

# SAMIR AMIN AS A NEO-MARXIST

By

*Kweku G. FOLSON\**

## I. — INTRODUCTION

It is hazardous to use the concept of Neo-Marxism for the purpose of analysis for the reason that the concept is nowhere so precisely defined as to clearly demarcate its area from that of other possible varieties of Marxism(1). It is possible, however, to see Neo-Marxism as any Marxist analysis of society that is based on a fundamental re-appraisal of some of the central categories of analysis integral to the work of MARX. This means that there is no school of Neo-Marxism as such though it is possible to have schools of Neo-Marxism. Thus «Western Marxists» have been roundly designated «Neo-Marxists» on the ground that they have re-read the very philosophical foundations of Marxism(2). On the other hand Aidan FOSTER-CARTER has interpreted Neo-Marxism to mean that body of Marxist thinking which has modified fundamental Marxist positions in an attempt to come to terms with the «paradox of Marxism's practical successes in underdeveloped countries and its comparative failures in more developed ones» (3). The purpose of this paper is to examine the work of Samir AMIN with a view to assessing the extent to which he may be considered a Neo-Marxist.

One must start by braving the hazards of defining more closely what Neo-Marxism is, and this can only be done by distinguishing Neo-Marxism from «orthodox» or classical Marxism. The main outlines of the latter go back to the Second International before the First World War and the controversies surrounding Marxist doctrines involving in particular KAUTSKY, LENIN, TROTSKY, BERNSTEIN and Rosa LUXEMBURG. With the success of the Russian Revolution, the establishment of the Third (Communist) International towards the end of the War and the accession of LENIN to political power in the Soviet Union, LENIN's particular brand of Marxism came to sharply define the contours of orthodox Marxism, which in its turn embraced the ideological interests of the classical Marxist tradition of the Second International. It can thus be said that orthodox Marxism was established by the first and second generations of Marxists after the death of ENGELS in 1895.

The main concern of these Marxists was to develop what they believed to be the «correct» doctrines of MARX and ENGELS in the light of the changing nature of capitalism. In this they were particularly influenced by the writings of ENGELS after the death of MARX. Consequently one of their dominant interests was the «scientific» nature of Marxism, which

---

\* *Professor — Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria/Nigeria. The author is from Ghana.*

was squarely anchored in the philosophy of history that ENGELS had increasingly elaborated towards the end of his life and which was elevated into a test of orthodoxy by the Third International. According to this view, history develops along a linear path and in accordance with an unbroken succession which can be delayed, temporarily deflected or obscured but cannot be changed. Though LENIN himself recognised the developments in capitalism outside Europe which emphasized the new importance of the underdeveloped and oppressed parts of the world, the recognition was not regarded fundamental enough to lead to the abandonment of the perception of the European proletariat as the necessary initiator of the world proletarian revolution, a view that was shared by both Soviet official ideology that became the main embodiment of orthodox marxism with time and its principal opponent, i.e. Trotskyism. Since this view of «historical science» was more explicitly characteristic of ENGELS than of MARX, ENGELS was elevated to a position of authority equal to, or even higher than MARX in the exposition of orthodox Marxism. The revered texts were *Anti-Duhring* and *Dialectics of Nature* to which were to be added later *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. In this it might be said that the orthodox Marxists were more concerned to «uphold» what they regarded to be the positions of MARX and ENGELS (and of LENIN, even STALIN) than with developing them. In any case for orthodox Marxists there almost never is the possibility of «revising» what MARX and ENGELS wrote.

The most important distinguishing mark of Neo-Marxism is the frank admission that MARX and, in particular, ENGELS, were wrong on certain issues or that changed conditions necessitate the revision of some of their doctrines. This process may be said to have started after the First World War and especially with George LUKACS, who may rightly be regarded as the father of Neo-Marxism. It was he who first drew attention in his *History and Class Consciousness* to the tenuous links between ENGELS and MARX, particularly in the realm of philosophy and science, and started the movement of going back to MARX and HEGEL. In this way he may be said to have founded «Western Marxism». In Europe the real casualty of this changed attitude to Marxism has been the orthodox philosophy of dialectical materialism and especially the unilinear view of history.

In the Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* and in *Anti-Duhring*, MARX and ENGELS had respectively laid it down that there was a linear development of society, that is, that there were «progressive epochs in the economic formation of society», an evolution which could apparently be «determined with the precision of natural science». In spite of protests by MARX and ENGELS (4) and modifications by ENGELS (5) after the death of MARX, this philosophy of history came to be the very foundation of the classical tradition, the cornerstone of Marxist historical science and the touchstone of orthodoxy amongst the first and second generations of Marxists (6). It is this tradition that has been repudiated by Western Marxists with the claim that it was never the view of Marx but that of ENGELS and that it cannot in any case be logically upheld.

In the Third World generally and in Africa in particular other departures from orthodox Marxism by Neo-Marxists are more interesting since they are in the more immediately relevant fields of sociology and economics rather than in the field of philosophy and science. Three of these departures are of particular importance. First was BARAN's quiet abandonment of the concept of surplus value and, even more importantly, the introduction of the concept of economic surplus in his path-breaking book *The Political Economy of Growth* in 1957 and its subsequent consolidation in *Monopoly Capital* in 1966 by him and Sweezy. This facilitated the break with the orthodox view that capitalism is necessarily progressive and that therefore the path to socialism leads through capitalism. This in its turn eased the way to the second departure from orthodox Marxism; it enabled some Marxists to abandon the belief that the capitalist mode of production in Europe continues to be the axle of world history. That is, these Marxists came to accept the concept of a World Capitalist System which, though originating in Europe, is no longer a simple reflection of production relations in Europe. The third departure closely followed the second: the rejection of the centrality of the European proletariat to the world revolutionary process. These Marxists came to hold that the world capitalist system, having proletarianized the masses of the Third World even when they are not strictly a proletariat, has created a new revolutionary force more important in the contemporary era than the European proletariat.

In contemporary Africa perhaps one of the most uncompromising orthodox Marxists is Dan Wadada NABUDERE. In his writings (7), he continues to accord as much validity to ENGELS' position as to MARX and LENIN; to uphold the concept of surplus value in its pristine purity as against that of economic surplus; to condemn ideas of unequal exchange, centre-periphery relations and world system; to assert the continued validity of the unilinear view of history; and to condemn all those who attempt at any degree to differ from Leninist or Marxist doctrines that were established before the First World War or by the Third International: TROTSKY, KAUTSKY, LUXEMBURG, SWEEZY, BARAN, DEUTSCHER, JELEE, *Monthly Review*, *New Left Review*, EMMANUEL, SHIVJI, MAMDANI, and, of course, Samir AMIN. Prominent African Neo-Marxists include the last three and in recent years Claude AKE, in addition to CABRAL and FANON. Before NABUDERE, the orthodox position had been upheld mainly by African Communist Parties in the Soviet orbit, especially the Communist Party of South Africa with its organ *the African Communist*. In recent years the *Journal of African Marxists* has been launched by African scholars of the orthodox school in opposition to the *Review of African Political Economy* which they feel is not orthodox enough (8).

## II. — AMIN AS A MARXIST

In discussing AMIN, it is perhaps best to begin with the fact that he considers himself a Marxist. To him Marxism is synonymous with historical materialism in that the latter is the heart of the former. He sees his own work as being an extended analysis in terms of historical materialism,

«the framework of my analysis of the world capitalist system». To understand AMIN it is imperative that one should understand his interpretation of historical materialism.

