

Slavery, Culture and Marxism

Sujit K Das

Slavery is an economic category like any other. Thus it also has its two sides. Let us leave alone the bad side and talk about the good side of slavery. Needless to say we are dealing only with direct slavery, with Negro slavery in Surinam, in Brazil, in the Southern states of North America.

“Direct slavery is just as much the pivot of bourgeois industry as machinery, credits, etc. Without slavery you have no cotton; without cotton you have no modern industry. It is slavery that gave the colonies their value; it is the colonies that created world trade, and it is world trade that is the precondition of large-scale industry. Thus slavery is an economic category of the greatest importance.

“Without slavery North America, the most progressive of countries, would be transformed into a patriarchal country. Wipe North America off the map of the world and you will have anarchy - the complete decay of modern commerce and civilization. Cause slavery to disappear and you will have wiped North America off the map of nations.

“Thus slavery, because it is an economic category, has always existed among the institutions of the peoples. Modern nations have been able only to disguise slavery in their own countries, but they imposed it without disguise upon the new world”.¹

This statement of the Marxian narrative appears to be an attempt to justify slavery as a modern, progressive act indispensable for the construction of capitalism in modern Europe (read Britain and France) and North America. In the modern socialist view this appears shocking and scandalous but emanating from Marx of the nineteenth century, such a view propagated by the Marxian narrative is not surprising at all. The Marxian narrative is informed by the dominating barbarian culture comprised of racism, colonialism and Christian genocide practiced by the people of the Western European origin, and Marx is no exception.

Let us indulge in a bit of ruthless criticism of the Marxian statement quoted above : Slave, slave-owners etc could be held as economic categories if and when they are engaged in the process of production. But slavery itself is a process not exclusively of production and, therefore, could be held as economic category only as a ‘mode of production’. But it is surely not ‘like any other’ as Marx wants us to believe. All other Marxian modes of production may be considered as civilized modes but slavery remains as the most barbarian mode of production. Here, two groups of humans are involved—the slave-owners behave as savages and forcibly treat the slaves as animals. Thus this mode is really an exceptional one. Marx, however, does not talk about the bad side of slavery. In fact, he never wrote anything about what he means by the bad side or mentioned the bad qualities. It is, therefore, doubtful that he ever cared about the bad side at all. In the modern socialist view, however, slavery is all bad from head to foot and it does not produce an iota of good anywhere; even when it produces wealth for the

savage slave-owners and their Euro-American inheritors, because it degrades the entire lot of them. That is, the bad overwhelmingly outweighs the good, if any. Elsewhere, Marx discloses his utter callousness towards basic human dignity by equating slave-owner/slave of slave economy with capitalist/proletariat of capitalist economy.² This he does when he himself admits that the slave-owners of the Caribbean and Southern YSA thrive on cruelly overworking the slaves so much so as to use up their lives in a span of 7 years.³ Then Marx frankly states that slavery and colonialism are the two most fundamental bases that created modern bourgeois industry or in other words, capitalism in Euro-America. By telling this, Marx amazingly contradicts the most fundamental theory of Marxism, universally known as 'historical materialism'. If, as Marx admits here, accumulation by forcible plunder from slavery and colonialism throughout the three centuries could be accepted as the unavoidable and necessary precondition for the capitalism, then that cannot be called 'capitalism'. According to the Marxian theory of capitalism, slavery and colonialism just cannot be contributors of surplus to the accumulation of capitalism; those latter two economies might at best be called pre-capitalist, feudal and despotism. Thus in view of such self-contradictory statement of Marx, one cannot avoid two conclusions : one, that there is no capitalism in the Euro-America of Marxian times, and two, that colonialism (or for that matter, imperialism) is a pre-capitalist phenomenon, not being a highest or any other stage of capitalism (a la Lenin), if at all the Euro-American economy can ever be called 'capitalist'. We have indicated these two conclusions on earlier occasions.⁴ Undaunted, Marx continues to disclose his most reactionary beliefs. He tells us that despite slavery North America is the most progressive of countries. Why? Well, Marx does not explain and it is perhaps inexplicable. People of European origin forcibly conquered territories after territories in the Western hemisphere, wiped out the natives by barbarian genocide, colonized America, kidnapped 60 millions of civilized African Negroes and killed most of them by subjugating them to slavery and thereby accumulate capital to become rich, and reserve an accommodation in the kingdom of a Christian God without passing through the eye of a needle. Thereafter, they christened themselves as a new nation on the earth. Marx followed suit by certifying these barbarians as the 'the most progressive of countries'. A look at the milieu Marx lived in may reveal that Marx could not have done otherwise. Contemporary Euro-America (Britain, France and USA) believed in and practiced racism, violence and genocide, and this Euro-American culture were an integral part of Christianity. Marx could not escape the commanding influence of this culture and that is the source of his unwavering belief in the supremacy of the European white race and Christianity, good side of slavery, benefits of imperialism, and even in the inevitability of slavery and imperialism for the construction of coveted capitalism in Euro-America. That is why, Marx is dead against abolition of slavery as that, in his view, will bring disaster and 'decay in the modern commerce and civilization' of Euro-America. Needless to say, this extremely reactionary view of Marx is quite compatible with racist and imperialist ideology, but it is undoubtedly anti-socialist and anti-democratic. Unfortunately, these views came to constitute the foundational elements of the culture of Marxism that was inherited by the Marxists. Further, Marx also deviated from fact. Slavery was not imposed upon the new world. It was invited to and installed in the new world by the old-world European colonizers with care and calculation.

