

## Understanding the Marxian perspective of British colonialism in India

**Bhup Singh Gaur,**

Head and Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, DGC Gurugram, Haryana

**Dr. Sunita,**

Extension Lecturer, Department of Sociology, DGC Gurugram, Haryana

### Abstract

Karl Marx became interested in studying a civilization that was neither Western nor European for the first time in the year 1853. He chose to focus his attention on Indian society and study and evaluate it for various reasons. This paper intends to investigate the Marxian viewpoint of British colonialism in India from the vantage point of India. Karl Marx, one of the most prominent intellectuals of all time, had the belief that Indians lacked the capability and intellectual level to represent themselves adequately, and as a result, they needed the assistance of a third party in this role. In this way, Karl Marx supports British colonialism in India, as this was important for Indians as they can't represent themselves. This paper attempts to provide critical analysis of Karl Marx's thoughts on colonialism in relation to non-European societies and the assumptions behind the Marxian hypothesis on colonizing India.

**Keywords:** Marx, Colonialism, India, British, Representation, Democracy

### Introduction

Karl Marx was active during a period in history when the world was moving in the direction of the path leading to the advancement of science, and people were moving away from religion and the laws of God to focus more on the laws of Science. Karl Marx was active during this time. The human race was gaining the confidence to manage its own affairs without relying on any particular religion, and it started looking to science for the answers to the questions it had. The basis for contemporary education was established, and the scientific method emerged as a revolutionary force.

The publication of 'Das Capital' by Karl Marx was an important step forward in the development of the field of social science. He was the first person to undertake the study of the structure and economy of a society and was known for his scientific and serious thinking. During the course of his research on Indian culture, Marx placed a strong emphasis on conducting an investigation into the social being of Indian people and the circumstances that led to the development of Indian culture. He educated himself on the difficulties faced by Indian society and endeavored to make educated guesses regarding its potential future directions of growth. Marx's insightful study about the British colonial rule in India put an end to the racial theories that were put forth by the colonial masters. These theories argued that the level of consciousness of the Indians is responsible for and is the sole basis of their misery. Marx's study put an end to these theories. Marx's study about the British colonial rule in India was undertaken by Marx.

### Research Problem

In the modern world, those who think in accordance with the Marxist tradition, as well as the states that follow this tradition, are opposed to colonialism. Despite the fact that Marxism advocates for equality and emancipation and is opposed to the oppression of "Haves" by "Have-Nots," Karl Marx was adamant in his belief that India ought to be colonized. He was a supporter of British rule in India, which runs counter to the modern Marxist opposition to colonialism and imperialism and is not consistent with the Marxist ideology.

### Objectives

1. To investigate the factors that led Karl Marx to the conclusion that colonialism was a progressive form of government for India.
2. to investigate the issues that arise from a Marxist perspective when attempting to comprehend India.

### Methodology

In order to gather information for the paper, the doctrinal research method was utilized, and secondary sources such as books, articles, journals, and commentaries were consulted as a means of information gathering.

### Marxian view on Oriental People

The Marxist discussions that are about non-European societies, and more specifically about Asian societies, are based on Karl Marx's concept of Asian society and its mode of production. It is common knowledge that Marx devoted most of his academic efforts to researching and writing about the growth of capitalism in Europe during the 19th century. The primary reason that Marx decided to investigate the cultures of the Orient was so that he could

better comprehend the origins of capitalism in Europe during the 19th century. Specifically, Marx was interested in the rise of industrial capitalism in Europe. (Lau, 2009)

Therefore, it is clear that the primary focus of Marx's work was to investigate the development of capitalist societies in Europe. Nevertheless, in order to provide his study with a comparative framework, he undertook the investigation of the societies of Asia. As a result, the concept that Marx developed regarding Eastern societies is given a negative significance in Marxism.