When MARX and ENGELS developed the theory of historical materialism, they worked out a complex of concepts which added up to make a total theory. They adumbrated such concepts as productive forces, classes forming on the basis of the relations of production, and necessarily engaged in a class struggle so long as private ownership of the means of production lasts, and ideology. Out of this complex of ideas Samir AMIN identifies historical materialism with only one — the class struggle (9). This enables him to redefine the relationship between historical materialism or the class struggle — he uses the two terms interchangeably — and other ideas traditionally subsumed under historical materialism. From the point of view of Neo-Marxism two examples of this are of particular importance.

AMIN sharply distinguishes what he calls «economic laws of capitalism» from the «laws» of historical materialism. The whole purpose of his book, *The Law of Value and Historical Materialism*, he explains, is to examine how, under capitalism, economic laws and class struggle are interlinked (10). He denies that there are economic laws that operate in society over and above the laws of historical materialism. In particular, he denies that the development of productive forces determines the changes in the relations of production. According to him, the evidence of history is that it is rather the class struggle which alters the relations of production and that the relations of production, in their turn, make possible the potential development of the productive forces (11) — a position similar to «structuralist» Marxism. Hence he holds that there are no economic laws independent of class struggle (12). But he does not deny that there is a relationship between the class struggle and the economic base. The relationship is «dialectical», though the economic base is «pre-eminent» (13).

It must be admitted that AMIN has not yet achieved consistency on this question. In *Class and Nation*, he flatly declares, in opposition to his earlier view, that «the development of productive forces controls, in the final analysis, the relations of production» (14). But here he also attempts to disentangle more clearly the various elements of these relationships. He isolates the relationship between the productive forces and the relations of production (i.e. within the mode of production) and between the latter and the superstructure. Hence he speaks of a «double dialectical» relationship.

AMIN decisively repudiates the linear view of historical evolution. He maintains that this view is Eurocentric in the sense that it is founded on the centrality of the capitalist mode of production in Europe to the historical process and the concomittant overriding role of the European proletariat (15). In his view, MARX was correct in his analysis of the importance of European capitalism and proletariat. For at the time of MARX's analysis he could not have known that circumstances were soon to change so drastically as to lead to the centrality of European capitalism and the European proletariat being transcended. In particular, MARX

could not have known about the character of monopoly capitalism and, hence, the extent to which the capitalist system as a whole was going to be changed by this development (16). With the rise of monopoly capitalism, a world capitalist system emerged and this factor transferred the crisis of capitalism from the centre in Europe to the periphery in what later came to be known as the Third World (17). To AMIN the recognition of this fundamental change was first made by LENIN (18), and was later fully developed by Mao TSE-TUNG (19). Yet LENIN's successors who constructed the Soviet system did not recognize this change. They clung to the «mechanistic approach» of the «linear vision of historical development», and on the basis of this they attempted to transpose soviet lessons to the Third World in the form of the «non-capitalist way» (20). AMIN is convinced that this vision of the world is not only dogmatic and pseudo-Marxist but is also characteristic of «bourgeois scientific ideology». More specifically, it is the exact Soviet analogue to Rostow (21). For this reason «it is no longer possible to view the Soviet experience as an instance of socialism». In the economic base it preserves division of labour, commodity alienation and centralized management, and in the superstructure it preserves the state, authoritarian police methods and «nationalist and social-imperialist ideological monolithism» (22).

In the advanced capitalist countries also, among «Western Marxists», among Marxist and social-democratic parties alike, even among the «ultra-leftists», i.e. among Trotskyists, Maoists and anarchists, the dominant tendency is to refuse to abandon the linear view of the historical process with all its consequences (23). The workers' movement in the West, he points out, was brought up on the view that socialism in the periphery was «a present» from the West. From this grew its establishmentarianism and its paternalist attitude to the periphery (24). The implication that Europe is no longer the centre of the world, according to AMIN, has therefore proved particularly hard for Western Marxists to swallow. They have shown no interest in the phenomenon of «unequal development» and resisted even the theory of «unequal exchange». In the end they have subscribed to doctrines characterized by pro-imperialist tendencies (25). Inevitably this leads to counter-revolutionary theories, as in the case of KAUTSKY and the Soviet Academy (26). The ultra-left, particularly in their criticism of unequal exchange refuse to see how «imperialism» determines the framework and the conditions of class struggle not only in the periphery but even at the centre. They hold on to this position even when they are flirting with «Third Worldism» (27). AMIN finds the Trotskyists particularly guilty of this since they insist most strongly that the revolution must start from the industrialized West (28).

AMIN maintains that not only should MARX's work not be treated like religious dogma, but that there are facts which MARX did not and could not know in his life time, and that there are points on which MARX was just wrong. MARX did not and could not know certain facts for the simple reason that they did not, as in the case of monopoly, exist in his life time. «History» he writes, «did not stop in 1880, or in 1917, or in 1945.

In each decade new facts appear which express new developments that had not been suspected in the previous phases» (29). We shall return to this point below. From the point of view of Neo-Marxism the most important point on which AMIN holds that MARX was wrong is the latter's conception of progressive capitalism. In the *Communist Manifesto*, MARX and ENGELS sing a veritable pean to capitalism (30). In his discussion of non-European societies MARX seemed to think that capitalism would perform in these societies the same progressive role it had performed in European society. MARX's exposition of this view in respect of British rule in India is well known (31).

It is a view-point steadfastly held by AMIN, as by all neo-Marxist dependency theorists, that the relationship between advanced capitalism in Europe and North America, on the one hand, and «peripheral», «dependent» capitalism, on the other, is such that it is impossible for the former to develop, or help to develop, the latter. We shall also revert to this point below. AMIN is clear that a Marxist in this age is someone who applies the methodology of MARX creatively to the changed conditions of the world today. He views with extreme distaste the practice of quoting passages from MARX which are treated like sacred texts (32).

### III. — METHODOLOGY

The specific marxist methodology which AMIN sees himself as applying is the dialectical approach. By this he means almost exclusively the determination of parts by the whole. His analysis of the world system is carried out by means of this method. For example, the «cause» of a significant social phenomenon in the Third World is to be found, he maintains, not in the Third World itself but «within the dialectic of the world system» as a whole. Hence «marginality» which he sees to be characteristic of the Third World is the effect within the periphery, of the law of accumulation operating in the world system as a whole. Hence, also, the relation between the state and social classes in the periphery must be analyzed within the world context. Again in discussing modern migrations in western Africa, he criticizes the «traditional» functionalist and the marginalist approach, which he regards to be circumlocutory and tautological, maintaining that the true explanation must be based on the needs and origins of the world capitalist system imposed by colonialism (33). Finally, it must be noted that it is the application of the dialectical approach, as AMIN understands it, that leads him to make the class struggle or historical materialism the fundamental factor of social change almost in opposition to the productive forces. The latter, to him, are particular factors whereas the class struggle represents the unity of the whole, operates at the level of the whole social formation. To explain social phenomena, including relations of production as well as the forces of production themselves, in terms of the class struggle is to explain them dialectically. To explain social phenomena in terms of the forces of production is to do so mechanistically. In the final analysis AMIN's account of the world system is the result of the operation of the class struggle at the level of the world system as a whole and hence of the contradictions on the world scale in the relations between centre and the periphery rather than at the level of individual social formations (34).

On the more economic aspect of his analysis also AMIN sees himself as adapting MARX to a changed world. In analyzing the world capitalist system AMIN says he has merely reformulated the question of the relation between the objective forces, i.e. the law of accumulation, and the subjective forces, i.e. class struggle, at that level. In doing so, he maintains, he uses the model used by MARX in the second volume of *Capital* to analyze the reproduction of the capitalist system in terms of quantitative relations between constant and variable capital (organic composition of capital) and between the latter and surplus value (35). Moreover, AMIN holds that in analyzing the capitalist system, MARX's approach in terms of the law of value as stated by MARX is correct; value is measurable, and the ratios between prices are homogeneous with ratios between values; and measurement of productive forces in terms of value is the only certain standard. It is necessary to emphasize, at the risk of repeating the obvious, that AMIN holds, with MARX, that it is the quantity of socially necessary abstract labour needed to produce a commodity that is the measure of the commodity's true value (36).

