

# SYMBIOSIS OF MODES OF PRODUCTION

Ikhlov B. L.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Perm State University*

**Abstract.** The provisions of Marx and Engels on the Asian mode of production are presented. It is shown that the system in the USSR is capitalist, with the preserved core of the Asian mode of production.

## Introduction

In all modern countries statist tendencies play an essential role - state-monopoly capitalism (SMC) is replacing monopoly capitalism. In underdeveloped countries (Iran, North Korea), SMC most clearly bears the features of the Asian mode of production. Interest in this issue is also caused by the desire to define in the categories of historical materialism and political economy the social system and the mode of production that were implemented in the USSR.

To explain the obvious inconsistencies between socialism in the USSR and Marxism, various authors have erected one or another explanatory theoretical construction. However, in the works of Trotsky, Cliff, Dunaevskaya, which are reduced to the position of Trotsky's construction of V.V. Orlov and A. Buzgalin, Messarosh, A. Razlatsky, Voslensky and others, there is no analysis in the categories of political economy. This analysis was carried out in the works "State capitalism in the USSR", "On the mode of production in the USSR", as well as in the book "Lessons of the revolution". In the USSR, labor power was a commodity, therefore, the mode of production in the USSR is capitalist.

However, it is also necessary to distinguish the system in the USSR from the standard SMC, since in the USSR there was only one monopoly, albeit divided into branches subordinate to ministries.

The ethical Ancient East is the earliest type of society that replaced the primitive communal one. Economically, it is characterized by the predominance of a patriarchal natural order, the stability of state ownership and communal land tenure, and the slow development of average private property in the form of means of production. In terms of social structure, this system is a system of communities and estates. The dominant place in ideology is occupied by myths about the divine, supernatural origin of social orders. Representatives of power were considered the descendants of the gods and were endowed with sacred properties. In the Artha Shastra it is said: "The sovereign and his power – these are the main elements of the state."

The French philosopher J. Bodin (1530-1595), H. Wolf (1679-1754), V. N. Tatishchev (1686-1750), I. T. Pososhkov (1652-1726), Montesquieu, Russo. Geographical scientist L. I. Mechnikov (1838-1888) wrote that "the social process is in inverse relation to the degree of coercion, violence or power that manifests itself in public life, and, conversely, in direct relation to the degree of development of freedom and self-consciousness" ... For him, despotism was a relic of the past. In P. A. Kropotkin's "Modern Science and Anarchy" we read: "... each time development began with a primitive tribe; then the period of free cities and finally the period of the state". He called the Asian formation a "despotic state".

Bodin believed that all states were created by conquest and violence. The monarchies of the East, on the other hand, arose as a result of just wars, so in them the monarch rules over the subjects as a father - a family. The etatist Christian Wolff substantiated the "political order" as follows: patriarchal families did not have enough means to improve, so they decided to unite into a state and a people, who handed over supreme power to the monarch. The laws of the state are the practical implementation of natural law. Tatishchev asserted: "The will of a person is put in bondage for his own benefit." This bridle could be: by nature (subordination to parents and the monarch), by contract (hiring labor) and by duress. Democracy, in his opinion, is possible only in a city-state, and Russia, like other "Great States, cannot be ruled otherwise than by autocracy." Strange, but the ideologue of feudalism advocated the development of the capitalist structure. "When the merchants are rich, then the whole state is rich, strong and respectable." Pososhkov also pinned his hopes on the monarch: "we revere our monarch like a god." Pososhkov and Tatishchev, proposed the following: "useful" administrative intervention in industry and trade, state control over the quality of goods, strict regulation of trade activities, restrictions on foreign competition. Trade was to be prohibited to all who do not belong to the merchant.

The first who tried to comprehend the essence of Eastern despotism was Montesquieu ("On the Spirit of Laws"). He believed that the climate in the south is hot, people are pampered, lazy and work out of fear of punishment, therefore "despotism usually reigns there." Hence the "tendency" of the Asian peoples to obey.

Montesquieu was horrified by the despotic rule in the East, since, in his opinion, it was based on lawlessness and arbitrariness. Also, the rule, the philosopher argued, is characteristic only of vast empires. For Diderot, the beginning of the social order was the Inca empire, supposedly the main thing there was a social contract. Rousseau believed that the last limit of inequality is the degeneration of the state into despotism. There are no more rulers and laws - only tyrants. Everyone becomes equal before the all-powerful tyrant, and private property also disappears. "The word right adds nothing to power. It just doesn't mean anything here" [2, 3]. F. Schlegel (1772-1829) in his "Experience and the Concept of Republicanism" wrote: "Despotism is opposed to it (republicanism), where the basis of political activity is personal will, therefore, such a state is untrue ... absolute despotism is not even an imaginary state, it is anti- state".

Before Marx, thinkers considered only the political system of Asian despotism.

### **Anti-communist teachings about the Asian mode of production**

Pyotr Struve called Bolshevism "the Asian mode of production" or "natural-economic reaction". Then he writes a complete nonsense ("The Results and the Essence of the Communist Economy"): "... the Soviet regime abolished not only the freedom of public life, infringed not only on the so-called subjective public rights, but abolished individual property, destroyed private economy" [4]. Poorly familiar with Marxism-Leninism, the Nobel Prize laureate in mathematics Igor Shafarevich in his article "Socialism" (collection "From under the boulders", Paris, 1974) calls the Asian mode of production "socialism", and also cites examples of various states as a help (Mesopotamia, the Inca empire and others) [5]. M. Voslensky in his book "Nomenclature" asserts that the Asian formation does not exist, there is only the "Asian method of total nationalization", not associated with a specific formation. Russian socialism, in his opinion, is a feudal reaction (feudal socialism; state-monopoly feudalism) [6]. Voslensky's scheme contains nothing but a set of terms and a descriptive part.

B. Russell believed that in the East the basis of power was scholarship, moreover, power and scholarship were identified. The development and spread of education deprived many scientists of the opportunity to exercise the power that the Confucians had in ancient China [7]. Russell notes only one side of Eastern despotism, which is not necessary. Russell has no analysis as such. M. Foucault defined the essence of the absolutely despotic model of power by the following formula: right over life and death. The power is characterized by the requirement: "wealth, blood, products of labor, objects of nature."

The "execution ritual" defined the "field of sovereignty" in which there is still no room for life. The dramaturgy of the execution announced that there was nothing but the divine body of the monarch. Foucault writes about the total deindividualization of the subject in a despotic society [7]. A. D. Toynbee calls countries with an Asian mode of production "universal states." He argues that they arose after the breakdown of civilization and are the product of dominant minorities, i.e. social groups that once possessed creative power. They are a symptom of social decay. The establishment of a "universal state" is preceded by the invasion of a foreign society. A captured society sometimes manages to stop the aggressor and use its institutions instead of its destroyed ones, extending the terms of its existence. The citizens of such societies want their order to remain eternal. In addition, they believe that the immortality of state institutions is guaranteed. Strange, but the citizens of the country are sure that this is the promised land, Toynbee wonders. The historian believes that the reason for the belief in the immortality of states is the personal charm of the founders, which has become a legend among descendants. Another reason is the impressive grandeur of the institution itself. The third reason is totalitarianism, the all-encompassing nature of the universal state [8]. Build data is difficult to take seriously. P.