Karl Marx tried until his last breath to come up with a systematic formulation that would be able to explain the intricate pre-capitalist economic formations of Asian societies, but he was unsuccessful. As a result, Marx could not come up with a theory consistent with the economic structures of Asian societies.

### **Marxian View on India**

It is generally agreed that Karl Marx's most creative period of activity occurred between the years 1853 and 1867, and it was during this time that he conducted research on the culture of the Indian people. Karl Marx took a significant interest in the uprising that occurred in India in 1857. Additionally, he contributed a significant amount of work on a consistent basis to a variety of journals on the subject of India. Karl Marx is known for penning a number of influential articles, including "The British Rule in India (1853)" and "The Future Results of the British Rule in India (1853)," in which he discussed the historical sociology of India. The "New York Daily Tribune" is where you can find these articles that were written. (Chopra, 1983).

Marx regarded the age-old village system of India as a distinguishing feature of Indian Society, and he also expressed this viewpoint in his early articles on India. This was one of the first times Marx discussed India. The ties of consanguinity were the factor that was responsible for these villages remaining cohesive over time. Because of this, Karl Marx referred to these towns as "Family Communities," and Friedrich Engels, a close friend of Marx's, referred to them as "Ancient Asiatic family communities." Both of these descriptions are accurate.

In these rural communities, the concepts of private property and individual land ownership did not exist. The land was owned by the state in many instances. In addition to that, it was in charge of organizing all of the agricultural activities. Since the state was the true landlord in India, the economic structure of the country was not drastically altered by the cyclical shifts that occurred in the political organization of Indian society. These shifts were the result of dynamic struggles and military conquests, but they did not bring about any significant changes in the economic structure of India. As a consequence of this analysis, Marx referred to these village communities as "Stagnant," and he stated that they lead a life that is characterized by passivity.

### **India as a closed society**

The Marxian concept of Indian society held that the village system in India, along with agriculture and handicrafts, were integrated and self-sufficient from an economic standpoint. For this reason, he blamed these aspects for the unchanging nature of Indian societies. Due to the caste system that was in place in India at the time, even though the land was held in common, there was an inflexible division of labor that existed. In addition to this, the combination of agricultural and economic activities served as the foundation for the communities that existed within the villages that were self-sufficient. These village communities never had any interaction with communities of other villages, so they were socially and economically unmoving throughout their existence. As a result, it becomes significantly more challenging for them to advance socially. The primary reason that communism lends its support to the central government is that it encourages the economic development of the nation through the process of industrialization. This is one of the primary reasons why communism cooperates with the central government. (Rammurti, 2007)

Because of the location and the climate, the village communities were totally reliant on the availability of irrigation. In this context, a centralized administrative apparatus was required in order to fulfill the requirements for coordinating and developing large-scale hydraulic works. As a result, the state played a significant and preeminent role in the operation of public works.

When each of these factors was taken into account, there was absolutely no room for even the tiniest amount of change to be made in the socioeconomic structure of Indian society. Marx was critical of the closed social structure of Indian society because he believed it reduced man's agency and made him more dependent on the forces of nature. Marx's description of the village communities posits that they are a natural destiny that does not change over time. On the other hand, Marx explains that the scenario could not have been altered prior to the British establishing a colonial presence in India.

### **Despotism in Oriental Societies**

Karl Marx identified the idyllic village communities as the enduring foundation of oriental despotism throughout the ages. The human minds were confined within these village communities, and they were forced to adhere to superstitions. It turned the human mind into a compliant servant of the established norms. These communities were corrupted as a result of the caste system that was in place. According to Karl Marx's analysis, this is what pre-colonial Indian society looked like. (Chandra, 1981)

For the very first time, a distinction was drawn between the urban history of European society and the urban history of Oriental society in a book written by Karl Marx called *Grundrisse*. When we consider the society of feudal Europe, we find that the production process began in politically independent cities. These cities also became the place where it expanded, and as a result, this resulted in the expansion of capitalism and the formation of two classes based on the factors of production: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

If, on the other hand, we take the society of Asia into consideration, Marx referred to the cities of that society as the artificial creation of a despotic state. Marx described these towns and cities as being little more than military camps, and he referred to them as "Princely Camps." The economic structure of these cities was superimposed by the existence of these towns and cities, and he referred to them as such. According to Marx, the state was a representation of the social unity that existed at the time due to the fact that the land was held in common by the communities of self-sufficient villages.