«One of the most striking features of many neo-Marxist writers... is how little they quote from, or otherwise attempt to articulate themselves to the classical canon of Marxism», Aidan FOSTER-CARTER has written (37). Our account of AMIN so far should lead us to modify this view in so far as it applies to him. He is concerned not only to prove his Marxist credentials, but also quotes MARX frequently both in support of his position and to criticize him. He is particularly concerned to clearly identify where he differs from other contemporary Marxists and MARX himself on substantive questions.

#### IV. — THE WORLD-SYSTEM OUTLOOK

The substantive position which best establishes Samir AMIN's credentials as a neo-Marxist is his world-system outlook. He first set out this theory elaborately in *Accumulation on a World Scale*. Before then he had published, among others, two books which attempted to explain the economic evolution of Ivory Coast in particular and West Africa in general. In neither of these is the world-system outlook evident. The explanation is in terms of «neo-colonialism», according to which the «extraverted» or «extroverted» economy of the area is «developed» in the interest of economies of the metropolitan countries. In the earlier work, *Le développement du capitalisme en Côte d'Ivoire*, published in 1967, AMIN appeared impressed with the phenomenal growth of the Ivorian economy, though he gave hints of the ineluctable collapse of the «colonial-type» economy (38). He even went to the extent of suggesting that the only way open to independent African countries to develop was the Ivorian way. Those countries, like Ghana under NKRUMAH and Mali under Modibo KEITA, which refused to follow this route, sooner or later according to him faced stagnation. This experience, he suggested further, was not dictated by governments, but by «objective economic laws» (39). The farthest he went in criticism was that this economy showed signs of growth without development and this only in 1970 in the «Postface». Appropriately, he thought

this criticism was equivalent to Gunder FRANK's new (at that time) concept of «the development of underdevelopment» (40). In the second work, *Neo-colonialism in West Africa*, originally published in 1971, he made an advance towards the world-system outlook. The economy of the region was seen as «a true underdeveloped economy», dominated by, and integrated into, the world market and increasingly dependent on the «centre» (41). By that time the theory of «unequal exchange» was also in the air, and the author integrated it up to a point into his account (42). Still, the author thought the way to cure the sick groundnut economy of Senegal was to secure improvement in the commodity terms of trade; to stop concentrating on groundnuts; to develop the varied potentialities of the Senegalese economy in order to grow such crops as rice, sugar cane, vegetables, fruits and livestock; and to train proper economists who could plan a strategy for real development (43). Similarly, discussing the *Pearson Report* in 1970, AMIN recommended agrarian capitalism in dependent Africa as a spur to economic development. Such capitalism, he maintained, would bring about increases in agricultural productivity in rural Africa. Yet he recognized that without the existence of a rural bourgeoisie this was not possible. He also recognized that the emergence of a rural bourgeoisie depended on certain conditions, among which were (i) a traditional society sufficiently hierarchical to accord some hereditary chiefs enough social power to appropriate important parcels of land to set up plantations, (ii) a population density facilitating expropriation of land and proletarianization, and (iii) a favourable political atmosphere (44). There is no hint of a world system perspective in these solutions (45).

*Accumulation on a World Scale* is suffused with such a perspective from beginning to end. Since writing this book, AMIN has also published at least four other books which all explore various aspects of the world system. *Unequal Development* concentrates on the periphery, analyzing the social formations through which the exploitation of the periphery by mature capitalism is made possible. *Imperialism and Unequal Development* goes back to the exploitative relationships between developed capitalism and the peripheral formations and confronts the Marxist theory which denies the existence of a world system. In *Law of Value and Historical Materialism*, AMIN may be said to take a backward glance at the capitalist mode of production in the advanced capitalist countries and its translation into the world system through the extension of the class struggle to the world scene. These four central books (46) give us a complete view of AMIN's world-system outlook. Among the later writings, *Class and Nation* develops this outlook most imaginatively. Besides, in numerous articles, he has explored various aspects of this outlook as well as used it to analyze specific problems.

The world-system outlook is based on the assumption that «all contemporary societies are integrated into a world system. Not a single concrete socio-economic formation of our time can be understood except as a part of this world system» (47). AMIN draws a distinction between the capitalist mode of production and the world capitalist system. The former is just that – a mode of production. It becomes a whole system



only when it is able to establish its complete dominance over other modes of production. So far, this has been achieved only in the advanced capitalist societies (48). The world capitalist system is rather a single interdependent network of «capitalist formations, central and peripheral» (49). Whereas the central formations are synonymous with the capitalist mode of production, the peripheral formations are decidedly not. In the peripheral formations, the capitalist mode of production has been inserted into societies with several other modes of production, particularly pre-capitalist modes which they dominate, though incompletely (50). The central and peripheral formations are linked together through trade relations to form the world capitalist system (51). Hence the world capitalist system is characterized by «variety, heterogeneity and complexity in the social formations that make it up». The segments that make it up sometimes even appear incongruous (52). Underlying these formations are (i) commodities with universal values, i.e. there is in the system «supremacy of world values over national values», (ii) universal capital, meaning capital that enjoys international mobility, and (iii) limited international mobility of labour (53). By the time *Accumulation* was published, Gunder FRANK had popularized the concept of 'centre' and 'periphery' and it is clear that AMIN had deepened and incorporated it into his World-System outlook. But though the main scope of his analysis is the relations between the centre and the periphery, he points out that the communist world is a third partner in the world system. However, he regards the communist world as not truly part of the capitalist system but only of the capitalist market; it has its own socialist system with its own laws (54). The centre nevertheless consists of North America, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Russia and Eastern Europe (55). The periphery comprises «the three continents». (56)

The relations between these two parts of the world system are fundamentally rooted in transfers of value from the periphery to the centre leading to «accumulation on a world scale».

*Whenever the capitalist mode of production enters into relations with pre-capitalist modes of production, and subjects these to itself, transfers of values take place from the pre-capitalist formation as a result of the mechanisms of primitive accumulation. These mechanisms do not belong only to the prehistory of capitalism, they are contemporary as well. It is these forms of primitive accumulation, modified but persistent, to the advantage of the centre, that form the domain of the theory of accumulation on a world scale (57).*

This accumulation on a world scale is in fact what defines the relations between the centre and the periphery (58). In accordance with general dependency theory, AMIN denies the assimilation of under-development to poverty in general and the conclusion drawn from it that present-day underdeveloped countries are at an earlier stage of the developed societies (59). Accordingly he also denies the non-existence of economic surplus or its meagreness in the underdeveloped countries. The real problems

of underdevelopment — he believes — are basically two. First, the distinctive ways of using the surplus: à la Baran, it is wasted, it is unproductive and it is exported. Second, the forms taken by the surplus and the ways of its utilization depend on the nature of the economic and social formations in the countries of the periphery and the mechanisms by which they are integrated into the world capitalist system. (60)