A. Sorokin in his review of Z. Lilin's book "From the Communist Family to the Communist Society" (1920) noted the arbitrariness of the scheme of social development: primitive society, patriarchal-clan community, feudal society, petty-bourgeois society, the era of commercial capital, industrial capitalism, dictatorship of the proletariat and communism. He does not accept a Marxist (supposedly one-sided) economic analysis with the prerequisites for the same type of development of all peoples. Apparently, Pitirim Sorokin was unfamiliar with Engels's book "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", and besides, the classics did not at all think that the development of all peoples was the same.

Let us analyze the views of the publicist A. Tarasov, who defines the system in the USSR as "super-statism". He writes: "Marx himself, as is known, decided by the end of his life to reconsider his views on the 'Asian mode of production', suspecting that there was no separate 'Asian' mode of production. Death did not allow him to complete this work ... Marx was right in his suspicion. Today we have a sufficient amount of empirical data

in order to define both "Asian" and "antique" modes of production as one mode of production: large-scale non-machine (home) production"[9].

Tarasov does not refer to Marx's "suspicion". There is an obvious mistake in Tarasov's definition, for the primitive communal, tribal system is also "domestic". The essential difference between the ancient and Asian modes of production is obvious. Tarasov, following the bourgeois ideologists, writes about a special industrial mode of production, as if with this "method" there is neither a bourgeois owning the means of production, nor such a special commodity as labor.

"... the transition from slavery to feudalism and from feudalism to capitalism was accompanied by a change in the mode of production, but not a change in the form of ownership," writes Tarasov.

Indeed, the dominant mode of production and property relations are not rigidly linked, under capitalism, slavery is also possible. But if we are talking about the fact that a private form of ownership was preserved, then Tarasov does not make a discovery. On the other hand, owning slaves is significantly different from owning land or owning the means of production.

Tarasov writes about the alleged contradiction in Marxism, because Marx defines socialism as not a commodity system. If you eliminate Tarasov's mistake in identifying commodity socialism and commodity-free communism, this is not a contradiction, it is a mistake.

Marx accurately connects the commodity form of the product of labor, its value, with the alienation of the product of labor, with the abstractness of labor. However, he attributes abstract labor only to the sphere of exchange, the market. Hence the elimination of the market, the complete subordination of production and distribution to the plan, should eliminate value, and with it capitalism. In fact, the worker's labor is abstract already in the production process. It is the sphere of production that determines the secondary sphere of exchange, the dominance of abstract content in the work of the worker and generates abstractness in the sphere of exchange [10]. Therefore, Lenin introduced the NEP. The high priest in Tarasov turns out to be allegedly not an owner, but simply a manager, Tarasov does not understand that management, disposal is a property relationship.

Following the right-wing ideologues, Tarasov assures that knowledge cannot be a commodity - whereas in a bourgeois society not only knowledge, not only material services, but also spiritual values, works of art are a commodity, Marx notes this in the 1st volume of "Capital".

According to Tarasov, the system towards the USSR could not be capitalist for all the reasons indicated by the Stalinists, Maoists, Trotskyists, and liberal democrats: the absence of a market, a complete absence of competition. However, in the USSR, competition was not only between piecework workers and time workers, not only between factories, for example, between the Nizhny Tagil tank and Chelyabinsk tank (tractor) ones, but even between the design bureaus, for example, between the Korolev design bureau and the Chalomey design bureau. The unemployed competed and were used to unload wagons and ships. Finally, the superpowers competed. Ricardo also pointed out that monopoly limits the game of market supply and demand. There is no market within a monopoly, but it does not cease to be capitalist, it remains capitalist due to the content of the worker's labor. To assess supply and demand in the USSR, entire laboratories worked with specialists in the field of mathematical economics, programming, catastrophe theory, etc.

Tarasov does not know the fundamental definition of capitalism. On the other hand. Tarasov refers to Engels, who allegedly argued that commodity-money relations always give rise to capitalism. This is not true, the CMR did not generate capitalism either in the Middle Ages or in ancient Greece.

"... under super-statism," writes Tarasov, "the hired worker did not necessarily receive good quality, but it was guaranteed and even obligatory that under capitalism he had to buy in the market of goods and services just for that part of the salary that (approximately of course) he was not paid under super-statism." Education, medical care, and subsidies for social programs in developed countries were also free, Tarasov does not know the Western economy.

Tarasov rejects socialism in the USSR, invented by Stalin, but writes: "... under super-statism, antagonistic classes are eliminated" and in fact quotes Stalin's pamphlet "on the economic problems of socialism": workers, a class of peasants and a class of hired intellectual workers, which, upon closer examination, turns out to be composed of two large subclasses: the administrative apparatus, the bureaucracy, first, and the intelligentsia, secondly. There is a kind of social homogeneity of society, to a certain extent - one-dimensionality ... The boundaries between classes are blurred, the transition from one class to another is facilitated, which is an advantage in comparison with capitalist society."

It is unclear how Tarasov eliminated the antagonism between the boss and the subordinate. But like Stalin, Tarasov has no contradiction between mental and physical labor.

Socialism, a transitional period, is a period of overcoming this contradiction, which is what Marx writes about in his article "Critique of the Gotha Program." There could be no question of facilitating the transition from one class to another in the USSR: Russia from agrarian to industrial, the working class was obliged to grow, artisans with their creative labor were replaced by conveyor workers. In the USSR, children of artists, as a rule, became artists, children of scientists - scientists, children of workers - workers, and children of state officials - state officials, this, according to Tarasov - "one-dimensionality".

Society is divided into classes due to the division of labor. The elimination of the old social division of labor, in which Marx considers the main division into mental and physical labor, "is the transition to communism during the period of socialism. Tarasov easily cancels this process by declaring society in the USSR to be one-dimensional. Tarasov attributes planning to the merits of his super-statism. However, planning is the conquest of capitalism; any monopoly is planning. In developed countries, there are a variety of forms and government planning. In addition to managing capital in the form of shares, the "non-personified" state is obliged to plan and manage the budget. As Marx wrote, the state plays the role of a capitalist [11].

Tarasov rejects the Asian mode of production - but he immediately defines *this Asian mode* as etatism-I. According to Tarasov, Marx simply misnamed the Asian mode of production, which should have been called statism. But according to the same Tarasov, the Asian way is not special, but slave-owning. However, statism cannot be a mode of production; by definition, it is the conviction that the state should interfere in the life of society. Accordingly, there cannot be a method of production and supereatism.