The oriental societies were resistant to any kind of change, and there were no internal contradictions that could have brought about a change. According to Marx, the foundations of oriental despotism were laid by the absence of private property, the land being held in common by the self-sufficient village communities, and the unity of agriculture and handicrafts that created a self-sustaining production cycle. Also contributing to the development of oriental despotism was Marx's theory that the land was held in common by the self-sufficient village communities. These same factors also rendered these societies socially and economically resistant to any kind of change that may have occurred. Therefore, the natural economies of these societies were not overly complicated, and this simplicity was the reason why these societies were able to maintain their status as stable.

The oppressive state in the Asian societies collected in the form of taxes any surplus that was generated as a byproduct of the production process in those societies. According to Marxist philosophy, Asian society had an overdeveloped state but a poorly developed civil society. This dichotomy was characteristic of the region. In feudal European society, the civil society held primacy over the state; in oriental societies, on the other hand, the despotic state held primacy over the civil society. In this case, the civil society was subservient to the state.

Marx demonstrated the devastation that was caused by the British colonial rule in India in his article that was published in 1853 and titled "The British Rule in India." In the article, he portrayed them as belligerent and callous individuals. Karl Marx asserted that the British were responsible for the destruction of the stable foundation of oriental despotism, which he defined as the villages. Marx went on to assert that the devastation brought about by the English invasion would eventually prove to be an unwitting instrument in the annals of history that would bring about a revolution in India.

#### **Traditional Hindu Society and the question of Modernity**

The term "Hinduization" refers to the process by which the Arabs, Turks, and Moguls who conquered India became more religiously aligned with Hinduism. This indicates that the civilization of the conquerors' subjects, the Hindus, was superior to the civilization of the conquerors and that the conquerors allowed themselves to be conquered by the superior civilization. Karl Marx asserted, however, that the British were the first conquerors of India who did not become "Hinduized" after their conquest of India. The barbarian conquerors were, by an eternal law of history, conquered themselves by the superior civilization of their subjects. Arabs, Turks, Tartars, and Moguls who had successively overrun India soon became Hinduized. The British were the first conquerors to be superior, and as a result, the Hindu civilization was unable to access their territory. (Chopra, 1983)

Marx wrote in an article he published in 1853 titled "The Future of British Rule in India" that the British, who represented India's final wave of conquerors, were the first people to demonstrate that they were superior to Indians. Marx said this in the article. They were out of reach for the ancient Hindu civilization. The British colonizers were responsible for the eradication of every indigenous community in India. Marx drew the conclusion that, in contrast to earlier conquerors of India, the British were able to successfully resist becoming "Hinduized." This was the result of all of Marx's observations, which can be summarised as follows: They were successful in destroying the indigenous industry of the Indian society, and in doing so, they established the basis for the revitalization of India.

If we look through the pages of history, we will see that during the time of British rule, India hardly reported anything other than acts of destruction. The British arranged for the formation of an indigenous army, which was then given instruction by a British drill sergeant. The British were the ones who initially allowed for an independent press to exist in India. Through the use of steam, regular and rapid communication between India and Europe was established. In addition to this, it linked the principal ports of India to those of the entire southeastern ocean. Because of all of these changes, India is no longer in the position of isolation that it was in, which was also the cause of the stagnation that occurred within the Indian society.