There are several mechanisms for securing the transfer of values to the centre, thus promoting accumulation on a world scale: the simple transfer of profits; the incorporation of the local bourgeoisie with a taste for imported luxuries; the development of «extraverted» or «extroverted» economies etc; all in the periphery (61). But AMIN picks on «unequal exchange» as the main mechanism of primitive accumulation by which the transfers of value are realized (62). In essence AMIN's interpretation of unequal exchange is the same as EMMANUEL's original interpretation as expressed in 1962 and was to be expounded *in extenso* in 1969 (63). At equal productivity, the reward for labour at the periphery is lower than at the centre; this combines with higher rates of surplus value and equalization of the rate of profit on a world scale to lead to «hidden» transfer of values to the centre in addition to the visible transfer of the profits of foreign capital (64). An aspect of the theory which AMIN thinks EMMANUEL under-emphasizes is that exports from the periphery come, not from the «traditional» sector, but from ultra-modern sectors of the economy. (65)

Unequal exchange, for AMIN, must necessarily be considered on a world scale. But he does not see this as operating on the level of states or countries; it is not, for him, a question of «proletarian» nations being exploited by «bourgeois» nations (66). By means of unequal exchange the bourgeoisie is enabled to exploit the proletariat — but on a world scale. It is a world bourgeoisie exploiting a world proletariat within the context of capitalist formations. Clearly, then, unequal exchange means that the problem of the class struggle must be taken on a world scale. (67)

## V. — UNDERDEVELOPMENT

AMIN uses this dependency-cum-world-system framework to analyze a number of problems. Two of these are of particular interest to us in Africa. First, the characteristics of underdevelopment. To him underdevelopment is synonymous with peripheral capitalism, and he distinguishes between its essential features on the one hand and its outward features on the other.

In contrast to the countries of the centre, where productivities in the various sectors of the economy tend to be even, clustering around the national average, in the peripheral formations they tend to vary widely from the average (68). These variations are due to the juxtaposition of two economic systems belonging to different ages and having levels of productivity that are not to be compared. This itself is the inevitable consequence of the intrusion of the capitalist system from the centre (69). It is not simply two economic systems that are juxtaposed, but the sectors and the

firms are all juxtaposed one to another. They are not integrated among themselves; the flow of internal exchanges between the «atoms» making up the economy is very low. Rather the density of external exchanges of the atoms is relatively high; each is integrated into entities whose centres of gravity lie in the centres of the capitalist world. (70)

It is this disarticulation which brings about the domination of the peripheral formations. These formations become merely producers of primary goods, unlike countries like Australia and Canada which have integrated such production into their internal economies. In this way the centre is strengthened as against the periphery (71). The domination is also partly brought about by the way productive investment is financed; at the periphery, investment is largely from foreign capital, and foreign investment sooner or later leads to the flow of profits in the reverse direction, causing growth to be eventually blocked (72).

These, then, are the outward «structural» features of underdevelopment, the immediate «appearances» of things (73). AMIN distinguishes these from the essential features. First, there is in the social formations of the periphery a predominance of agrarian and commercial capitalism in the national sector of the economy. Agrarian capitalism leads to the «agrarian crisis» so characteristic of these formations: intense pressure on land, excessive agricultural labour, rural poverty and general unemployment (74). Second, a local bourgeoisie dependent on foreign capital is created. This local bourgeoisie is dominated by the capital of the centre to which it is related hierarchically. Hence it is only to a minor degree that the mechanisms of primitive accumulation or expanded reproduction operate in areas other than the export sector to the advantage of the local bourgeoisie (75). Third, there is a peculiar formation of the bureaucracy in the peripheral formations. The weakness of capitalism and its attendant social structure leads to the strengthening of the state bureaucracy consisting mainly of groups of a «petty-bourgeois» character. That is, the state bureaucracy is inflated in numbers and importance by the displacement of the landlords and the «comprador bourgeoisie», the spread of education and the need to construct a public sector of the economy. (76)

The second problem which AMIN uses the dependency-cum-world-systems outlook to analyze is the transcendence of underdevelopment. The perception of underdevelopment naturally shapes the strategies for its transcendence. At one level, there must be a development policy, which must be based, on another level, on a social structure capable of sustaining it. The policy must aim at achieving three objectives. First, it must create a homogeneous national economy, progressively transferring the working population from the low productivity, mainly agricultural, sectors into the high productivity sectors. Second, it must aim at the overall cohesion missing from the underdeveloped economy by deliberately creating integrated industrial groups made up of complementary activities. Third, it must aim at imparting to the economy its own «dynamism», freeing it from dependence on the outside economy (77). On the technical level this strategy demands, according to AMIN, the use of modern techniques for the immediate improvement of productivity and of the condition of the masses. This, he maintains, necessarily goes with the spread of «specific

forms of democracy» at every stage and at every level, village, region and state, making real development at once «national socialist, and popular democratic». The strategy also demands autonomous scientific and technological research in the Third World, an undertaking that precludes the imitation of the technology of developed countries and entails the use of rather elementary levels of technology (78). These objectives depend on effective planning for their realization, and effective planning itself depends on a break with the world market. «The failure of planning in the Third World... is essentially due to (the) refusal to break with the world market». (79)

This break with the world market is a *sine qua non* of the liquidation of underdevelopment and, hence, of the economic liberation of the countries of the periphery. To AMIN this means that these countries must go the socialist way, that is, adopt a socio-economic structure that will support the policy of real development. He does not by this mean that each country in the periphery must become socialist by itself, in isolation, that there must be «a juxtaposition of national socialisms». Rather he means that the world must be organized into a unified socialist whole of completely equal nations. There are two conditions of such equality. First, the victims of the current set-up must assert themselves as «complete nations», that is, they must gain their independence and sovereignty. They must also give priority to internal development, and cease to be extraverted. The starting point of such a policy would be a shift from the production of luxuries, which necessarily satisfy only the minority to mass-consumption goods. This would in its turn mean a massive shift of resources, implying a rejection of the rules of profitability (80). Without such a policy the demands of the NIEO cannot be realized: they are certain to be blocked by political forces operating on the national level in the developed centre (81). Secondly, the international division of labour must for the first time really depend on the distribution of natural resources in different parts of the world. But this division of labour cannot, again, be based on the market, for the market inevitably accentuates inequality. Even common markets «tend to accentuate the internal inequalities in the peripheral areas» (82). However, in a fully socialist world, nations will wither away. But it would be utopian, AMIN holds, to speculate as to what such a society would look like. (83)

How the socialist world would come about is also a question AMIN feels must be left to the future. He thinks it would be prophesying to speculate on it (84). AMIN holds that since the coming into being of the world capitalist system, the principal nucleus of the world proletariat has shifted to the periphery (85). This, to him, means that the principal nucleus of the forces of socialism has also shifted to the periphery (86), making possible the development of socialist movements in the periphery. The shift to the periphery is due to the fact that the world bourgeoisie exploits the periphery more than the proletariat at the centre since the mechanism that limits exploitation at the centre — «autocentric» character of the economy — is missing from the periphery. These factors are what AMIN believes explain the plain fact that transformations towards socialism have so far taken place only in the periphery. To deny these developments and characterize revolution in the Third World as mere «accidents of

history» or «peasant revolts» is ultimately to deny changes recognized by Lenin in the world economy and the existence of a world-system (87). But he stresses that there is nothing inevitable about the process of transition to socialism. There could in fact be two other outcomes to the crisis: continued existence of imperialism in the dominant global system or dominance of «social imperialism». (88)

AMIN has worked out a general theory (the «unequal development» thesis, he calls it) that explains why socialism is more likely to start from the periphery of the world capitalist system than from its centre. He holds that in any system of social formations, resistance to change is stronger at the centre where the system is mature. In the periphery the development of the productive forces is insufficient, and this means there is more flexibility there. Hence change and, even more so, revolution is easier to effect at the periphery. (89)

## VI. — CLASS AND EXPLOITATION IN THE WORLD SYSTEM

In this section of the paper and the next we wish to consider the differences between AMIN and other Marxists on substantive questions, that is, to discuss the extent to which the positions taken by him in section four above differ from the positions of other Marxists. We shall do this specifically in respect of the class struggle, the theory of the modes of production and transition to socialism.