Now that Marx candidly expresses his view on slavery, can Engels be far behind? No, he is not. Engels endorses the above-quoted view of Marx in an accompanying footnote to Marx's article. Later he expresses his own view thus : "Thus force, instead of controlling the economic situation, was on the contrary pressed into the service of the

economic situation. *Slavery* had been invented. It soon became the dominant form of production among all peoples who were developing beyond the old community, but in the end was also one of the chief causes of their decay. It was slavery that first made possible the division of labour between agriculture and industry on a larger scale, and thereby also Hellenism, the flowering of the ancient world. Without slavery, no Greek state, no Greek art and science; without slavery, no Roman Empire. But without the basis laid by Grecian culture, and the Roman Empire, also no modern Europe. We should never forget that our whole economic, political and intellectual development presupposes a state of things in which slavery was as necessary as it was universally recognized. In this sense we are entitled to say: Without the slavery of antiquity no modern socialism.

“It is very easy to inveigh (inveigh) against slavery and similar things in general terms, and to vent to high moral indignation at such infamies. Unfortunately all that this conveys is what everyone knows, namely, that these institutions of antiquity are no longer in accord with our present conditions and our sentiments, which these conditions determine. But it does not tell us one word as to how these institutions arose, why they existed, and what role they played in history. And when we examine these questions we are compelled to say - however contradictory and heretical it may sound - that the introduction of slavery under the conditions prevailing at that time was a great step forward. For it is fact that man sprang from beasts, and had consequently to use barbaric and almost bestial means to extricate himself from barbarism. Where the ancient communities have continued to exist, they have for thousands of years formed the basis of the crudest form of state, Oriental despotism, from India to Russia. It was only where these communities dissolved that the peoples made progress of themselves, and their next economic advance consisted in the increase and development of production by means of slave labour”.⁵

Whenever an attempt is made to evaluate a statement of Marx or Engels one should continuously keep it in mind that for them the Western Europe and the USA constitute the entire world; otherwise confusion may block its understanding. This may happen in dealing with the statement of Engels under consideration. He just mentions Greece or Roman, and means the world. Whenever he talks of slavery of antiquity that actually happened in Greece and Rome, Engels implies that it was the same world over or universal. If one corrects this tendency, then it appears that Engels describes the Euro-American world correctly in terms of its politics and economics, that all the countries of Euro-America survived and developed themselves exclusively on the loot plundered from slavery and colonialism. But the trouble is that Engels forgets himself in his enthusiasm of new discovery and lays a rule that without Greco-Roman slavery, *no modern socialism* (emphasis added). This fantastic prediction goes on to firmly establish the correctness of our finding that for them, Euro-America was the world. True to form, Engels here firmly believes that only Euro-American countries will be blessed with ‘modern socialism’, and hence, practicing slavery is an unavoidable precondition for achieving ‘modern socialism’. Like Marx, Engels also tells about good and bad sides of slavery, but he does know much about the bad side except that slavery is immoral and infamous. He further admits that everyone knows that slavery is not compatible with our present day values and sentiments. Still he tries to be extra-clever in his attempt to make it compatible by some pseudo-scientific mumbo-jumbo. He says that man sprang from beasts and so inherits barbarism. No Sir, animals are not barbarians, only humans, especially Euro-Americans, are proved to be practicing barbarians. Engels also