In the beginning, all that the aristocrats, monarchs, and millocrats wanted to do was conquer India, loot India, and undersell India, respectively. The millocrats, on the other hand, came to the realization that it is very important for them for India to have efficient means of irrigation and communication because this would make India a more

productive country, which in turn would benefit them. The establishment and growth of a free and active press, an irrigation system, the introduction of vast swaths of the hinterland to modern farming practices, and the development of modern means of communication in India are some of the hallmarks of India's entry into the modern era.

Karl Marx made the observation that in order for Indian society to become more modern in the future, it is necessary to export capital in order to develop its infrastructure. Marx also provided examples to support his argument that the British were on a mission to civilize the world. Marx, with the precision of a scientist, breaks through this morass of "popular" theorizing and sees the driving forces of historical progress pushing on regardless. He does this with an eye for detail that is reminiscent of a scientist. This is something that he discusses in an article titled "The Future Results of British Rule in India." In this article, he states that "England has to fulfill a double mission in India: one destructive, and the other regenerating. This mission consists of the annihilation of old Asiatic Society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia" (Chopra, 1983). They had the intention of bestowing railways upon India with the purpose of facilitating the extraction of raw materials like cotton at reduced costs for the purposes of manufacturing.

According to the calculations of Marx, it is not possible to maintain railways in such a large country as India without the introduction of all industrial processes that are crucial for meeting the requirements of railway locomotion. Without these processes, it will not be possible to meet the needs of railway locomotion. As a result, Marx reasoned that the railway network in India will eventually develop into a forerunner of the modern industry in India. The construction of railways in India will require new production relations to be established between employers and employees, as well as the teaching and learning of new skill sets. These changes will also be necessitated by the introduction of railways. According to Marx, the modern industry that would emerge as a result of the railway system would wane the caste-based division of labor in Indian society, which rests on which it rests and which also hinders its progress and growth. This is because the railway system would connect more people to more jobs. Marx reasoned that because of this, the forces that would eventually free India were already taking root on Indian soil.

#### **Marxian View on British Colonialism in India**

Because of the absence of private property in Indian society, the possibility of the development of social classes, that is, bourgeoisie and proletariat is ruled out, and this further eliminated the possibility of any social change taking place. Given that private property plays a significant role in the development of capitalism, and given that the absence of private property in Indian society plays a significant role in the development of Indian society, the possibility of the development of capitalism is eliminated. According to Marx, the social structure of European countries went through several different phases of historical development, including slavery, feudalism, and contemporary capitalism. Indian society, on the other hand, lacked the mechanisms necessary to bring about any kind of social change. According to Marx, the caste system is an extremely archaic form of class relations, and Indian society is still mired in this phase.

Marx viewed the presence of British rule in India as an instrument that would usher in a significant social transformation within the Indian society and eventually lead to revolutionary upheaval. The process might be unpleasant for the people, but it would rid Indian society of all the filth that has been pervasive in it for many years. This would be a significant advance. It was argued by Marx and Engels in their articles for the "New York Daily Tribune" that the British rule had torn apart the stagnant village communities and caused them to become more disorganized. It was the cause of these communities losing their capacity for self-sufficiency, which opened the door for them to be affected by the forces of social transformation.

Marx proposed a theory that he called the "double mission" to explain British colonial rule in India. According to him, the British have a dual mission to carry out in India, one that involves causing destruction and another that involves fostering growth. The objective of the destructive mission is to bring about the total collapse of the existing framework of the Indian society, while the objective of the regenerating mission is to establish the cornerstones of a society that is modeled after that of western Europe in India. According to Marxism, the horrors of industrialization, in which those with more resources exploit those with fewer resources, are necessary for the triumph of communism. He drew parallels between the atrocities committed by industrialization and those committed by colonialism in the context of India. The colonization of India by the British was necessary in order to bring about a global revolution of the proletariat class. This is due to the fact that without such a revolution, Indian society would not be able to break free from its regressive and stagnant state of development.