### **Marx and Engels on the AMP**

For the first time, the concept of the Asian mode of production is used in the correspondence between Marx and Engels in 1853 [12] and in Marx's article "British rule in India" [32].

In the work "Forms preceding capitalist production", which is a section of "Economic manuscripts of 1857-1859," Marx singles out Asian production relations, which made it possible to speak of a special Asian (archaic) socio-economic formation that preceded the slaveholding in ancient Eastern societies.

The work was published in 1939 and has not been republished in the USSR since [14].

In the preface to his work "On the Critique of Political Economy" [15], Marx writes: "... the Asian, ancient, feudal and modern, bourgeois modes of production can be designated as progressive epochs of the economic social formation." They were preceded by a pre-class society - primitive communism. And further specifies that the ruling class were despots, i.e. the state [16]; he writes: "If not private landowners, but the state directly opposes direct producers, as is observed in Asia, as a land owner and at the same time a sovereign, then the rent and the tax coincide, or rather, then there is no tax that would be different from this form of land rent ... the state here is the supreme owner of the land, sovereignty here is land ownership, concentrated on a national scale. But in this case, there is no private land ownership, although there is both private and public ownership

and use of land."

Marx speaks of AMP as a tributary mode of production, as an era that saw the progress of the productive forces ("Preface to the Critique of Political Economy"). At the same time, in the third volume of *Capital*, he points to a thousand-year stagnation of productive forces in Asian societies, caused by the burdens of corvee and tribute.

In *Capital*, Marx writes: "If not private landowners, but the state directly opposes direct producers, as is observed in Asia, as a land owner and at the same time a sovereign, then rent and tax coincide, or rather, then they do not exist no tax, which would be different from this form of land rent ... The state here is the supreme owner of the land. Sovereignty here is land ownership concentrated on a national scale. But in this case, there is no private land property, although there is both private and communal ownership and use of land" [17].

Engels notes in "Anti-Dühring": "...The introduction of slavery under the conditions of that time was a great step forward ... The ancient communities where they continued to exist, for millennia constituted the basis of the roughest state form, Eastern despotism, from India to Russia. Only where they disintegrated, the peoples moved forward on their own along the path of development, and their immediate economic progress consisted in the increase and further development of production through slave labor [18].

In the "Economic manuscripts 1857-1859." Marx points out: "... the basis of the Eastern structure is the complete absorption of the personality by the collective and, accordingly, the absence of the personality as an intrinsically valuable individual integrity with all its internal potencies and characteristics. But if this is so, then there can be no question of European-type property in the East, where an individual "never becomes the owner, but is only the owner", because he is "the slave of the one in whom the single beginning of the community is personified" [19].

In *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Engels does not deviate from the Marxian 5-member scheme, but specifies that the first ruling class was slave owners, not despots.

In the later period of his activity (1870-1880).

In the last years of his life, Marx stopped mentioning AMP in his works. But this does not mean that he began to believe that AMP did not exist. For example, in his article for the *Encyclopedia Pomegranate*, Lenin quoted Marx's 4-term scheme, but already in 1919 he named only three major historical periods: slaveholding, serfdom and capitalist [20, 21].

Bukharin, in 1932, in his work "Etudes" writes: "The decomposition of the ancient mode of production and the transition to medieval feudalism, 56

the formation of the Asian mode of production, the birth of capitalism in wars and revolutions..." And, following Russell, notes the explicit usurpation of knowledge, characteristic of India: "Indeed, in the theocratic state of Ancient Egypt there were elements of a naturally centralized planned economy; knowledge (theory) the nearest was associated with practice, for it was expediently directed to practice. But this connection was of a special type: knowledge was inaccessible to the mass of workers; their practice was blind for them, their knowledge was surrounded by a halo of terrible secrets" [22]. In addition to the above, there are many more references by Marx and Engels to AMP. I.e. the classics did not depart and did not intend to depart from the isolation of the Asian mode of production.

### **Stalinist school of history**

Hegel and Saint-Simon identified 5 stages, respectively, Marx identified 5 main historical modes of production, supplementing them with Germanic, Asian and Slavic. In 1925-1930, a discussion about AMP began in the USSR. Varga E.S., Lominadze V.V., Magyar L.I. believed that AMP is inherent only in Eastern societies, replacing slavery. Their opponents extended AMP to all countries, placing AMP between the period of the primitive communal system and slavery. Examples were considered AMP in Ancient Egypt, in the Achaemenid empire, in Rome during the period of kings, in the Cretan-Mycenaean society, in Mesoamerica. The official point of view denied the existence of AMP, insisting on a 5-membered pattern of formations, from primitive communism to communism.

In 1930, A. M. Deborin, a professor at the Institute of Red Professors, again began to assert the existence of AMP. However, on December 9, 1930, Stalin held a conversation with the bureau of the Institute's AUCPb cell, members of the presidium Milyutin and Pashukanis accused Deborin of "Menshevik idealism."

M.B. Mitin, P.F. Yudin, V.E. Egorshin, M. Kammari and others began to argue that the Asian formation is in fact a slave-owning formation. Assyriologist V. V. Struve, the head of ancient Oriental studies, stood on the same positions: "...once and for all the attempts of some historians to see in Marx a special Asian socio-economic formation is put to an end."

Most scientists supported him. Stalin's article "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism" approved a five-term scheme: primitive communism, slave-owning society, feudalism, capitalism and communism, in the 4th chapter of the "AUCPb Short Course" Stalin again cited the well-known five-term scheme of development. Thanks to the leader, the comparative historical method disappeared from historiography for a long time. The Trotskyist historians adhered to the same line. The "Stalinist views" were especially clearly reflected in the book by G. Seidel and M. Zvibak "The Class Enemy on the Historical Front" (M.-L., 1931) with speeches and debates at a joint meeting of the Institute of History at the Leningrad branch of the Communist Academy and the Leningrad Society of Historians -Marxists. The historians of the Marxist "Asian formation" E. Tarle and S. Platonov were declared to be falsifiers of history. M. Tsvibak declared: "At the present time there is no need to talk about individual scientists and super-scientists who are so irreplaceable as to allow them to continue the old traditions" [23]. According to the Decree of the Central Committee of the AUCPb on the journal "Under the Banner of Marxism" dated 25 January 1931, Academician Deborin was removed from the leadership of the Institute of Philosophy.