Dependency theorists are sometimes accused of neglecting class analysis (90). Undoubtedly, this is true of some of the earlier formulations in South America and of André Gunder FRANK in his earlier phase, that is, before he embraced the world system outlook (91). The charge can also be laid at the door of AMIN before he published *Accumulation on a World Scale* (92). But since then he cannot be said to have ignored class analysis. It is not an exaggeration to say that class analysis has always been integral to AMIN's world-system outlook.

Traditional Marxist analysis assumes that classes are coterminous with individual societies or social formations. The analysis of class struggles therefore tends to be on the level of individual societies. But central to the world-system outlook is the proposition that, thanks to the extension of the capitalist system, especially since the late nineteenth century, individual societies have now converged on a single world-society. Accordingly, AMIN holds that though the class struggle has not ceased to operate in individual societies, it is meshed into and subordinated to the class struggle within the world capitalist system as a whole. (93)

In accordance with the orthodox view, AMIN holds that in the capitalist world system there are basically two classes contending, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie in the peripheral formations is created in the wake of the central bourgeoisie whose interests it normally serves and for compensation gets the crumbs which are dished out of the surplus product. In effect, then, there is in the world system only one bourgeoisie, the central bourgeoisie, with minor dependent bourgeoisies in the peripheral formations. It is this central bourgeoisie whose interests

are realized in the world system as a whole. Primitive accumulation, unequal exchange and other mechanisms by which surplus value is siphoned off to the centre are all means by which the central bourgeoisie exploits the proletariat and the «proletarianized» peasantry of the periphery. (94)

Just as there is a world bourgeoisie, so is there a world proletariat. But whereas the structural features of the world bourgeoisie are fairly clear, those of the world proletariat are not that clear. Corresponding to the central bourgeoisie there is a central proletariat, and corresponding to the peripheral bourgeoisie there is also the «peripheral» proletariat, which consists of the proletariat in the strict sense and the proletarianized and semi-proletarianized peasantry and masses (95). But how the proletariat of the centre is related to the proletariat of the periphery in such a way as to constitute the world proletariat is not made clear by AMIN.

There cannot of course be a hierarchical relationship between the proletariat of the centre and that of the periphery for the simple reason that a proletariat, by definition, cannot employ and, hence, exploit another proletariat. From this AMIN usually draws the explicit conclusion that the proletariat at the centre does not exploit that at the periphery (96). He argues however that there is a hierarchy of exploitations in the world-system with «the proletariat at the periphery ... being more severely exploited than the proletariat at the centre» (97). He also argues that the standard of living of the proletariat at the centre is higher (98). But he attributes the higher standard of living of the former to their higher productivity and not their exploitation of the latter. He does not appear to appreciate the point that this position undermines the whole argument of unequal exchange. The tenor of AMIN's thinking should lead to this conclusion: At equal productivity the proletariat of the periphery is paid less than the proletariat of the centre, thus enabling the world bourgeoisie to transfer values from the periphery to the centre; this transfer of values then enables the world bourgeoisie to pay the proletariat of the centre a much higher wage than at the periphery (99). As a Marxist AMIN cannot bring himself to contemplate a situation where a proletariat can be said to exploit another proletariat. He therefore goes through extraordinary intellectual tergiversations to deny it (100). Yet he maintains that the periphery is largely proletarianized, (101) whilst the proletariat at the centre has been integrated into their bourgeois nations making them «stand shoulder to shoulder with their bourgeoisie in relation to external competition» (102). He now explicitly maintains that it is exploitation on a world scale that creates full employment and the growth of real incomes at the centre (103). Indeed, he draws the only possible conclusion from this position, a conclusion that is vital to the process of transition to socialism: that the centre of gravity of the world proletariat has shifted to the periphery.

## VII. — MODES OF PRODUCTION AND SOCIAL FORMATIONS

One of the strengths of AMIN and of the world-system outlook generally is that it enables one to look at the world-system from the periphery rather than from the centre as with traditional Marxism. To do this

AMIN finds it necessary to analyze in detail the social formations of the periphery. A social formation is seen as an articulation of modes of production in which one mode is predominant (104), and AMIN finds that it is the articulation peculiar to a particular area and the period during which it was incorporated into the world-system that fundamentally determines its role in the world capitalist system (105). Thus it is the particular social formation of the white colonies that enabled them to escape peripheral capitalism and become part of the centre early in their history (106). Similarly, it is the peculiar social formations of the areas later to be called the Third World which consigned them to their peripheral status. (107)

AMIN distinguished five principal modes of production, which are not on all fours with the principal modes delineated by classical Marxism. There is, first, the primitive-communal mode anterior to all others as laid down by Marx and Engels. There is, secondly, what he calls the tribute-paying or simply tributary, mode of production. This is imposed on the primitive – communal mode for purposes of exploitation, and it is the most wide-spread form of the pre-capitalist modes. In the tributary mode there is already considerable development of the productive forces with guaranteed surplus. Classes have also already emerged. On the one hand there are working peasants who are neither completely free and «commodified» nor totally within the confines of communal property. On the other hand there are landowners who have become the rulers and who appropriate economic surplus under the guise of tribute which is generally drawn in kind, leaving the peasants with subsistence income. In the tributary mode there is the dominance not of the economic substructure but of the superstructure, which takes the form of the great religions: Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism and Confucianism.

The early form of the tributary mode can be distinguished from its developed form. In the latter the central authority was highly developed. The fief was an administrative unit, and the state generally coincided with a unified national formation. Highly developed also were the relations of production, and already the productive forces were guided by these highly developed relations of production. This was how the improvements in techniques of irrigation, building and communication were achieved in the mature tributary modes of China and Egypt. Such a mature tributary mode also developed among the Arabs. Contrary to what Marx and Engels believed, AMIN holds that the feudal mode is not a major category in its own right but an incomplete version of the tributary mode. It was incomplete in the sense that state centralization of the tributary surplus was relatively retarded. In short, the central authority in the feudal system was less powerful than in the developed tributary mode. The feudal system was a peripheral form of the tributary mode, or rather belonged to the periphery of a vast system of tributary modes of production. It was to be found in its true form only in Europe and Japan and it was precisely because of this that capitalism was successful in these countries, though Japan was additionally lucky to have been poor and to have launched its capitalist development before the formation of imperialism. By the time the tributary mode acquired its complete form in Europe (also

in Japan?) through absolute monarchies it was too late in the sense that new class contradictions between agrarian and manufacturing capitalisms were already too advanced for the state to avert their development in any real way (108). On the other hand, in the mature tributary modes like China, India and Egypt, the central authorities were developed enough to be able to block the emergence of new productive forces. In this way they prevented the emergence of capitalism (109.) It was these mature tributary modes, AMIN points out, which are sometimes erroneously referred to as the «Asiatic» mode. This is of course a thinly veiled reference to Marx who used the expression «the Asiatic mode» to refer to oriental, particularly Chinese and Indian, pre-capitalist societies.

The third major category of modes of production AMIN identifies is the slave-owning mode. In *Unequal Development* he was clear on this though even there he saw it only as being situated on the borders of the tributary formations «appearing only by way of exception, in a sequence that is not central but peripheral». In his later works AMIN downgrades the slave-owning mode to the extent of even considering it as a merely transitional form between the primitive-communal mode and the tributary mode. Even so it is neither obligatory nor widespread among the extreme varieties of forms of transition from communal to tributary modes. It becomes a marginal case, even a «so-called» mode of production. It assumes general importance only in mercantilist forms of capitalism.