According to Marx, the more direct and intense the control that Europeans have over any Asian society, the greater the likelihood that a bourgeoisie class will be created in that society, and as a consequence, the greater the likelihood that that society will be transformed into a communist society. Therefore, according to the calculations of Marx, the intense and direct control that British rule exerted over India paved the way for India to be taken over by communists. This was because British rule in India was so oppressive.

Marx and Engels held the view for a considerable period of time that a revolution in a colonial setting could only occur as a direct consequence of a revolution in a metropolitan area. In light of this, Marx asserted that "it would be possible to overthrow the Irish regime by English working-class ascendancy." Later on, he came to a different conclusion, stating that "deeper study has now convinced me of the opposite" (Kumar, 1992). The Marxian way of thinking about the British colonial rule in India can be seen to undergo a shift in his later writings on India, which are focused on India. Marx made the observation that British rule in India began the process of de-industrializing the Indian economy and transforming it into an appendage of the industrial economy of British society. This was in contrast to what Marx believed would happen if India were to undergo the process of industrialization.

In the later stages of his life, Marx focused more on the destructors than the regenerators of the British colonization of Africa. The British colonizers were responsible for the destruction of the handicraft industry in India and turned it into a mechanism for the supply of raw materials to Britain. The production of raw materials such as cotton, jute, and wool for Great Britain was mandated by the British empire and required of the East India Company. Consequently, during the time that the British ruled, one portion, namely India, was transformed into a principally agricultural field of production, while the other portion, namely Great Britain, continued to serve as principally an industrial field of production.

Marx was critical of the practice of transferring wealth from India to Britain, which he viewed as a barrier to the growth of capitalism and the bourgeoisie class in India. He said that this practise impeded progress. Marx made the observation in 1881 that the removal of communal ownership of land by the Britishers was nothing more than an act of destruction and that it further pushed the Indians backward rather than moving them forward. Marx believed that this action was counterproductive.

Marx made the observation in the early 1870s that the British invasion of Ireland had resulted in the country's stifled economic growth. He made the observation that Ireland had been set back by several centuries due to the fact that Ireland was made to be subordinate to the society of Great Britain and it supplied Great Britain with inexpensive raw materials and labor. The United Kingdom became an important market for manufactured goods.

Karl Marx had previously held the belief that a colonial revolution in India would propel the Indian society forward. However, after conducting further research into the topic, Marx's perspective shifted, and he came to the conclusion that the opposite is actually the case. According to the later thinking of Marxism, the countries that had been ruled by colonial powers, such as India, would be taken over by the proletariat class in the later years. These countries would then move towards independence through a revolution, and finally, they would arrive at a stage of a communist organization. Marx, on the other hand, was uncertain about how this process would progress and what political and social phases these victim countries will need to pass through in order to arrive at a communist stage of organization. In addition to the wars fought by colonial powers, these countries may be subjected to a variety of different kinds of destruction as they work toward gaining their independence.

There is no such thing as a "theory" of a colonial revolution that Marx and Engels have left behind. To restate, what Marx and Engels wrote about Indian society and other colonial societies was primarily concerned with the intellectual challenge of analyzing society and economy that was structured so differently from the European society and economy (Kumar, 1992). As a result, it is clear that this is merely a pointless and abstract hypothesis that was presented by Karl Marx, and it is also clear that he did not provide any convincing theories regarding the colonial revolution in India.