discloses his utter ignorance about animals by holding them bad for acts actually committed by humans, not animals. In any case, a dose of the Darwinian theory of origin of man from lower organisms by evolution does not necessarily make the beasts barbarians, nor it invents the word 'bestial' to denote something heinous or despicable. Here, Engels makes a not-so-innocent attempt to put the blame on the simple innocent beasts for transmitting barbarity to the humans. But we all know that barbarity is inherent in the people of European origin, and has nothing to do with the beasts. Again like Marx, Engels discloses his ignorance about India. He declares that Oriental despotism was the crudest form of state and imagines that such a form was prevalent in India for thousands of years. Predictably Engels also, like Marx, forgets to mention the source of such peculiar information as well as what he means by Oriental despotism and why that was crudest.⁶ Obviously Marx and Engels have not heard anything about the highly developed ancient Egyptian, Sumerian, Persian, Indian, Chinese civilizations. Ancient Asian civilizations did not practice Greco-Roman slave mode of production and hence they tell different stories. Here, an amateurish attempt made by Engels to relate ancient Greco-Roman slavery as the foundation of modern Euro-American economy actually brings much discredit to his reputation. It is universally known that the modern European economy was founded upon modern Euro-American practice of slavery (meaning capturing, trading and labouring millions of Negro nationalities), and Asian, American, African colonialism; it had nothing to do with the ancient practice of slavery.

Not that it was unknown to Marx and Engels. The barbaric practice of the ancient Europeans was, compared to that of the modern Europeans, negligible in terms of dimension and extent but quite comparable in terms of character. In modern times, Columbus started it by episodic plunder and making slaves of the Native Americans. Gradually increasing the rapidity of the barbaric acts, the practice turned into plunder, colonization, slavery of Native Americans and extension of conquest. This was led mostly by Christian robbers and priests. In this context, a piece from the writing of one W Howitt, certified by Marx as a specialist on Christianity and quoted by him in his book *Capital*, Vol. 1, may be reproduced here. Howitt says, "The barbarities and desperate outrages of the so-called Christian race, throughout every region of the world, and upon every people they have been able to subdue, are not to be paralleled by those of any other race, however fierce, however untaught, and however reckless of mercy and of shame, in any age of the earth".⁷ In the same piece of his narrative, Marx himself denounced the protestant settlers in North America in the early eighteenth century for openly inciting their co-settlers to commit a different form of genocide against the Native Americans with a reward of 100 pounds per killing of every Native American with proof of scalp. Marx further lets us know that the British Parliament proclaimed blood-hounds and scalping as "means that God and Nature had given into its hand". Hereafter Marx continues, "The colonial system ripened, like a hot-house, trade and navigation. The "societies Monopolia" of Luther were powerful levers for concentration of capital. The colonies secured a market for the manufacture, and, through the monopoly of the market, an increased accumulation. *The treasures captured outside Europe by undisguised looting, enslavement, and murder, floated back to the mother-country and were there turned into capital* (emphasis added)".⁸ We see that Marx unabashedly defends modern slavery by Euro-Americans as unavoidable for economic progress, while Engels, altogether avoiding modern slavery, harps on the defense of ancient slavery by extremely slippery arguments and hopes thereby to soften up the expected bitter reaction of moral indignation against modern slavery.

