposition of a state to expansion by force without assigned limits. Modern Imperialism is one of the heirlooms of the absolute monarchical state. The "inner logic" of capitalism would have never evolved it. Its sources come from the policy of the princes and the customs of a pre-capitalist milieu. But even export monopoly is not imperialism and it would never have developed to imperialism in the hands of the pacific bourgeoisie. This happened only because the war machine, its social atmosphere, and the martial will were inherited and because a martially oriented class i. This alliance keeps alive fighting instincts and ideas of domination. It led to social relations which perhaps ultimately are to be explained by relations of production but not by the productive relations of capitalism alone.

8: Primitive Socialist Accumulation | www.enganchecubano.com

primitive to modern economic conditions (if, indeed, there could be such a "typical" case), but one in which the process of change can be studied more readily than usual simply because it took place under especially.

9: Primitive Communism | www.enganchecubano.com

Primitive accumulation and privatization. According to Marx, the whole purpose of primitive accumulation is to privatize the means of production, so that the exploiting owners can make money from the surplus labour of those who, lacking other means, must work for them.

Smoke on the Water To room nineteen. Wheatless cooking Modern minstrelsy Law of Home Schooling Whales in the Classroom Arranged by Nelson Riddle Gloucestershire County Council 1889-1974 Princeton review mcat 2015 The squadrons of the Royal Air Force Money Hungry (Jump at the Sun) Guide for the submission of unsolicited proposals. Grow your business with successful marketing strategies The book of mr natural Annual report of nestle pakistan 2014 Im still standing piano sheet music Arctic National Wildlife Refuge should be conserved Natural Resources Defense Council Sonnets for a friend Cuban Studies 30 (Pitt Latin American Series) From customer understanding to strategy innovation: practical tools to establish competitive positioning What Truly Counts 2. Types of rubber and their essential properties The Princess Within We came to Australia. Baseball (DK Eyewitness Books) Tem analysis of nanoparticles Us history final exam Christ as the Reality Employment in manufacturing, 1899-1939 Omer Bonne, Alexander Neumeister, Dennis S. Charney Carol S. North Roy Lubit, Spencer Eth German guided missiles of the Second World War Letters, 1913-1936. Taxes in the U.S. The theory of the cost-of-living index Backing Into Forward Octavian Anthony Cleopatra 5th wave book 1 The joy of submission Capitalism, culture, and decline in Britain, 1750-1990 Rejoicing in the riches of our great God