### **Karl Marx and Orientalism**

The problem of representation and misrepresentation was first brought to light by Edward Said in his book "Orientalism," which was published in 1978. In his book, he made the connection between Karl Marx and other authors, such as Burton and Disraeli, who used terms such as "Oriental," "Oriental Despotism," and other similar terms. Edward Said made the observation that Marx's characterization of the nature of 'Oriental Despotism' was observed by him. Said pointed out that Marx hypothesized that an invasion by the English would force a culture that had become stagnant to resurrect and reinvent itself. Therefore, Edward Said made use of such instances and a quote by Marx from his essay 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' (1852) to suggest that Marx had stereotyped India and Indians, or to put it another way, had "Orientalized" it. Marx said, "They cannot represent themselves; they must be represented." [Citation needed] Said also used a quote by Marx from his essay 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonapart

Edward Said's interpretation of Karl Marx's comments on India and Indians has been criticized by a large number of Marxist thinkers, who assert that Said's argumentation in 'Orientalism' is very flawed and that Marx's statements were misinterpreted by Said. As a consequence of this, debates and discussions among Marxist thinkers were sparked as a direct result of the comments made by Edward Said regarding the reductionist nature of Marx's writing on India.

Harbans Mukhia, an Indian historian, discussed Marx's views on the Asiatic Society and the function of irrigation in the context of an oral presentation. Mukhia drew attention to a number of Marx's shortcomings in this area. Marx placed an excessive amount of emphasis on the role of the state in providing and maintaining irrigation systems, and he paid insufficient attention to the initiative of peasants (Baru, 1983)

In a well-reasoned paper titled "Karl Marx, His Theories of Asian Societies and Colonial Rule," which was written by an eminent historian from India named Bipin Chandra after he conducted an in-depth analysis of the writings of Karl Marx on India, he stated that Marx had never properly studied the Asian society and that he lacked adequate knowledge of these societies, claiming that Marx had never studied the Asiatic society. When Marx first attempted to characterize and classify pre-capitalist societies and forms of property, he did so in *German Ideology* and *The Communist Manifesto*. However, Marx did not discuss Asian societies in either of these works. In 1853, over the course of a series of articles in the *New York Daily Tribune* written after correspondence and consultation with Engels, he first developed certain distinct ideas on pre-colonial India and Asian societies in general. These articles were published after he had developed these ideas. In these articles, he focused on three distinct characteristics of Asian societies: the Oriental despotism that was based on irrigation, the absence of private property in land, and cohesive village communities (Chandra, 1981). Bipin Chandra made some suggestions on the early Marxian writings on India in the 1850s, which revealed that Marx had assumed that the Asian society was unchanging, immune to any kind of changes, and unable to undergo any kind of change from within. Bipin Chandra had made these suggestions on the early Marxian writings on India. Because of this, he came to the conclusion that colonization was playing an important part in the revolutionary process in India and Asia. According to Bipin Chandra, Karl Marx was so steeped in the western tradition that it led him to believe that the British colonial rule was a progressive intrusion into a stagnant and backward India. Marx held this belief because he believed that India was inert in and of itself.

### Conclusion

Karl Marx encountered challenges when attempting to analyze Indian society, which was significantly dissimilar to European societies in social aspects, the economic system, and structural makeup. Marx hypothesized that under British rule, a capitalist transformation of Indian society would take place; however, he was unable to provide a convincing theory of the colonial revolution in India in order to support this hypothesis. Marx's prediction should be interpreted as an abstract possibility rather than a concrete one.

Towards the end of his life, Marx's understanding of British rule in India underwent a significant shift, which is visible in his later writings. As a result, he was unable to make accurate calculations and forecasts regarding the development of Indian society in the future. Even now, after nearly a century and a half have passed, the study of Marxism in India is still in its very early stages and has a very long way to go.