During the thaw, in 1957, Yu. I. Semenov, in the "Scientific Notes of the Krasnoyarsk Pedagogical Institute," refuted the version of the Ancient East as a slave-owning society. AMP has been openly compared to the formation in the USSR. In addition to Soviet scientists, A. Ya. Gurevich and others, foreign leftists took part in the controversy: Garaudy, Wittgofel. In the Moscow Discussion of 1965, foreign leftists, Jean Suré-Canal, Maurice Godelier, also distinguished themselves. However, then the discussion was gradually curtailed, only in 1977 was I. Shafarevich noted. In the early 1980s, A. V. Zhuravel, like many informal Marxists, came to the conclusion that the system in the USSR was not socialist. He further suggested that this tuning is AMP on a new technological basis [24]. It is easy to see that this definition is meaningless. First, why AMP has not emerged on a new technological basis in developed capitalist countries. Secondly, it remains unclear why AMP emerged precisely on a new technological basis in the USSR, which appears immediately after the primitive communal society. Third, the institution of the sale of labor, which is characteristic of capitalism, is ignored. The Soviet Historical Encyclopedia denies the existence of AMP. Later AMP was written about already in the course of perestroika by L.S. Vasiliev [25], R.M. Nureyev [26] and others. And, conversely, for example, Yu. M. Kobishanov unites slavery and feudalism [27]. VP Ilyushechkin generally unites all pre-capitalist formations into one [28].

## Neo-Marxist teachings

In 1957, the German-American historian and formerly Marxist Karl Wittfogel published the book *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Totalitarian Power*. He writes that the basis of a "hydraulic" (despotic) society is not slaves and slave owners, but kings and communes. Using the AMP concept, Wittfogel explains the emergence of a specific "agro-managerial" system by carrying out large-scale irrigation works. All such systems, according to Wittfogel, have common characteristics: the absence of private ownership of land and, in general, no private property; absolute power of the state bureaucracy; lack of market competition and social classes; absolute power of the ruler. Wittfogel points to the similarity of the "irrigation empires" with the USSR and Germany under Hitler, and concludes that the system in the USSR is not socialist, but only a modern version of Eastern despotism based on AMP [29]. Which, no doubt, is not true, since the element of capitalism, the sale of labor power, is excluded. F. Tekei and F. Pokor believe that in ancient China there was no private ownership of land and call this era the time of AMP domination. B. Welskopf in 1957 expressed the opinion that the concept of the patriarchal system is not suitable for characterizing the Ancient East, but only AMP: there was no private ownership of land, the state was a "supreme unity" and exploited rural communities. Tekei believes that Europe has chosen an exceptional path of development, at a time when the whole world was moving along the path of AMP. African and French Marxists J. Sure-Canal, P. Boisto and R. Galisso discover AMP in African countries. Galisso speaks of "public property" and that the "state" directly controls the founding of the means of production in the Maghreb and Algeria until the era of colonization [30].

S. Platonov found 9 modes of production: archaic, primary-collective, clan, primitive, Asian, slave-owning, feudal, absolutist and capitalist. He believed that AMP emerged as the military domination of one community over others. The main production relationship is non-economic coercion, exploitation in a "pure" form. Integral communities, not separate individuals, are the primary, indivisible objects of exploitation. The dominant community turns into the historically first form of the state - the apparatus of direct violence, and the dominant clan becomes the "class-in-itself", the first exploiting class. The community that was the dominant form of activity of the previous mode of production in AMP becomes a productive force. The absolutist mode of production is similar to AMP. Under absolutism, law is transformed from a dominant production relationship into something that can be bought. The main production relation of absolutism as a mode of production is the commodity-money relation. Platonov proves that CMRs form only the "matter" of capital, but it is a qualitatively new form of existence of this matter, self-increasing value. Under absolutism, money is only a means to buy oneself the right to move to a higher class. The social structure of the USSR Platonov calls state-monopoly socialism ("rough communism" according to Marx) [31].

It is obvious that Platonov is weak in Marxism, for example, "state-monopoly socialism" is a tautology, since the definition of socialism includes state ownership of the main means of production. As for his definition of the Asian mode of production, it is, of course, incorrect.

The French anthropologist M. Godelier argues that AMP is a form of social organization inherent in the transition from a classless to a class society and is more widespread than Marx assumed; the European way of history is fundamentally different from others, it is unique. In his work "The Concept of" AMP "and Marxist Schemes of the Evolution of Societies, he writes that the concept of AMP was distorted and rejected because the hypotheses of historical materialism were turned into a collection of dogmas. The author, in relation to Attali, also makes an attempt to substantiate an independent "nomadic mode of production" [32]. At the same time, Godelier in his work "AMP - a stimulating concept with limited analytical value" argues that because AMP is a tributary way, it cannot be a production method. I.e. Godelier throws organization out of production. In fact, the reason for the termination of discussions about the Asian mode of production is different, but Godelier is undeniably right when talking about the widespread use of AMP.

In his speech at a discussion at the Institute of the Peoples of Asia in May 1965, A. Sedov spoke about three types of "pre-industrial societies." Some societies, in his opinion, had as their production basis agriculture with natural irrigation, others - agriculture with artificial irrigation, and still others - cattle breeding. He argued that "irrigation gives a society led by a bureaucratic nobility, and cattle breeding - led by a military aristocracy." In 1968, in his article "Angora Society and the AMP Problem," Sedov argued that in some countries of pre-capitalist society, the role of a kind of basis was played by the family. "Societies ... are organized according to the model of family structure and are formed into bureaucratic patriarchal monarchies: the monarch is the father, and the subjects are children." In other societies, "political functions" play a dominant role. These societies are formed according to the model of political or military organization. Finally, there are also those in

which religion plays a decisive role in the entire social order. It ensures the unification of rural communities into a single state. Sedov was supported by A. Ya. Gurevich, M. Vitkin, but none of them gave a single concrete example, did not indicate which kind of society can be considered as family, religious or political.

Gurevich is an opponent of the concept of "formation", instead of it - "creative model". He argues that personal relationships dominate in pre-capitalist societies. Economic forms of exploitation were mediated by them and derived from them. Gurevich exaggerates the role of power and non-economic coercion, but he is right when he argues that lord-vassal ties could exist without an appropriate hierarchy of land tenure, although they always had a material basis. According to Gurevich, the surplus product or part of it was given by subordinates directly (in money, food) or indirectly (by service). He believes that in pre-capitalist societies it is almost impossible to distinguish between the basis and the superstructure, they are so closely intertwined, therefore it is necessary to abandon the concept of "formation" and build "socio-cultural models."

Although Gurevich is classified as a Marxist, it is clear that this scheme has nothing to do with Marxism, Gurevich does not understand that trade and wars unite countries with the same mode of production into a single formation.

Jean Chenot rejects the mechanical identification of pre-colonial Africa with European slavery or feudalism and proposes to investigate the state of production forces, the specific features of farming techniques and crafts in the countries of the East. For Chenot, class division in Asian societies is combined with the lack of private ownership of the means of production by the exploiters. He mentions "universal slavery", the state is a class - the exploiter, communities - the exploited class. Chenot stresses that "the state itself as an entity ... really benefits from exploitation." The aristocracy and bureaucracy, although members of the "ruling class", have only "a part of public power." They "take part in the exploitation of the village" only on the basis of powers received from the state, the state at any time at its own discretion can take them back. He called this system "despotic communal regime", but in 1968 he abandoned it and expressed the idea that the essence of AMP is in the "dualism of rural communal production and economic intervention of the state", where the main branches are control over crop rotation, maintenance of roads in good state, mining and metallurgical industry.