But slavery and Christian racism were integral components of the deeply backward barbarian culture of the nineteenth century Euro-Americans, to which Marx and Engels belonged, and despite their revolutionary socialist thoughts they were firm believers in the counter-revolutionary elements of that culture, such as racial chauvinism, orientalism, Euro-American supremacy, Negro slavery, colonial destruction of non-European peoples and territories, etc. They had, thus, no compunction to admit that the Euro-American societies were built up on the foundation of slavery and colonialism. This fact, however, was common knowledge, and to quote one of the later Marxists, "The British, French and the Spanish empires all arose on this foundation of African slave labour, and could not well have arisen on any other basis. The whole development sailed under the patronage of nominally Christian Governments."⁹ Here, Lichtheim emphasizes that without slavery and colonialism, there was no way for the Christian peoples of European origin to acquire wealth. He adds, "Schopenhauer refuted pantheism by pointing the absurdity of any God transforming himself into a world where on an average day six million slaves received sixty million blows".¹⁰

Modern slavery, however, is too enormous and serious a phenomenon to be dismissed by such immoral arguments offered by Marxism. Here, it may be useful to cast a glance to this phenomenon of modern slavery. In one count it is estimated that 30 million slaves died in transit among a 100 million captured. Another rather conservative estimate puts the figure of the total captured at 60 million. One may compare this with a 100 million Native Americans, who untiringly fought to death to resist slavery, killed in a parallel genocide.¹¹ Slave trade, operated by Portugal, Spain, Holland, Britain, France, USA, Denmark, lasted for almost four centuries (1501-1873), and slavery for a few years more after its major practitioner, the USA was forced to stop in 1865. No, Abraham Lincoln must not be congratulated for this, as Marx wrongly did. Lincoln himself was a racial fundamentalist, was anti-Negro, was a firm believer in white supremacy over the black, believed two races couldn't coexist peacefully. As president, he repeatedly pledged not to interfere with slavery. But he had to fight the slavery-states and stop slavery in order to restore the USA from disintegration and win the civil war. Lincoln was never a moral hero as he was hypocritically made to be. All these were not unknown to Marx when he also joined the chorus. Even after the legal abolition of slavery in USA, when the rabidly racist Americans of European origin went on rampage with lynching, rape and physical abuse against the free Negroes at will with tacit support of the US Government, it was hard to find a word of criticism in the Marxian narrative.¹² Philosophically, Hegel and certain other German philosophers believed in their funny theory that the Chinese and Negroes represent the infancy and childhood respectively, of the human race in terms of intellectual capacity and human potentiality. Marx and Engels were quite aware of the barbarity of the practice of slavery, yet the Marxian narrative endorsed such fantastic racial views of Hegel and others.¹³ Today, slavery is in all countries considered to be a criminal activity, outlawed by UN conventions, and this took time and effort. But the Euro-American slavery-countries still arrogantly refuses to apologize for the despicable crime of slavery and summarily dismisses the demand of the non-Euro-American world for reparations. The blatant contradiction between slavery and innumerable political and religious declarations of the ideal of human freedom never bothered the Christian, white, civilized, most democratic, progressive, Euro-American people, including Marx and Engels. The attention of the protagonists of socialism was seized by only the economic aspects of slavery and that also with a narrow, partial, barbarian, exploiter's point of view. It is true that the so-called European capitalism was founded, in the words of a modern European Marxist historian, with the means of, "the

influx of wealth resulting from the pillage of treasures in America, the extortion of surplus labor based upon the slave trade of Africa, and the development in America of mineral and agricultural productions depending upon forced labor or slavery—a brutal exploitation of Africans and Americans We should never forget that this was an essential basis (though largely erased and ignored in Western thought) for the bourgeois enrichment of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. In effect, the forced labor of black slaves and of the population of South America permitted the release of a huge mass of surplus value”.¹⁴ On the other hand, it is also true that the Negro slavery and colonial slavery caused development of economic underdevelopment in the entire Africa and all the colonized countries; the economic indices of Africa were worse off as it entered twentieth century than when it entered fifteenth century, and the entire world of the ex-colonies is still devoid of the means to exploit their own remaining economic resources independently for economic development. Our point is - Marxian times was contemporaneous to all these barbaric acts and ideologies, and the Marxian narrative justified all these as necessary and inevitable for the progress of mankind, and declared Britain, France and USA as the most civilized, democratic, progressive nations. Such Marxian values and views irreparably injured the process of building a socialist culture. As a promoter of slavery, colonialism and even tolerant of Christian racist genocide, Marxist culture appears to be founded on an extremely backward barbarian culture, devoid of simple humanitarian concept and practice. It is a concoction of religious fundamentalism, racism, barbarism, imperialism, etc, and took care to exclude moral and ethical values.