### References

- Baru, S. (1983). Karl Marx and Analysis of Indian Society. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2103.
- Behdad, A. (1994). Orientalism after Orientalism. *L'esprit Créateur*, 34(2), 3-11. <https://doi.org/10.1353/esp.1994.0011>
- Blackstone, W., Prest, W., Lemmings, D., Stern, S., Gallanis, T., & Paley, R. Commentaries on the laws of England.
- Byres, T. (2007). Karl Marx on India Edited by Iqbal Husain. *Journal Of Agrarian Change*, 7(1), 128-132. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2007.142\\_3.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2007.142_3.x)
- Chandra, B. (1981). Karl Marx, His Theories of Asian Societies, and Colonial Rule. Review (Fernand Braudel Center), 17.
- Chopra, S. (1983). The Approach of Karl Marx to study of Indian society. *Social Scientist*, 65-82.
- Chua, P. (2008). Orientalism as Cultural Practices and the Production of Sociological Knowledge. *Sociology Compass*, 2(4), 1179-1191. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00129.x>
- Engels, F., Husain, I., & Marx, K. (2011). Karl Marx on India. Tulika Books.
- Jan, A. (2018). In the Shadow of Ghadar: Marxism and Anti-Colonialism in Colonial Punjab. *Socialist Studies/Études Socialistes*, 13(2), 58. <https://doi.org/10.18740/ss27202>
- Keerthiraj. & Devaiah N. G., (2022). Quintessence Of International Politics: Theoretical And Conceptual Foundations. Blue Hill Publications.
- Keerthiraj. (2019). *Isms in Politics: Political Ideologies Ruling the World*. Evincepub Publishing.
- Kumar, A. (1992). Marx and Engels on India. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 493-504.
- Lau, L. (2009). Re-Orientalism: The Perpetration and Development of Orientalism by Orientals. *Modern Asian Studies*, 43(2), 571-590. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0026749x07003058>
- Ledgister, F. (2020). Marxism, Colonialism, and Cricket: C.L.R. James's Beyond a Boundary. *Caribbean Quarterly*, 66(1), 131-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00086495.2020.1722381>

- Locker-Biletzki, A. (2018). Rethinking Settler Colonialism: A Marxist Critique of Gershon Shafir. *Rethinking Marxism*, 30(3), 441-461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2018.1525969>
- Marx, K., & Renton, D. (2014). *Marx on globalisation*. [NA].
- Marx, K., Engels, F., & Feuer, L. (1989). *Basic writings on politics and philosophy*. Anchor Books.
- Keerthiraj, Suresh, K. G., Raja, A., & Devaiah, N. G. (2022). Research And Teaching In Political Communication: Ideological Asymmetries Determining Media Discourse In India. *Webology*, Volume 19(No. 3).
- Mawby, S. (2010). Orientalism and the Failure of British Policy in the Middle East: The Case of Aden. *History*, 95(319), 332-353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-229x.2010.00489.x>
- McGuire, C. (2006). Irish Marxism and the Development of the Theory of Neo-Colonialism. *Éire-Ireland*, 41(3), 110-132. <https://doi.org/10.1353/eir.2007.0008>
- Mufti, A. (2010). Orientalism and the language of Hindustan. *Critical Quarterly*, 52(3), 63-68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8705.2010.01960.x>
- Naved, S. (2008). The Colonial Encounter in Marxist Terms. *Social Scientist*, 33-37.
- Rammurti, A. (2007). Marx and Gandhi. *India International Centre Quarterly*, 63.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*.
- SeungWookBaek. (2008). Marxism, Internationalism and Workers' Movement. *MARXISM* 21, 5(3), 80-116. <https://doi.org/10.26587/marx.5.3.200808.004>
- Turner, B. (1977). Karl Marx and Oriental Colonization. *Journal of Palestine Studies*, 169-177.
- Williams, R., & McLellan, D. (1977). *Karl Marx*.
- Wittfogel, K. (1957). *Oriental despotism*. Yale University Press.
- Wolff, R. (2003). Colonialism in Africa and reparations: a class analysis. *Rethinking Marxism*, 15(1), 141-150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0893569032000063628>
- Wright, C. (1981). Karl Marx and Religion in Europe and India. *Sociology*, 15(3), 468-469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003803858101500326>
- Zhang, P. (2002). Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient — On Edward W. Said's Orientalism. *Comparative Literature: East & West*, 4(1), 176-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25723618.2002.12015317>