Chenot noted that AMP is present in modern Afro-Asian countries. In his opinion, trade and commodity exchange with this method of production plays a secondary role. In addition, in such a society, "universal slavery" is noted: 1) the exploitation of an almost free labor force; 2) wasteful use of labor; 3) hard unskilled labor of workers; 4) the state forces communities to allocate workers for public, gigantic work; 5) exploitation is carried out through collectives. Chenot believes that the division into antagonistic classes is based on the "socially useful functions" of the state [30, 32]. That is, Chenot did only the descriptive part of the work.

M. Cheshkov studied pre-colonial Vietnam. He argued that the term "class" is not suitable for the dominant social stratum. It was a hierarchy of functionaries headed by the emperor. This state-class exploited the communal peasants on the basis of their functional role in the management of society and its economy [30].

The error is obvious, since the layer of state officials satisfies Lenin's definition of class. The state can not only be a tool for protecting warring classes from mutual devouring and a tool for suppressing one class by another, as Engels notes in his book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. The state, becoming the owner of all the basic means of production, can itself be an aggregate capitalist, which Engels emphasizes already in *Antiduring*.

### **Countries with Asian production**

Engels, in his book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, in view of the lack of ethnogeographical data on South America, makes a mistake, repeating after Morgan the erroneous judgment that the union of five Iroquois tribes, which never exceeded 20,000 in number, was itself developed social organization of the Indians. Moreover, the head of a clan or union of clans never possessed totalitarian power, and the economy functioned without police and soldiers.

However, the Inca empire that existed in the XI-XVI centuries was strikingly different from the Iroquois union. The population was divided into 3 layers: 1) the Incas - the ruling class, from which came the administration of the state, the officer corps, the priesthood, scientists and the unlimited ruler of the country - the Inca; belonging to the group was inherited, but it had access for the leaders of the conquered tribes and for distinguished soldiers; 2) peasants, shepherds, artisans - they were burdened with two duties - military and labor; 3) state slaves, they cultivated state lands, grazed flocks of llamas, were servants of the Incas. All the land belonged to the Inca and from him was given for use by the Incas and peasants. The lands received as a gift from the Inca were inherited, but administered by the administration. After marriage, a peasant received a plot necessary to



feed one person, one for a son who was born, and half for a daughter; after the death of the owner, the land was returned to the state fund. Part of the land belonged to temples and priests, and the rest to the state. Officials exercised control over agricultural work. Peasants were involved in construction sites, road repairs, and work as artisans. The state supplied raw materials for the craft. The completely disabled and the elderly were in the care of the state or rural community. The lowest officials were appointed from the peasants, and the highest from the Incas. The state controlled the roads, carried out forced relocations, and obliged peasants to marry [33, 34].

The state of the Jesuits dates back to 1516. It consisted of settlements - reductions. The reduction was headed by 2-3 Jesuit Fathers. The land of reduction was divided into 2 parts: communal and personal. Individual families were treated personally. The plot was given to the Indian on the day of his marriage, after his death he went to the general fund. Work on a personal plot and the harvest from it were under the control of the administration. The community provided seeds and implements. Work on the communal land was compulsory for everyone. Meat and tea were provided by the storekeeper of the public warehouse. The tools and raw materials of the artisans belonged to the reduction. All manufactured products were handed over to warehouses [35, 36]. Mesopotamia. In Ancient Sumer (IV - early III millennium BC) a priest ruled, the main labor force was made up of peasants. By the middle of the 3rd millennium BC, kingdoms were formed, headed by a king. The main economic units were temples. The workers received natural allowance or allotments for "feeding" from them. The temple warehouses were supplied with everything necessary for the peasants. The group of "feeding people" consisted of scribes, "noisemakers" and chiefs in charge of the processing of fields. There was a lease. The management of agriculture was in the hands of the ensial administration. The workers handed them the product of labor. The means of production were given out to the heads of the parties from the warehouse, and after the end of the work they were returned. There were production rates. Everything produced went to the warehouse, from where it was distributed in the community. There were almost no slaves [37, 38].

In ancient Egypt, the land was the property of the pharaoh. The peasants were transferred with it, worked under the supervision of an official who determined the supply rate. They were imposed labor service for construction projects and other government work. The norms were regulated and collected in each region by 4 departments subordinate to central warehouses and departments. There were workers living in workhouses and artisans. The owners of the land donated by the pharaoh did not have political rights. The position was inherited, but the position of the official depended on the favor of the king. In the XVI-XIV centuries BC, the priests and military authorities became private owners, but the pharaoh could deprive them of their property [39].

Obligatory labor played an important role throughout the Ancient East, including in Egypt. The state retained the communal duty - to run a common economy, turning it into a state labor service. Public works were primarily associated with agriculture, which is completely dependent on the constant regulation of the Nile regime and the state of the irrigation system.

Already by the beginning of the III millennium BC, a complex Egyptian irrigation system was created. By means of public works, the eastern rulers subjugated the free community members. Slave labor played a secondary role and was of a "domestic" nature. Only in the XVI, XII centuries BC slaves began to be used as weavers, potters, etc. In the "Asian" communities there was no need for additional labor, there was an excess of labor resources, and the use of slave labor in agriculture was meaningless. Communal farmers are a free labor force that does not need to be bought, fed, clothed, this huge labor army was used centrally in the construction of irrigation systems, roads, and religious buildings. Marx wrote that in Asia the state had a special branch - the management of public works.

In the II millennium, when they learned to smelt bronze in China, a slave-owning society arose. At the same time, the Yin Empire (Shang dynasty) that emerged from the XVIII to the XII century BC in the period of XIV-XIII century BC, in particular, during the Wang rule, the state included the features of AMP. At the same time, the system retained significant vestiges of primitive communal relations. The emperor was obliged to give gifts to his officials. Wang granted the aristocracy of people and land for temporary use. Officials, scientists and artisans were "fed". Peasants worked for them, they bore numerous labor duties. Craftsmen, overseers and merchants received allowance from the treasury. There were 3 main departments: agriculture, war and public works. Their heads, the Elders, were the highest dignitaries. The supplies to the state were made in kind. The society of the Zhou era in China resembles the Inca empire [40 - 42].

Thai state (XIII-XV centuries). In 1238, the liberation uprising of the Khmer Empire began in Thailand, and Bang Klang became king. He appointed 4 officials dealing with public order, palace affairs, legal proceedings,

tax collection, and agriculture. The "sakdina" system determined the size of land allotments given to officials, taxes and labor service in favor of the monarch of high-ranking officials and temples [44].

