

Neel Sengupta

Professor Catherine May

PSC 393

March 16th, 2020

Genocide and Noam Chomsky: Orientalist Anti-Imperialism in Public Intellectuals

Around the world authoritarian regimes are forming an alliance that is willing to adopt and update the rhetoric, tactics and aims of old imperialisms to cement the status of modern forms of exploitation and violence against their people. Although the tactics have been modernised the consequences of these modern emperors are no less lethal to the people they target. Thus, it should be of immense concern to the moral observer that some significant portion of the Western left seems perfectly willing to align or even to ally with international despots in order to further the cause of an extremely narrow view of anti-imperialism. In this paper I am studying one of the most influential Western leftists of the last half century: Noam Chomsky. I am examining how the anti-imperialism for which he is the standard bearer ignores the agency and opinions of the populations under siege by the many empires of the modern world. Chomsky and his approach to anti-imperialism frequently amounts to apologetics for imperialisms and crimes against humanity committed by non-Western imperialists. In this paper, I will analyse specific examples of Chomsky's writing and interviews (and those of frequent collaborator Edward S. Herman). I will focus on the treatment of genocide and related crimes by Chomsky and Herman and the pattern of genocide apologia and tacit support for brutal regimes that emerges across several decades of political writing. Using a combination of Edward Said's *Orientalism* and Murray Edelman's *Symbolic Uses of Politics* to analyse the themes that emerge in Chomskian politics and what these problems reveal about the failures of Chomskian anti-imperialism and Chomsky's role as a public intellectual in the 21st century.

Review of Literature

Political theory that relates to imperialism and its opposition is too wide to accurately summarise and there are many concepts and thinkers I will reference incidentally. Thus, I will instead make note of those concepts and thinkers whose work I think is most useful to understanding the kind of anti-imperialism I am critiquing.

Although the concept of imperialism as a theoretical critique of capitalism can be found in Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* the more influential text on left-wing conceptions of empire is Vladimir Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* which posits that imperial conquest and exploitation is a necessary component of finance capitalism and will ultimately lead to strife and conflict.¹ This account of imperialism is valuable for this study because it leads to the very particular anti-imperialism that views imperialism as synonymous with capital, and in many cases, specifically Western capital.

The study of genocide as a practice and phenomenon is similarly wide ranging. Samantha Powers 2003 book "*A Problem From Hell*" *America and the Age of Genocide* offers a useful, albeit U.S.-centric account of genocide through the 20th century, and *Genocide: New Perspectives on Its Causes, Courses and Consequences* edited by Üngör Uğur Ümit's offers a more academic study of genocide with a less parochial focus. *Empire's Twin: U.S. Anti-imperialism from the Founding Era to the Age of Terrorism* is an excellent collection of academic essays that provide a historical overview of American anti-imperialism up to the modern era.

This paper is already quite broad, and it would grow unwieldy in the space I have to

¹ Worth noting Lenin is heavily influenced by John Hobson's *Imperialism: A Study* but that book seems less widely read and influential than Lenin's, for obvious reasons, and Hobson attributed a not insignificant amount of imperialism to "Jewish financiers" which is both unpleasant and analytically weak.

devote much time to alternative approaches to anti-imperialism. However, I found Michael Walzer's *A Foreign Policy for the Left* to be a valuable contribution in this regard and Rohini Hensman's *Indefensible: Democracy, Counterrevolution, and the Rhetoric of Anti-Imperialism* invaluable for the general shape of this paper and for provided a non-western lens and definition of anti-imperialism.

In addition to those sources, I will be referencing journalistic articles about, and interviews of, Chomsky. This paper is structured around a textual analysis of Chomsky and his colleague Herman's writing on the Cambodian and Bosnian genocides, and the ongoing Syrian civil war. It is worth noting that I view Chomsky's contribution to political theory, particularly his analysis of media in *Manufacturing Consent*, and his public opposition to U.S. imperialism to be very valuable contributions to academic and public discourse. Chomsky is the focus of this study because of his status as public intellectual and his outsized influence on Western leftists his strength as a critic of U.S. and Western imperialism makes his weakness on questions of Russian imperialism or genocide in the subaltern world far starker than if I only used his less renowned and capable colleague Edward Herman.