The simple petty-commodity mode of production is the fourth category identified by Samir AMIN. It practically never constitutes the dominant mode in any social formation, and must actually be considered an early version of capitalism. The last category of mode of production AMIN distinguishes is the capitalist mode properly speaking. He also identifies a soviet mode of production which he regards as being neither capitalist nor socialist. Lastly, he occasionally identifies a colonial mode of production.

AMIN's classification of modes of production unables him to identify specifically an «African»-type social formation. This is a special type of pre-capitalist social formation, but combining the same elements of modes of production as in all pre-capitalist social formations. The elements are (1) a predominance of the communal or tribute-paying mode of production, (2) the existence of simple petty-commodity relations in limited spheres, and (3) the existence of long-distance trade relations. In the African type the simple commodity relations within a given society are absent. Thus it is characterized by a combination of long-distance trade and undeveloped communal or tribute-paying mode of production (110). Thus to AMIN there can be no one or general answer to the question whether there were classes, or whether there was feudalism, in precolonial Africa: the answer, for a particular area, depends on the articulation of modes of production there.

In much the same way as there was a special Africa-type of pre-capitalist social formation, so there were Oriental, Arab and American types. The first two were a more developed version of the African type, whilst the American type was different, being characterized by the imini-



gration of Europeans during the era of merchant capitalism and quick subordination to European capitalism. (111)

To AMIN the fact that social formations are articulations of modes of production leads to the conclusion that there can be a historical sequence of social formations but not of modes of production (112). Modes of production of various kinds always exist side by side though they are in particular social formations always dominated by one of them. The capitalist mode in particular has a way of dominating those with which it comes in contact. But modes of production cannot be said to succeed one another, much less in a particular order, as in the unilinear view AMIN has always denounced. Though social formations do follow one another, they cannot be said to follow in a particular order either. The «historical sequence of formations is not unique» (113) «There are no general laws of social formations», nor is there a «possible general theory of formations but only the theory of particular formations or groups of interconnected formations» (114). There are only general concepts that make it possible to formulate laws for particular formations: modes of production, interconnection between different modes, dominance, instances and articulation of instances. (115)

This is basically why AMIN repudiates the unilinear view. There is no certainty about the outcome of the historical sequence as we have already seen. Socialism has to be planned for, and for socialism to be successful the peripheral formations must «de-link» (116) from the central formations and it must be based on social forces that will sustain it. Of one thing only in this respect is AMIN certain: the shift of the centre of the world proletariat to the periphery, a phenomenon he regards to be a plain fact. This suggests to him that if world socialism is to come, it can only start from the periphery as the communist nations in Asia have already demonstrated (117). It cannot as in the classical view, come from the centre. In this lies the revolutionary potential of marxism in our time (118) and it is the recognition of this changed condition by Lenin that makes Leninism the «Marxism of the imperialist epoch». (119)

It should not be assumed that AMIN's account of modes of production and social formations is free of ambiguities or even contradictions. For one thing he is not entirely clear whether his distinctive category, the tribute-paying category, is a mode of production or a social formation. From the account he gives of it, it should be a social formation, but he treats it like a mode and repeatedly refers to it as such. He is also not entirely clear as to whether the slave mode — that is, if he really considers it a mode — is part of the tributary formation or is a transnational stage to it, and if it is, whether it is a necessary stage. Thirdly, a close examination shows that though AMIN usually considers the feudal mode an incomplete version of the tributary mode, he sometimes treats it as a developed form of it. Still, in spite of these ambiguities and contradictions, one can detect an underlying consistency in his account of modes of production and social formations. Though AMIN considers modes of production as being important «in the last instance» or «in the final analysis» in the determination of social and political action, he considers social formations

the important social units to be studied. He distinguishes five such progressive units in the history of society; communal, tributary, capitalist and socialist-communist. The communal, capitalist and socialist-communist social-formations bear the names of their principal modes of production because of their undoubted pre-eminence in determining the characteristics of these social formations. The tributary alone does not bear the name of any of its modes of production because of their differing importance in the different versions of it. For it encapsulates the three different modes of production Marx sandwiches between the primitive-communal mode and the capitalist: Ancient (slave), Feudal and Asiatic.

It should also be observed that, his direct words to the contrary notwithstanding, AMIN still seems to believe in the unilinear view of history. Though it is not entirely clear what he means by the statement that «history has a meaning», this seems to imply a unilinear view when taken together with statements like «the Third World's necessary transition to socialism», and description of socialism as «a historical necessity» (120). In any case he buttresses this view when he writes of «the necessary succession of three families of modes of production», of the «three major, necessary stages» of universal history which he considers an «obligatory development», and adds that all societies will also reach the communist stage. (121)

## NOTES

1. See, for example, PARKINS, Frank (1974) *Passim*
2. See, for example, Mc INNES, Neil (1972) pp. 50 and 65.
3. FOSTER-CARTER, Aidan (1974) p. 67.
4. See, for example, MARX (1877).
5. MARX and ENGELS (1951) II, pp. 441—454.
6. Mc INNES (1972), p. 118 and ANDERSON (1979), pp. 50—60.
7. See NABUDERE (1978), (1980) and «Imperialism, State and Revolution: A Reply to MAMDANI and BHAGAT» in Yash TANDON (1982).
8. See Emmanuel HANSEN (1982) where he writes: «There is no doubt that with the appearance of the *Journal of African Marxists* serious African scholarship in the marxist tradition is now firmly on the agenda». Though he notes the existence of *African Communist* and the *Review of African Political Economy*, he argues, at least by implication, that until the establishment «there were no radical journals to cater for the ideas of the Left». In response to this, Stephen HOWE (1982) notes the air of «depressingly rigid adherence to a discredited, mechanistic Soviet Model Marxism that characterized the contents of the first volume of the journal and their tired orthodoxy».
- 8a. AMIN (1978A), p. 3.
9. AMIN (1978A), p. 4.
10. *Ibid*, p. 2.
11. AMIN (1980), p. 4.

130 *Africa Development*

12. AMIN (1977), p. 92, and (1984A), pp. 31–32 and 64.
13. AMIN (1978), pp. 4 and 33.
14. AMIN (1980), p. vii.
15. AMIN (1977), pp. 5, 92, 107–109.
16. AMIN (1974A), Vol. 1, pp. 147–148 and (1976), pp. 198–199.
17. David McLELLAN (1980) ch. 11; ANDERSON (1979), pp. 50–60 and McINNES (1972), p. 118.
18. AMIN (1978A), pp. 57 and 123–124.
19. *Ibid*, p. 109.
20. AMIN, (1977), pp. 4–5.
21. *Ibid*, pp. 5, 7, 103 and 109.
22. *Ibid*, p. 12 and (1978A), p. 114.
23. AMIN (1977), pp. 107 and 109.
24. *Ibid*, p. 183.
25. AMIN (1978A), pp. 108–109 and 116.
26. *Ibid*, p. 117.
27. AMIN (1977), pp. 11–12.
28. *Ibid*, and fn. 5 pp 262–263 African Neo-Marxists feel very strongly on this question. See, for example, Issa SHIVJI at p. 183 of Y. TANDON (1982).
29. AMIN (1974A), Vol. 2, p. 590.
30. See, Section I of the *Communist Manifesto*
31. Karl MARX (1953A and B). See Okello OCULI (1974) esp., pp. 162–168 for an exposition and critique of MARX's view of the progressive nature of capitalism.
32. AMIN (1974A) p. 590. Here he also refers to them as «Pseudo Marxists» and «Soothsayers». At page 148 he invents a new term, «Marxologists», to refer to them. He also writes that MARX «was only a man, who lived neither outside space nor outside his time. But the religious spirit of others has freed him from this modesty». (1980, p. 206). On this question SHIVJI also maintains that Marxism is a world outlook and a methodology. The application of this methodology to a concrete situation «may conceivably produce different conclusions from those reached by Marx. There is nothing un-Marxist about that». (1976, p.13). One should perhaps add that another point on which AMIN seeks to correct MARX, like other Marxist scholars, is the concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production. See Section IV below. On correction by other scholars see MELOTTI, UMBERTO (1977) *passim* and HINDNESS, BARRY and FIRST, Paul Q. (1975) Introduction and Ch. FOUR, esp. Section 3.
33. AMIN (1974c) Section III. AMIN (1977), pp. 65 and 185 and 185–186. It must be pointed out that AMIN is not consistent in the use of the dialectical approach to explain Third World phenomena. In explaining the peculiarities in Africa of the effects of agrarian capitalism he resorts to «Specific Causes» internal to Africa and not to the general needs of the World System, much less to its origins. Some of the specific causes he resorts to are the dynamism of the rural community and the rights of its members to cultivate the soil, the relatively low initial densities of population and so on. See AMIN (1974c) Section IV, especially p. 94.
34. AMIN (1974A), p. 600 and (1978A), pp. 42, 44, 75 and 107.