Japanese state (VIII-XVII centuries). The first cities in Japan emerged at the beginning of the VIII century. (Nara 710). During this period, Japan was ruled by an emperor and his military government (bakuhan system). The economy was based on small-scale private land tenure (seyon). Samurai held administrative posts in villages (dogo) and were subordinate to the government. The aristocracy, monasteries, and synoptic shrines were landowners. Aristocrats formed local government bodies (governors, curators, government officials). The peasants were restricted in movement and united in village communities. Laws regulated their clothing, food. The military government received 1/4 of the rice crop harvested throughout the country, it monopolized political and economic power. Large landowners, thanks to the hostage system, completely fell under the control of officials. Until the 10th century in Japan, land belonged to the state and was distributed in the form of allotments to aristocrats [45, 46].

Tibet (XII-XIX centuries). The country was ruled by princes and clergy. The Tibetan hierarchy is not backed by land ownership. Titled persons have public office, they are honored, there are peasants and princely workers. The social structure is similar to the Chinese one [47].

Islamic countries (VII-XX centuries). Slavery existed in Arabia in the 7th century, but it did not determine social relations in general (domestic slavery). The presence of a community ensured the development of cooperation. Exploitation was covered by the custom of tribal mutual assistance: the rich man, by providing work, "saved" from poverty. The fields and gardens in the oases were cultivated by free community members or workers. There were two types of property: private (livestock) and communal (pastures). There were many cattle community members. Most of the Arabs were engaged in trade.

Engels explained the absence of private property among the Arabs as follows: "... why did the Eastern peoples not come to private ownership of land, even to feudal property? ... The first condition of agriculture here is artificial irrigation, and it is a matter of either communities, or provinces, or central government".

At the same time, Muslim ideology - the sovereignty of the ruler over all lands (state-feudal property). The ruler distributed the land in the form of allotments to the governors of the provinces, military leaders, officials. There was an institute of hima (state property) approved by Muhammad. He contributed to the emergence of a nationwide land fund. Rent was widely used. The parties entered into an agreement, one provided the means of production, the other - labor. This was the main method of exploiting the peasants, without formal restrictions on their freedom [48, 49].

In modern Kuwait, educated from the outside, it was the state that became the mobilizing and guiding factor that had a decisive influence on the creation of the foundations of the national economy. In 1967, the Planning Council was created, which determined the long-term goals of economic development and developed the 1st and 2nd five-year plans (1967-1976). In 1976 the Ministry of Planning was created to prepare 5-year plans [50].

### **AMP theme development**

It is obvious that AMP has similarities with slavery, since there were slaves, but slavery was not defining. At the same time, there is a fundamental difference between AMP - not just participation of the state in managing the economy, but dominant, total participation.

There are too many analogies with modernity in AMP - for example, the hypertrophy of manipulation of mass consciousness: pyramids, a statue of a sphinx, temples. On the other hand - the dominant role of religion and its main representative.

It is these features, inherent in the USSR (a tomb for Lenin, thousands of monuments to Stalin, etc., religion in the form of perverted Marxism and the dominant role of the main "mullah") that caused the debate about AMP to curtail in the 30s.

Note that under the tribal system, the exclusive role of the leader was based either on primitive forms of religion, then a shaman was appointed as the leader, or as a result of special skills, for example, to melt metal (E.B. Taylor, "Primitive Culture").

As for property relations: "Property," writes Marx, "means ... originally (and such it is in its Asian, Slavic, antique, Germanic forms) the attitude of the working (producing or reproducing itself) subject to the conditions of its production or reproduction as to its own. ... This relationship ... presupposes a definite existence of the individual as a member of a tribal or communal collective (of which he himself, to a certain extent, is). ... Slavery, serfdom are always secondary forms, never primary ..." [53].

However, it is obvious that AMP has specific ownership relations. The exclusive role of the state in the Asian mode of production is not necessarily linked to land ownership.

The method is not necessarily associated with monotheistic religions and the high religious priest, however, in a number of countries with AMP, its role is high.

In the Inca empire, the growth of wealth did not lead to decay, although, perhaps, due to the Spanish conquest, the period of decay simply did not have time to take place. As well as the emergence of cities from villages surrounded by palisades, in which the Indians lived.

It is surprising that the Incas never learned how to melt bronze, it is with this that the underdevelopment of crafts is associated, with this - trade and the emergence of cities.

In history, different ethnic groups go through the same stages of development at different times. Therefore, ethnic groups with a later development experience the influence of already established formations.

Hence, it is obvious that the change of formations has a nonlinear character, but without bifurcations inherent in biological development. Namely: the contact of formations or modes of production does not lead to the pres66

ervation of the hierarchy of formations, like animal kingdoms, but to their assimilation. If only because human society differs from the animal in that exploitation has taken the place of the food chain; In addition to universal extermination, seizure of property and cannibalism, it turned out to be profitable to use the labor of prisoners, then the understanding came that the freer the bonded labor, the more productive it is.

The multi-line approach to world history is most consistently defended by L.S. Vasiliev, A.V. Korotaev and N.N. Kradin [54]. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the sequence "primitive communal, tribal system - (slavery, AMP, Slavic way, German way) - feudalism - capitalism" is a pattern.

Russia arose after the disappearance of the slave-owning formation, but the semblance of slavery, already under feudalism, took shape in slavery. Klyuchevsky writes: "... relatives lived in special villages, not interspersed with foreigners. But these were hardly primitive integral tribal unions: the course of settlement had to break up such a community. The tribal union holds tight while relatives live together in dense heaps; but the colonization and the properties of the region where she was heading destroyed the life of relatives together. Relatives could remember their blood relationship, could honor a common ancestral grandfather, keep ancestral customs and traditions; but in the field of law, in practical everyday relations, the obligatory legal connection between relatives was more and more frustrated. We will recall this observation or this conjecture when in the most ancient monuments of Russian civil law we will look for and will not find clear traces of the generic order of inheritance. In the structure of a private civil hostel, an old Russian *courtyard*, a complex householder family with a wife, children and inseparable relatives, brothers, nephews, served as a transitional step from an ancient clan to a modern simple family and corresponded to an ancient Roman surname" [55].

Founded in the VIII century, the trade of the Eastern Slavs became the reason for the emergence of the most ancient Russian cities, Kiev, Pereyaslavl, Chernigov, Smolensk, Lyubech, Novgorod, Rostov, Polotsk. These cities arose much later than the cities of Ancient Greece and Western Europe.

Secondly, Russia, as a lagging behind in development, bore the features of both European feudalism and AMP. On the other hand, it developed immanently. Accordingly, something new arose in the country's economy, which is why Marx mentions the Slavic mode of production.