Initially the protagonists found it necessary to strongly emphasize the irrelevance of the Utopian socialism’s ideological basis. The Utopians held morality and humanism as the basis of their own variety of socialism. The stand of the Utopian socialists e.g. Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen and others, was that social injustice to the proletariat was the cause of misery and social disharmony. They demanded “abolition of distinction between town and country, of the family, of the carrying on of industries for the account of private individuals, and of the wage system, the proclamation of social harmony, and conversion of the functions of the State into a mere superintendence of production, etc. Marx-Engels recognized the revolutionary aspects of these demands, but they severely derided the Utopians’ rejection of all political and revolutionary actions and adoption of only peaceful means to achieve socialism.¹⁵ No doubt, this attack on the Utopian ideology was correct and quite justified both politically and ideologically, but it is inexplicable how this correct stand could lead to a rejection of morality and humanism from the corpus of scientific socialism. It is hard to find any incompatibility of materialist morality and humanism with class struggles and socialism. But Marxism doggedly stuck to its old stand of rejection of any element of moral values from the politics and economics in both the theory and practice of socialism, developed this thesis as virtue and thereafter turned it into a tradition.

Thus culture never occupied a structural space in Marxism. Marx did not pick occasion to deal with culture politically and ideologically, except praising the barbarian culture of Euro-American peoples. Lenin and Mao Zedong, however, did face and talk about the role of culture in the task of building socialism, but the trouble with them was that none of them knew the meaning of culture or cultural upliftment or cultural revolution in any fundamental sense. So, it may be relevant here to spend a few words on culture.

Culture is often referred to as the socially inherited body of learning characteristic of human societies. Human society is made up of individuals who engage in activities by which they adapt to their environment and exchange with each other so that the society is maintained and individual needs are satisfied. These activities are learned by imitation and tuition from other humans and hence are part of the social heritage, or culture, of a society.¹⁶ Some maintain that culture is neither aesthetic nor humanist in emphasis, but political.¹⁷ Popular culture is described “as an arena of contest and resistance. It is partly where hegemony arises, and where it is secured. It is not a sphere where socialism, a socialist culture—already fully formed - might be simply ‘expressed’. But it is one of the places where socialism might be constituted. That is why ‘popular culture’ matters”.¹⁸ The point being made here by referring to these statements is that culture is often the real driver behind political and economic changes in the tumultuous moment of revolutionary transformation of the society. The morphology and character of hitherto unknown socialism will be determined by the culture of the people building it. Yes, the role of culture is that crucial, as Lenin was made to realize rather early and Mao Zedong a bit late in their seats of power. Lenin came to his despairingly bitter realization that violence and coercion alone failed to do the trick. Violence cannot inspire or teach the people to anything except resistance against unjust violence. Along with the other leaders, Lenin found that the culture of the people was backward and anti-socialist. But alas, the leaders knew of culture only as education; better culture means better education.