35. AMIN (1977), p. 45.
36. AMIN (1978A) pp. 9–11.
37. FOSTER-CARTER (1974), p. 84.
38. AMIN (1967), p. 253.
39. Ibid., p. 270.
40. Ibid., p. 288 and FRANK, A. Gunder (1966).
41. AMIN (1973), p. xiv.
42. See, for example, Ibid, pp. 9 and 176-177.
43. Ibid., pp. 9–11 and 15.
44. AMIN (1970), pp. 210–212.
45. AMIN claims (1974A), pp. 1 and 303 fn. 1 and 2 that he had adopted the world-system outlook as early as 1957 or so in his thesis and that the works on Ivory Coast and West Africa were based on that outlook. This is to be taken with caution. The word «internationale» instead of «mondiale» in the title of the thesis – *Les Effets Structurels de l'Integration Internationale* – suggests this caution. In any case fn. 8 at p. 263 of (1977) – where he writes «since my first critique in 1957 (which was still economic) of «the economics of underdevelopment» I have arrived, as from 1965, at what now seems to me a clearer understanding of these fundamental questions» – suggests that he adopted the world-system outlook in 1965.
46. AMIN has also published (1982A), and edited with others another (1982B) which I have not yet read.
47. AMIN (1974A), p. 3.
48. AMIN *ibid*, p. 21 and (1976A), pp. 22 and 202. See also AMIN (1977), p. 127.
49. AMIN (1976A), p. 360. See also (1977), p. 40.
50. AMIN (1976A), pp. 293–295.
51. AMIN (1977), p. 39 and (1978A), p. 56.
52. AMIN (1978A), pp. 58 and 59.
53. AMIN (1977), p. 40.
54. AMIN (1974A), pp. 3–4.
55. AMIN's treatment of the way the communist world is related to the capitalist world is not satisfactory. It is further complicated by his conviction that the Soviet Union already possesses all the characteristics of «Sub-imperialism» and that there is a Soviet mode of production which is somewhat *sui-generis*. See AMIN (1975), pp. 16–17 and (1976A), pp. 370–374. Also AMIN (n.d.) p. 14.
56. AMIN (1974A), p. 4.
57. Ibid, p. 3. Italics in the original. See also, p. 382.
58. Ibid, p. 21.
59. Ibid, pp. 7–8 and (1978D) *Passim*.
60. AMIN (1974a), pp. 9–10.
61. Ibid, pp. 17–19; (1974B), pp. 13–14 and (1978C), p. 24.
62. AMIN (1974a), pp. 58–59.

63. EMMANUEL, Arghiri (1972), p. 70, where he uses the expression «the conjunction of Western productivity with 'exotic' wages» to characterize the essence of the theory of equal exchange.
64. AMIN (1974A), pp. 23, 58–59, and 88; (1976A), pp. 138–145, 161–162, 192 and 196; (1977), pp. 106, 128, 131, 211 and 221 and (1978A), p. 62.
65. AMIN (1974A), pp. 23, 42, 57 and 62.
66. AMIN (1976A), p. 359 and (1978A), p. 66.
67. AMIN (1974A), p. 600 and (1978A), p. 35.
68. AMIN (1974A), pp. 262.
69. *Ibid*, p. 282.
70. *Ibid*, pp. 288–290.
71. *Ibid*, pp. 292–294.
72. *Ibid*, pp. 15–20, 294–296.
73. *Ibid*, p. 15.
74. *Ibid*, pp. 380–382.
75. *Ibid*, pp. 382–384.
76. *Ibid*, pp. 389–390.
77. *Ibid*, pp. 28–33.
78. AMIN (1974B), pp. 17 and 19–20. Also (1976B) *Passim*.
79. AMIN (1974a), pp. 32–33. Quotation is at p. 33.
80. AMIN (1976A), pp. 195 and 288–289.
81. AMIN (1979), p. 65.
82. AMIN (1970), p. 219.
83. AMIN (1974A), pp. 33–34 and 64; (1974B), p. 16 and (1976B), pp. 195, 288–90 and 382–384. Yet AMIN writes (1977), p. 256 fn. 1: «Utopia is not synonym for the impossible: on the contrary, since we are able to imagine a coherent society such a society is a possibility».
84. AMIN (1974a), p. 600.
85. AMIN (1977), p. 10.
86. AMIN (1974A), p. 600 and (1977), p. 10.
87. AMIN (1974A), pp. 600–602; (1976A), pp. 360–361; (1977), p. 13.
88. AMIN (1977), pp. 14 and 89.
89. AMIN (1978B), p. 87 and (1980), pp. 14–15.
90. See for example Ronald CHILCOTE (1982) Introduction, p. 4.
91. AMIN characterizes dependency theory as such «semi-Marxist». Among such dependency theorists he includes Gunder FRANK and CARDOSO. See AMIN (1977), p. 5.
92. Though the English edition was published in 1974, the French edition had been published some time before. It is not yet clear to me when the French edition was published. The French edition of *Unequal Development* was, however, published in 1973, and *Accumulation* was published before *Unequal Development*. It is even more important to note that the «Afterword» to the second edition of *Accumulation* was dated July, 1971.
93. AMIN (1978A), pp. 42, 44, 66 and 107–119.