In the USSR, legally, the supreme power belonged to the Congress of the Supreme Soviet. In reality, the entire economy was ruled by the elite of the CPSU, represented by the "inner circle", the Politburo and the "Sec67

retariat".

Further, the right to order was redistributed to the ministries. The supreme manager of the means of production, working conditions, labor and manufactured products at a plant, factory, car company, etc. was the general director directly reporting to the relevant minister. The first secretaries of regional committees played the role of extras under the ministries, secretaries of factory party committees - the role of extras under general directors.

To finally resolve the issue, it is necessary to determine what is the mode of production.

The mode of production is a historically determined way of obtaining material goods necessary for people for production and personal consumption, that is, social production at a certain stage of historical development, characterized by a certain level of development of productive forces and the type of production relations corresponding to this level.

This is the unity of a certain stage of development of the productive forces and the type of production relations conditioned by it. And then, as a rule, they quote the words of Marx that the mode of production determines the social, political and spiritual processes of life [15]. It follows from these definitions that there are as many modes of production as there are diverse unities of productive forces and production relations. That is, these definitions are meaningless.

You can define the mode of production as a way of connecting labor power with the means of production. If the intermediary is the slave owner, this is slavery, the feudal lord - feudalism, the bourgeois - capitalism, the pharaoh - the Asian way. It is possible to distinguish such characteristics as the type of property: slaves, land, means of production. Capitalism has a special definition: a mode of production in which a new type of commodity appears, labor power, the exchange of which generates surplus value. It is possible to link the emergence of this or that method of production with the emergence of technical inventions, bronze, steam engine, conveyor, etc. And then introduce the terms "industrial", "postindustrial", "information society".

To understand the essence of the Asian mode of production, you need to understand the role of bureaucracy and the fact that the capitalist mode of production existed in the USSR.

Various authors emphasize the role of bureaucracy without understanding its essence. If in the developed capitalist countries the bureaucracy plays a secondary, auxiliary, subordinate role, then in the Asian way this role is the main one. Marx writes [56]: "The general spirit of the bureaucracy is a mystery, a sacrament. The observance of this sacrament is ensured in her own environment by her hierarchical organization, and in relation to the outside world - by her closed corporate character. The open spirit of the state, as well as state thinking, is therefore presented to the bureaucracy as a betrayal in relation to its secrets. " What is this sacrament? Many researchers point out that there is no private property in the Asian mode of production. This is not true.

Since the time of Roman law, property relations have been subdivided into use, ownership and disposal (management). Since the bureaucrat (state official) is the steward-manager, he thereby becomes the owner. Such an attitude of property as disposal (management), which plays a dominant role in the economy of Eastern despotism, as opposed to direct ownership and use.

"The new class draws its power, - writes Milovan Djilas, - privileges, ideology, habits from some special, special form of property. This is a collective property, that is, that which he controls and which he distributes "on behalf of" the nation, "on behalf of" society ... The very property of the new class, as well as the class belonging of individuals, which has already been noted, is realized through managerial privileges "[57]. Jilas only confuses such an ownership relation as management with the ownership relation in the form of privileges, these are different things, although privileges are generated precisely by the usurpation of control.

Property, explains Marx in a letter to Annenkov, is not the relation of a person to a thing. It is the relationship between people about things. In turn, capital is also a social relation.

The owner of the means of production is called a capitalist. Since the management-disposal is a property relation, the steward-manager is the owner. Consequently, the steward-manager of the means of production is a capitalist.

Thus, in the USSR, the bureaucratic class is the capitalist class, it is a historically formed large group of people who have a predominant relationship with the means of production, as a result of which they occupy a high position in the social hierarchy and receive a large share of social wealth, expressed not so much in money as in state support.

Note that ownership in the form of management extends to all countries of the world. At the same time, there is a tendency to combine ownership relations such as management and ownership. For example, in Argentina, many landowners become members of Congress, in the United States, the entire Congress is engaged in mediation activities. Examples are modern Russia, where a state official is usually a businessman, Italy, where the capitalist Berlusconi held the presidency, or France (Chirac).

The strengthening of the role of the state in modern history covers a number of countries with a capitalist system: Germany under Bismarck, Italy (Mussolini), Germany (Hitler), Argentina (Peron), Cuba (Castro), which in the late 30s and today is reflected in the ideology of Keynesianism and neo-Keynesianism.

Engels writes: "The modern state, whatever its form, is in its very essence a capitalist machine, a capitalist state, an ideal aggregate capitalist. The more productive forces it takes into its ownership, the more complete its transformation into an aggregate capitalist will be and the more citizens it will exploit. The workers will remain hired workers, proletarians. Capitalist relations are not destroyed, but, on the contrary, are driven to the extreme, to the highest point ..." [58]. State property does not abolish private property, on the contrary, private property becomes absolute, in the words of Marx, in its universal form.

That is, in the USSR the state as a set of bureaucrats coincides with the capitalist class and satisfies the definition of classes given by Lenin in the article "The Great Initiative".

In the slave system, slaves are not the only productive class, the contradiction is not covered only by two antagonistic classes, hence the specificity of the transition to feudalism - not as a result of a victorious uprising of slaves, as Marx noted. Therefore, the transition to feudalism occurs before the slave class reaches a sufficient level of development.

That is why slavery in a systemic form existed until the late Renaissance, then in England, then in the USA, then in Germany (Kurds) and in the 90s in Russia.

The first bourgeois revolutions took place long before the proletariat matured as a class, that is, long before the moment when the bourgeoisie had reached the level to replace the aristocracy in the economic hierarchy. That is why the bourgeois revolution in France lasted for a century and a half, and the revolution in England was defeated.

The socialist revolution in Russia took place long before the working class reached a level of development where it could replace the bourgeoisie. Therefore, already in 1918-1919. Lenin argues that there is no socialism in the country, so in 1991 capitalism in the USSR took on an explicit form.

The specificity of AMP is that the property relation in the form of slave ownership is replaced by property in the form of disposition of peasants.

In the USSR, ownership of the means of production was replaced by their disposal. The intermediary between labor and the means of production is a government official.

Lenin in 1921 in his work "On the food tax" enumerated the elements of five different socio-economic structures: patriarchal, small-scale commodity, private economic, state capitalism and socialism. Thus, the mixing of different modes of production under one dominant one is a law.

Since the distinction between two forms of property relations, ownership and control, also exists at different levels of production, it must be admitted that AMP existed in the USSR under state capitalism, but to a greater extent than in Japan or Sweden.

## **Conclusion**

Bureaucracy is not a parasitic layer, it is a necessary control element. To deprive the bureaucracy of managerial privileges, Lenin called for everyone to become bureaucrats, and every cook must learn to run the state (roughly the same thesis is expressed by the possibilist Bruss: "Everybody must be officials"). In the April Theses, Lenin writes that the main principles of socialism, that is, Soviet power, should be the principles of the Paris Commune, thanks to which managers are destroyed as a class: constant turnover from top to bottom, modest pay of a civil servant and direct control over a civil servant by workers, "from below". Thus, socialism as it should be is not AMP, it is an "inverted" AMP.