Anti-imperialism in the West tends to take the form of opposition to intervention and military adventurism abroad. This is both understandable and fairly uncontroversial. Much of the Western left's current stance on imperialism owes a debt to and is summarised by Vladimir Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. He writes

“Capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of “advanced” countries. And this “booty” is shared between two or three powerful world plunderers armed to the teeth (America, Great Britain, Japan).” (Preface 2, section 2)

This analysis and definition of empire has come to dominate much of leftist thinking on the subject, although in the intervening years Japanese empire is often excluded from the analysis. Rohini Hensman in *Indefensible: Democracy, Counterrevolution, and the Rhetoric of Anti-Imperialism* writes that Lenin's analysis "conflates two distinct phases of capitalism – imperialism and finance capital...The idea that finance capital and foreign investments constitute imperialism would lead to absurd conclusions; for example, that China is an imperialist power in the US, or India in the UK." (Chapter 1, para 1) She offers an alternative definition that avoids this, writing

"imperialism should be defined as political, and sometimes military, intervention in another country in order to install or keep in power a regime that acts more in the interests of the imperialist power than in the interests of any class – even capitalists – in its own country." (Chapter 1, para 2)

In this paper I am looking specifically at Noam Chomsky's treatment of genocide in the last five decades. Uğur Ümit Üngör writes in *Genocide: New Perspectives on its Causes, Courses and Consequences* that

"genocide can be defined as a complex process of systematic persecution and annihilation of a group of people by a government...Genocide can best be understood as the persecution and destruction of human beings on the basis of their presumed or imputed membership in a group rather than on their individual properties or participation in certain acts." (Üngör 15)

These definitions colour my understanding of imperialism, opposition to it and genocide as phenomena.

In 1977, not much more than a decade after he wrote his debut dissent 'The Responsibility of Intellectuals' against the Vietnam war, Noam Chomsky co-wrote with Edward

S. Herman (future co-author of *Manufacturing Consent*) in *The Nation* a book review titled “Distortions at Fourth Hand”. A close reading of this article shows that nearly every citation Chomsky and Herman offer is deeply misleading in ways that can only be read as dishonest. It is worth taking the time to look at some examples. They write of John Barron and Anthony Paul’s *Murder of a Gentle Land*

“Barron and Paul’s “untold story of Communist Genocide in Cambodia” (their subtitle), virtually ignores the U.S. Government role. When they speak of “the murder of a gentle land,” they are not referring to B-52 attacks on villages or the systematic bombing and murderous ground sweeps by American troops or forces organized and supplied by the United States... Their point of view can be predicted from the “diverse sources” on which they relied: namely, “informal briefings from specialists at the State and Defense Departments, the National Security Council and three foreign embassies in Washington.” Their “Acknowledgements” mention only the expertise of Thai and Malaysian officials, U.S. Government Cambodian experts, and Father Ponchaud. They also claim to have analysed radio and refugee reports.”

A cursory glance of the sources section of the book (which is 23 pages long) shows that their primary sources were testimony from nearly 300 Cambodian refugees. On the occasions where Barron and Paul cite other sources, they are mostly western journalists and Khmer Rouge radio broadcasts. That Chomsky and Herman seem to impute some form of imperial agenda to a book composed primarily of Cambodian survivors is an extremely revealing moment of how paranoid anti-imperialism operates. It attributes near absolute power to the American state and its media organs and assumes a kind of slavish imbecility in the people actually affected. Later in the essay

Chomsky and Herman write that the authors “do not mention the Swedish journalist, Olle Tolgraven, or Richard Boyle of Pacific News Service, the last newsman to leave Cambodia, *who denied the existence of wholesale executions* (emphasis mine).” Tolgraven is referenced in the May 9th, 1975 edition of the LA Times as follows “A Swedish journalist, Olle Tolgraven of Swedish Broadcasting, said he did not believe there had been wholesale executions. But he said *there was evidence the Khmer Rouge had shot people who refused to leave their homes in a mass evacuation ordered the first day of the takeover. This was corroborated by others* (emphasis mine).”² The exclusion of the latter half of that quote, done two years after the fact, is deeply misleading and relies on the readers trust in Chomsky and Herman to fairly represent the Tolgraven’s view. There are many other examples of their misrepresentations in the review, only visible after considerable digging into the news coverage at the time. A refrain in their review is a constant referencing of the “extreme unreliability of refugee reports”. This is not only a dubious assertion made without evidence but offers a stark contrast to Chomsky and Herman’s timid acceptance of statements made by another book under review: *Cambodia: Starvation and Revolution* by Gareth Porter and George C. Hildebrand. They write “Hildebrand and Porter present a carefully documented study of the destructive American impact on Cambodia and the success of the Cambodian revolutionaries in overcoming it, giving a very favourable picture of their programs and policies, based on a wide range of sources.” whose sources (especially on events taking place during the Khmer Rouge’s reign) are primarily official reports, statements, and government radio broadcasts. The disinterest in the testimony of survivors and refugees and the credulous acceptance of Khmer Rouge reveal Chomsky and Herman’s priorities in international politics. Their priority does not seem to be the conditions and needs of the victims