Lenin said, “The *elements* of democratic and socialist culture are present, if only in rudimentary form, in *every* national culture, since in *every* nation there are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions of life inevitably gives rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. But *every* nation also possesses a bourgeois culture (and most nations a reactionary and clerical culture as well) in the form, not merely of “elements”, but of the *dominant* culture”. We have to build socialism with people who have been thoroughly spoiled by capitalism those men and women who grew up under capitalism, were deprived and corrupted by capitalism it is foolish to imagine that we can solve the problem of organizing a new science and technology for the development of communist society by violence alone force had to be the primary weapon. But after that we must make use of the *moral* weight (emphasis added) of the proletariat, strong organization and discipline comradesly discipline among the masses, the organization of proletarian influence over the rest of the population, the creation of a new, mass environment. The Soviet apparatus is accessible to all the working people in word, but actually it is far from being accessible to all of them, as we all know. A vast amount of educational, organization and cultural work is required ...To compel a whole section of population to work under coercion is impossible... they will be conquered morally The communist organization rests... on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves... of voluntary class-conscious and united worker... they could not retain power by dictatorship, by force, by coercion alone; power can be maintained only by adopting the whole experience of cultured, technically-equipped, progressive capitalism. ...We talk about proletarian culture ...only a precise knowledge and transformation of the culture created by the entire development of mankind will enable us to create a proletarian culture... But is there such a thing as communist ethics? Is there such a thing as communist morality? Of course, there is... very often the bourgeoisie accuse us communists of rejecting all morality.... We reject any morality based on extra-human and extra-class concepts our... morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the proletariat’s class struggle”. Meanwhile Lenin repeatedly asserted

that proletarian culture being steeped with anti-people values of bourgeois culture at present, had to be transformed to a higher level by all round education, and appealed to everyone to join forces with the education department of the government in their task of spreading education. He appeared to sincerely believe that the state, so long condemned in Leninist vocabulary as the instrument to forcibly subdue the adversary class, could be trusted to perform the task of transforming the culture to a higher level by imparting education. It just shows that Lenin himself did not believe in his own theory of state. He said, "We must raise culture to a much higher level. A man must make use of his ability to read and write; he must have something to read, he must have newspapers and propaganda pamphlets.... If the whole of the peasantry had been organized in cooperatives, we would by now have been standing with both feet on the soil of socialism. But the organization of the entire peasantry in co-operative societies presupposes a standard of culture among the peasants... that cannot, in fact, be achieved without a cultural revolution : in our country the political and social revolution preceded the cultural revolution, that very cultural revolution which nevertheless now confronts us. This cultural revolution would now suffice to make our country a completely socialist country.... If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say just what that "level of culture" is, for it differs in every West-European country), why cannot we begin by first achieving the prerequisites for that definite level of culture in a revolutionary way, and *then*, with aid of workers' and peasants' government and *the* Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations? ...We hear people dilating at too great length and too flippantly on "proletarian" culture. For a start, we should be satisfied with real bourgeois culture; for a start, we should be glad to dispense with cruder types of pre-bourgeois culture, i.e. bureaucratic culture or serf culture, etc. In matters of culture, haste and sweeping measures are most harmful".¹⁹

These pieces collected from various writings of Lenin in a span from 1913 to 1923 precisely represent in a nutshell Lenin's views and range of thought on culture. Lenin appears to be aware that freedom of speech, thought and politics is integral component of socialism but in practice he denies such freedom to the proletariat and all other labouring masses. Lenin resorted to violence, because the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) had never had peoples' sanction behind its rule; there was no other way to retain power. So he had to thrive on violence and violence alone. But every step of this all round incessant violence brought him the expected lesson that socialism could never be achieved in this way. By taming the proletariat and people through state violence you do not achieve 'moral weight of the proletariat', 'comradely discipline', 'hegemony', 'new, mass environment', 'moral conquest', 'free and conscious discipline', 'voluntary class-consciousness', 'communist ethics and morality'; no Sir, none of these. Also culture is not a function of education and pedagogy only, as the CPSU leaders like to believe. The fundamentals of the culture of communist politics are freedom, democracy, human rights, abolition of private property, classes, exploitation of man by man, social discrimination, etc. Now-a-days these may also need elaboration but that is no obstacle in the way of understanding what is meant by a higher culture. In any case, Lenin should have kept the state, his own agent of violence and coercion, excluded from the job of imparting education. He ought to have known that Marx always wanted to keep the Government excluded from any influence over education.²⁰

For Mao Zedong, the scenario was not much different. Following the Soviet footsteps Mao also embarked on the familiar voyage for socialism without democracy. Narrow

dictatorship and all round authoritarian administration of the Party expectedly led China astray. Mao felt the need for a cultural revolution only when he discovered that he lost his command-control over the Party. That is why, in spite of the big words and deeds the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was derailed and eventually turned out to be a struggle for power in the Party. Culture stayed where it did. The eventual cultural fallout of Mao's so-called cultural revolution resulted in a total reversal of his political-economic programme for socialism. The other so-called socialist countries of Vietnam, Eastern Europe and Cuba fared no better, nor were they expected to. They all provided examples of caricature of socialism, as the Soviet and China did.