94. AMIN (1974A), pp. 24–25, 382–384, 600–601; (1976A), pp. 338–342, 360; (1978A), pp. 44, 65 and 107.
95. AMIN (1978A), pp. 65–66; (1974), pp. 25–26.
96. AMIN (1974A), p. 599.
97. AMIN (1977), pp. 127 and 130; (1976A), pp. 360–361.
98. AMIN (1978A), pp. 34–35.
99. AMIN (1977), pp. 121–122.
100. Compare, for example, AMIN (1974A), p. 23; (1976A), pp. 23, 59–60, 168, 196 and 199. In (1983), pp. 364 and 371 he denies that he has ever claimed that imperialism implied Third World's Stagnation; that the development of the centre is due to transfer of values from the periphery to the centre; and that the underdevelopment of some is the cause of the development of others. But he admits in the same article that transfers from the centre speed up accumulation at the centre and that the development of some is the cause of the underdevelopment of others. Moreover he writes (1977), p. 110: «Imperialism is indeed accompanied by an increase in wages at the centre, which capital tries to offset by over-exploiting the periphery». See also (1980), p. 202.
101. AMIN (1974A), p. 601.
102. AMIN (1978A), p. 119.
103. AMIN (1980), p. 202.
104. AMIN (1976A), pp. 16 and 23, and (1978A), p. 39.
105. *Ibid*, p. 202.
106. AMIN (1974A), pp. 18, 378; (1976A), p. 21.
107. AMIN (1974A), pp. 9–10, 364–6; (1976A), p. 200, 202; (1977), p. 66.
108. On this whole question see AMIN (1978B), p. 89; (1980), pp. 62, 68 and 88; and (1976A), p. 56.
109. AMIN (1978B), p. 90.
110. AMIN (1976A), p. 17.
111. *Ibid*, p. 295.
112. *Ibid*, p. 22.
113. *Ibid*, p. 21.
114. *Ibid*, p. 363.
115. *Ibid*.
116. AMIN (1983), p. 374.
117. AMIN (1977), pp. 10, 13 and 101.
118. AMIN (1978A), p. 57.
119. *Ibid*, p. 124.
120. AMIN (1978B), pp. 85 and 87. *Emphasis mine*. And (1980), p. 32.
121. AMIN (1980), pp. x, 4, 7 and 15.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AMIN, Samir, (1967) *Le Développement du Capitalisme en Côte d'Ivoire* (Les Editions de Minuit).
- (1970) «Development and Structural Change: The African Experience, 1950–1970», *Journal of International Affairs*, XXIV, 2.
  - (1971) *Maghreb in the Modern World* (Penguin).
  - (1972) «Underdevelopment and Dependence in Black Africa. Origins and Contemporary Forms», *The Journal of Modern African Studies*.
  - (1973) *Neo-Colonialism in West Africa* (Monthly Review Press) (originally published as *L'Afrique de l'Ouest Bloquée* (Les Editions de Minuit, 1971).
  - (1974A) *Accumulation on a World Scale. A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment* (Monthly Review Press) (Originally published as *L'Accumulation à l'Echelle «Mondiale» (?)*.
  - (1974B) «Accumulation and Development: a theoretical model», *Review of African Political Economy* No. 18.
  - (1971C) Introduction to Samir AMIN, ed., *Modern Migrations in Western Africa* (OUP).
  - (1975) «Towards a New Structural Crisis of the Capitalist System?» in Carl WIDSTRAND, ed., *Multi-national Firms in Africa* (Uppsala: African Institute for Economic Development and Planning and Scandinavian Institute of African Studies).
  - (1976A) *Unequal Development, An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism* (the Harvester Press). (Originally published as *Le Développement Inégal* (Les Editions de Minuit, 1973).
  - (1976B) «UNCTAD IV and the New International Economic Order», *Africa Development*, Vol. 1. No. 1, 1976.
  - (1977) *Imperialism and Unequal Development* (Monthly Review Press).
  - (1978A) *The Law of Value and Historical Materialism* (Monthly Review Press) (Originally published as *La Loi de la Valeur et le Matérialisme Historique*).
  - (1978B) *The Arab Nation, Nationalism and Class Struggles* (Zed Press) (Originally published by les Editions de Minuit, 1976).
  - (1978C) et al. «Social Science and the Development Crisis in Africa: Problems and Prospects» in *Africa Development*, Vol. III, No.4; 1978.
  - (1978D) «Développement Autocentré, Autonomie Collective et Ordre Economique International Nouveau: Quelques Réflexions» in *Africa Development*, Vol. III, No.1, 1978.
  - (1979) «NIEO: How to put Third World Surpluses to effective use» in *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No.1.
  - (1980) *Class and Nation, History and the Current Crisis* (HEINEMANN)
  - (1982A) *The Contemporary Arab Economy* (Zed Press).
  - (1982B) et al., eds., *Dynamics of Global Crisis*.
  - (1983) «Expansion or Crisis of Capitalism?» *Third World Quarterly*, Vol.5, No.2.
  - (n.d) «Modes of Production and Social Formation» (KIL cyclostyled)

- ANDERSON, Perry (1979) *Consideration on Western Marxism* (verto).
- CHILECOTE, Ronald H. (1982), ed., *Dependency and Marxism, Toward the Resolution of the Debate* (Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press).
- EMMANUEL, Arghiri (1969), «*Echange Inégal et Développement Inégal*», *Politique Aujourd'hui*, No.12.
- (1972) *Unequal Exchange: A study of the Imperialism of Trade* (Monthly Review Press) (Originally published as *L'échange Inégal* (Francois Maspero, Editeur, Paris, 1969).
- FOSTER-CARTER, Aidan (1974), «Neo-Marxist Approaches to Development and Underdevelopment» in Emmanuel de Kadt and Gavin Williams, eds., *Sociology and Development* (Tavistock Publications).
- FRANK, A. Gunder (1966) «The Development of Underdevelopment» *Monthly Review*, 8.
- (1971) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (Monthly Review Press).
- HANSEN, Emmanuel (1982) «Marxism and Africa» *West Africa* (No.3372, 22 March)
- HOWE, Stephen (1982) «Mechanistic Marxism», *West Africa* (No.3375, 12 April).
- HINDNESS, Barry and FIRST, Paul Q. (1975) *Pre-capitalist modes of production* (ROUTLEDGE and KEGAN Paul).
- MAMDANI, Mahmood (1976) *Politics and Class Formation in Uganda* (Monthly Review Press).
- MARX, Karl (1853A) «The British Rule in India» (Written on 10 June, 1853).  
(1853B) «The Future Results of British Rule in India» (Written on 22 July, 1853)  
(1877) Letter to the Editorial Board of the *Otechestvenniye Zapiski* (Written in November, 1877).
- MARX, Karl and ENGELS, Frederick (1951) *Selected Works* Vd.I and II (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House).
- McINNES, Neil (1972) *The Western Marxists* (N.Y.: Library Press).
- McLELLAN, David (1980) *Marxism After Marx* (Macmillan).
- MELLOTTI, Umberto (1977) *Marx and the Third World* (Macmillan).
- NABUDERE, Dan Wadada (1978) *The Political Economy of Imperialism* (Zed Press and Tanzania Publishing House, 2nd ed).
- (1980) *Imperialism and Revolution in Uganda* (London: Oryx Press)
- OCULI, Okello (1974) «On Marx's Attitude to Colonialism» *The African Review* (Dar-Es-Salaam), Vol. 4, No.3.
- PARKINS, Frank (1979) *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique* (London: Tavistock Publications).
- SHIVJI, Issa G. (1976) *Class Struggles in Tanzania* (London: Heinemann).
- TANDON, Y. (1982) ed., *Debate on Class, State & Imperialism* (Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House).



## RESUME

*Il n'est pas aisé d'utiliser le concept de Néo-Marxisme à des fins d'analyse pour la raison simple que ce concept n'est nulle part suffisamment défini au point de pouvoir clairement se démarquer des autres variantes du Marxisme. Cependant, il est possible de considérer comme Néo-Marxisme toute analyse marxiste de la société basée sur une ré-évaluation fondamentale de quelques unes des principales catégories d'analyse du travail de MARX. Cela veut essentiellement dire qu'il n'y a pas d'école Néo-Marxiste en tant que telle bien qu'il soit possible de penser à des écoles Néo-Marxistes. Ainsi les Marxistes occidentaux furent appelés Néo-Marxistes parce qu'ils avaient fait une re-lecture des fondements philosophiques du Marxisme. D'autre part, pour Aidan FOSTER-CARTER, le Néo-Marxisme est ce corps de pensées marxistes qui a modifié les principes de base du marxisme dans sa tentative de justification du paradoxe des succès pratiques du Marxisme dans les pays sous-développés et de ses échecs relatifs dans les pays les plus développés. Dans cet article l'auteur se livre à une analyse du travail de Samir AMIN dans le but de voir dans quelle mesure il peut être taxé de Néo-Marxiste.*