Thus, AMP can arise naturally, but it can also, like slavery in the United States or the Jesuit state, be imperatively introduced, as a result of reforms, becoming organic or not later.

Thus, the USSR is a capitalist state organized in AMP. The prerequisites for this were formed throughout the history of Russia.

At the same time, an attempt to liquidate capitalist commodity-money relations led to a crisis, and the NEP was introduced. Thanks to Lenin's reforms (state monopoly on foreign trade, etc.), industrialization took place in the country, but the abolition of the NEP slowed down the growth of labor productivity.

The initial reason for the destruction of AMP is the complication and expansion of production, which make it impossible to cover all economic ties with a limited management apparatus. But the same reason will be the ultimate cause of the destruction of the capitalist mode of production.

### **References**

1. I. Meszaros. *Beyond Capital*. London, Merlin Press, 1995.
2. The image of the future in Russian socio-economic thought in the late XIX - early XX centuries. *fav. works / comp. Ya.I. Kuzminov*. - M.: Republic, 1994. - 416 P.71

3. History of political and legal doctrines: pre-Marxist period: textbook / ed. O. E. Leist. - M.: Jurid. lit., 1991. 528 P.
4. Struve P.B. Results and society of the communist economy. - Berlin, 1921.
5. Shafarevich I. Way from under the boulders. - M.: Contemporary, 1991; Socialism as a phenomenon of world history. M. : Soviet Writer, 1991.
6. Voslensky M.S.Nomenclature. The dominant class of the USSR. - M.: Sov. Russia, 1991. - 624 P.
7. Power / V.V. Mshvenieradze, I.I. Kravchenko and others - M.: Science, 1989.
8. Toynbee A. D. Comprehension of history / comp. Ogurtsov A.P. - M.: Progress, 1991.
9. Tarasov A.N.Super-statism and socialism. To the problem statement.
10. Ikhlov B.L. Why the CPSU and the CPRF – anti-communist bourgeois parties. Perm, 2014.
11. Marx. Capital. Criticism of Political Economy. Volume two. Op., 2nd ed., V. 24, P. 112.
12. K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., 2nd ed., V. 28, P. 174—267.
13. Marx. British Raj in India. Op., 2nd ed., V. 9, P. 130-36.
14. K. Marx, F. Engels Op., 2nd ed. V. 43, Part 1, P. 268–269.
15. Marx. To the criticism of political economy. V. 13. P. 7.
16. Marx K., Engels F., Op. V. 20. P. 186.
17. Marks K. Capital. Moscow: Politizdat, 1970. V. III. Ch. 47. P. 860.
18. Engels F. Antiduring. Works, Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961. 2nd ed., V. 20. P. 186.
19. Marx K. Engels F.M. : Gospolitizdat, 1968. Op., 2nd ed., V. 46. Part 1. P. 482.
20. Encyclopedic Dictionary GRANATE, 7th ed., V. 28.
21. Lenin V.I. CW., V. 26. – P. 39, 70-71, 57.
22. Bukharin N. Etudes. - M.: Book, 1988.
23. Seidel G., Zvibak M. The class enemy on the historical front. - M.-L., 1931.
24. Alexander Zhuravel. In memory of Viktor Petrovich Danilov (memoirs of a failed student).| Russian field
25. Vasiliev L.S.Evolution of society. Types of society and their transformation. M., KDU, 2011. 206 P. ; What is the "Asian" way of production? // Peoples of Asia and Africa 3 (1988): 65-75.
26. Nureyev R.M. The Asian mode of production and socialism // Problems of Economics №3. 1990. P. 47-58.
27. Kobishanov Yu.M. The theory of a large feudal formation // Questions of history. №4-5. 1992. P. 57-72.
28. Ilyushechkin V.P. Estate-class society in the history of China. M.: Science, 1986.
29. Wittfogel K. Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study Of Total Power, New Haven and London, 1957.
30. Problems of pre-capitalist societies in the countries of the East. - M., 1971.
31. Platonov S. After communism. - M.: Young guard, 1990 - 255 P.72



32. Kachanovsky Yu. V. Slavery, feudalism or the Asian mode of production. - M.: Science, 1991.
33. Garcilaso de la Veta. History of the Inca state. - L.: 1974.
34. Inca // Traveler - 1997 - №4(8).
35. Lafargue P. Jesuit Republics. - S.-P., 1904.
36. Svyatlokovsky V.V. The communist state of the Jesuits in Paraguay in the XVII-XVIII centuries. - P., 1924.
37. Tyumenev A.I. The state economy of ancient Sumer. - M., L., 1956.
38. Dyakonov I.M. Social and state structure of the ancient Mesopotamia. Sumer. - M., 1959.
39. Vasiliev L. S. History of the East: in 2 V. V. 1 - M.: Higher. Sch., 1993 - 495 P.
40. Kokin M., Papayan G. "Qin Tian". The agrarian system of ancient China. - L., 1930.
41. Duman L.I. Essays on the ancient history of China / Leningrad Oriental Institute. - L., 1938.
42. Ethics and Ritual in Traditional China: coll. art. M.: Science, 1988.
43. Perelomov L. S. Empire Qin. - M., 1962.
44. A.V. Kochetov The golden ax of the vritra. - M.: Thought, 1987 - 160 P.
45. Ignatovich A.I., Svetlov G.E. Lotus and politics. - M.: Thought, 1989.
46. Hiroshi N. History of Japanese Philosophical Thought. - M.: Progress, 1991.
47. Tsybikov G.D. Selected works, in two volumes - 2nd ed., Abstract. - V. 1: Buddhist pilgrim at the shrines of Tibet. - Novosibirsk: Science. Sib. branch, 1991 - 256 P.
48. Ereemeev D.E. Islam: a way of life and a style of thinking. - M.: Politizdat, 1990.
49. Panova V.F., Vakhtin Yu.B. The life of Muhammad. - M.: Politizdat, 1991.
50. Turadzhiev V., Mironov L. Oil can be choked with // Asia and Africa today - 1997 - №9.
51. Mamedova N. Economy dictates the political course // Asia and Africa today - 1997 - №4.
52. Melkumyan E. Development factors // Asia and Africa today - 1997 - №9.
53. Marx. Criticism of Political Economy. Op., V. 46. Part I. P. 485.
54. Alternative paths to civilization. M.: Logos, 2000.
55. Klyuchevsky V.O. Course of Russian history. Lecture VIII.
56. Marx K., Engels F., Op., V. 1, P. 299.
57. Djilas M. New class. 1957.
58. Marx K., Engels F. Op, 2nd ed., V. 20. P. 290.

**DOI 10.34660/INF.2021.99.90.00549**