In order to determine the elements of a higher culture and understand their role in determining the standard of the society or say, the stage of its development, one must be able to distinguish the backward and cruder elements of cultural belief and conduct e.g. racism, religious fundamentalism, social violence, etc., and slavery is an example of all of these traits. The question is not merely whether you are able to stay clear of slavery, but the question is whether you are able to recognize that slavery is barbarian, violent, sub-human, self-degrading, a most heinous and despicable crime. If you cannot even recognize that in your thought, you belong to a reactionary, backward, barbarian culture. Wittingly or unwittingly, Marxism offered such a culture. Such a culture informing your ideology, your venture towards socialism ought to be a non-starter. That was what happened actually in the world Marxist movement. All socialist projects imbued with Marxist culture did, true to expectation, fail.

Given the reality of the extreme underdevelopment of the concept and contour of socialism in the unrevised primitive Marxian narrative, this essay agrees with the observation of S Hall, cited above, that in the days lying ahead, the corpus of the narrative of modern socialism may be constituted in the arena of enactment of the struggle for socialism. What the modern socialists, endowed with the vast experience of failed socialist projects, have to do is to retrench all reactionary and barbaric elements necessarily packed in the primitive narrative and replace them with feasible and acceptable programme for democratic secular society free from imperialism, class exploitation, social discrimination, etc., i.e. socialism.

References :

1. Karl Marx(1847): The Poverty of Philosophy, Marx Engels Collected Works, Vol 6, pp 167-68, Progressive Publishers, Moscow, 1976
2. Marx(1867): Capital, Vol I,p 226, P.P., Mos, 1978
3. Ibid, p 254
4. Sujit K. Das: On Capitalism: A Revisionist Agenda, *Frontier*, Autumn Number 2005, pp34-44, Kolkata; On Imperialism: A Revisionist Agenda, *Frontier* A.N. 2003, pp 18-31
5. F. Engels(1878): Anti-Duhring, pp 221 -222, P.P., Mos, 1978
6. Sujit K. Das: Marx on India: A Revisionist Agenda, *Frontier*, A.N. 2009, pp 8-17
7. Marx(1867): Capital, Vol 1, pp 703-04, P.P., Mos, 1978
8. Idem: Ibid, p705
9. George Lichtheim: Imperialism, pp 49-50, Allen Lane The Penguin Press, 1971
10. Ibid, p 50
11. David E. Stannard: American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World, 151 and 317(f.n. 9),Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1992
12. Deborah Mercer and Edith Beckett: Slavery: Unit 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, New Jersey Historical Commission, USA, 2003, accessed from Internet on 3.2.2006; information from this source has been used here as well as elsewhere in this essay.
13. Marx and Engels(1846): The German Ideology, pp 131-33, 163-70, MESW, Vol 5, P.P., Mos, 1976

14. Michel Beaud: A History of Capitalism, 1500-2000, pp 41, 45, 79
15. Marx and Engels(1948): Manifesto of the Communist Party, in M.E.Selected Works, Vol 1, pp 134-135, P.P., Mos, 1977
16. Roy D'Andrade: Culture, The Social Science Encyclopedia, ed. A. Kuper and J. Kuper, 2nd Ed, p 277, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, London,2005
17. John Fiske(1992): British Cultural Studies and Television, in R.C.Allen ed. Channels of Discourse, Reassembled. London
18. S. Hall(1981): 'Notes on deconstructing the "popular"' in R. Samuel ed. People's History and Socialist Theory, London
19. V. Lenin: On Culture and Cultural Revolution, A collection of extracts from Lenin's writings, pp 42,64, 61, 67, 73-75, 94, 105, 127, 133-34,178, 208-9, 213-14, 216, P.P., Mos, 1985
20. Marx(1875): Critique of the Gotha Programme, MESW, Vol 3, p 28, P.P., Mos, 1977.