² A pdf of the article in question is available on request.

of genocidal violence. Instead it is a seemingly unreasoning need to deconstruct and argue against any claim or testimony that may serve pro-U.S. narratives or U.S. interests.

Chomsky's co-author Edward S. Herman offers the clearest connective tissue between Chomsky's opposition to empire and the consequences this has for an understanding of genocidal violence. In a 2004 review of Samantha Power's *A Problem from Hell* Herman wrote of the Srebrenica massacre

“...the genocide charge was based on the Srebrenica events of July 1995, where some substantial but uncertain number of Bosnian Muslims were killed, some in fighting and some executed. Here again the number of bodies in the discovered grave sites in the Srebrenica area is under 5,000, and certainly includes large numbers killed in the fighting during July.”

Herman is lying about the numbers of dead at Srebrenica (the actual number is around 8,000). At the time of his writing (May 2004 the figures have been well established in the judiciary by the UN-mandated International Criminal Court for the Former Yugoslavia and forensically by NGO's like the International Commission on Missing Persons. But he continues “It is also well-known and conceded by the court that all the Bosnian Muslim women and children in Srebrenica were *helped to safety* (emphasis mine) in Bosnian Muslim territory, strange behaviour with a genocidal intent.” This is not simply dishonest, but morally abhorrent. Here Herman is describing the forced expulsion of tens of thousands of civilians as “being helped to safety”. He is ignoring here the widespread accounts of mass rapes, torture and the targeting of civilians that are so well established to be subject of academic inquiry (Diken and Bagge Laustsen)

Herman also wrote a book with David Peterson called *The Politics of Genocide* which starts with a critique of the politicisation of genocide in service of Western imperial interests, and

the popular ignorance towards atrocities by Western powers. These sections of the text, while provocative, could be valuable contributions to the literature surrounding genocide. But the authors devote their fourth and longest chapter to explicit revision and denial of the Rwandan genocide. There is little textual analysis to be done here: these sections are conspiratorial and seem to be written with the kind of feverish pathologies that mark the genocide denial of Davids Irving or Duke.³ It is an indictment of the publisher (Monthly Review Press) and those who praises are printed on the dust jacket. I bring up the book, vile though it is, because the seemingly approving foreword is written by Noam Chomsky. Chomsky does not mention the genocide denial it precedes but instead endorses Peterson and Herman's soft thesis, that genocide prevention is often used as a justification for more crude imperial intervention and conquest.

This is not a dry question of academic history. Chomsky's double standard about genocidal violence continues to the crises of the present. At a discussion with the Harvard Kennedy School of Politics in 2015 Chomsky claims that although Russia is "supporting a brutal vicious government" in Assad, that support is "not imperialism. To support a government is not imperialism." This claim is a deeply strange one; particularly from Noam Chomsky. In 'The Responsibility of Intellectuals', Chomsky wrote of US-Soviet conflict over Iran "the more powerful imperialism obtained full rights to Iranian oil for itself, with the installation of a pro-Western government." More explicitly, in a 2003 interview with the International Socialist Review Chomsky says of British imperialism in the Middle East

"The idea is to have independent states, but always weak governments that rely on the imperial power for their survival. And they can rip off the population if they

³ A review of the book in detail can be found [here](https://www.pambazuka.org/governance/politics-denialism-strange-case-rwanda) by Gerald Caplan.
<https://www.pambazuka.org/governance/politics-denialism-strange-case-rwanda>

like, that's fine. But they have to be a façade, behind which the real power rules. That's standard imperialism."

The above seems rather a perfect description of the relationship between Assad and the Russian state. That Chomsky cannot see this or chooses to ignore it is perplexing. In order to understand why Chomsky holds this view we can look to a 2016 interview with Mehdi Hasan of Al Jazeera. Chomsky is asked about the possibility of allying with the Assad regime in order to fight ISIS. At one point in his response he says "If you want to rank evils, the United States and Britain are so far higher than anyone else that we can put all the others to the side. Yes, there's plenty of evils in the world but we have to deal with the world as it exists."

These examples capture the contradictions and strange loops of logic in Chomsky's theory of anti-imperialism. For Chomsky, it seems that imperialism is a crime only available to the west. His anti-imperialism is rooted in opposition to American empire, but it seems in doing so he has rooted himself in the same soil from which American empire grows. In Edward Said's *Orientalism* the titular phenomenon is a discourse among and of the powerful about the powerless. Chomsky is capable of integrating Orientalism as a concept in his critiques of Western empires, but he ignores that Said offered a far more nuanced and reasoned analysis. Orientalism is not a unilateral attitude of superiority or racism. The view that the people of the Middle East need dictatorship, lest they succumb to religious extremism serves the interests of the Bashar al-Assad just as much, if not more so than it served George W. Bush. The difference between Said and Chomsky is valuable and worth returning to. Said understood that imperialism was not simply a material process of domination but a discourse of delegitimization that attempts to erase the agency and experiences of its victims. He writes "The Orient then seems to be, not an unlimited extension beyond the familiar European world, but rather a closed field, a theatrical

stage affixed to Europe.” (Said, 63) This describes Chomsky’s analysis of imperialism quite well. For Chomsky, if the action onstage contradicts with his long-held positions as resident theatre critic, it is the action that is disposable, even if it is real suffering.

In *The Symbolic Uses of Politics* Murray Edelman defines the term “political quiescence” as “a function either of lack of interest or of the satisfaction of whatever interest the quiescent group may have in the policy in question.” (Edelman, 22) Applying this concept to Chomsky, despite his role as perennial dissident and critic, still has some analytical value. Chomsky ultimately is embedded in a role of a Western leftist, despite the occasional paean towards internationalism the Western left is far from immune to parochialism and a kind of reverse nationalism. Chomsky does not consider the West superior in any essential way, apart from its capacity for and proclivity towards evil. It is in the interest of the Western leftist to make claims of imperialism and domination against Western leaders and governments and this interest leads to the development of a kind of mirroring of Edelman’s political quiescence; a sort of political vociferousness where all the ills of the world and its many despotisms are incomparable to the heights of evil of Western governments. This attitude is rooted in valuable and necessary critiques of Western imperialism, foreign policy and popular sentiment. But when it is applied to contemporary political brutality faced by Syrians, Iraqi’s or Iranians it loses its critical power and resembles apologia for authoritarianism that does not materially affect the Western leftist. Thus, Chomsky can, in an interview with Jacobin, state that the conflicts in Middle East are “substantially a consequence of the Iraq invasion.” While this claim plays well among Western leftists eager to display their opposition to the Iraq war and US government writ large, as an explanation for conflict in the Middle East in manages to ignore the entirety of the Arab Spring and genuine popular opposition to dictators across national lines. Edelman writes that dissenters

in the administrative system “serve a necessary function in the sense that if they do not exist, they are created, and perhaps even in the further sense that if their dissents were the majority policy, they would not necessarily take the same position.” (Edelman, 72). Chomsky is hardly an administrative dissenter but his criticism of American empire, made primarily from university campuses and media interviews, loses its potency with distance. His willingness to mislead or dissemble about the suffering of the most vulnerable populations and his pathological assumption of the primacy of American power is not radical or even particularly critical. It is a funhouse mirror of the kind of assumptions of American superiority that characterises Chomsky’s most frequent antagonists. Edelman’s framework of symbolic politics is largely an administrative one. He focuses mainly on the use of symbolism in politics by governments in ways that manipulate or mislead the public towards specific views and attitudes that best serve those in power. A similar process may take place in dissident or opposition groups like Western leftism. Instead of serving explicit power structures the symbols serve to uphold ideological narrative. Thus, for the Western anti-imperialist, the United States becomes a force purely for ill, whose intervention and international actions should be opposed wherever possible. To be clear, much like the symbolic narratives Edelman describes there is truth within this idea. The failures of American policy and the prospect of US adventurism should be critiqued and opposed, but what differentiates between criticism as an intellectual process and symbolism as a political tool is the degree to which symbolic models allow for contrary evidence and opinions. As Edelman writes of Neville Chamberlain in 1939 and 40 “Chamberlain’s loss of a following came about precisely because his acts indicated he was not sure who the enemy was.” (Edelman, 82) The symbolic narrative does not allow for uncertainty. Dissent, if it exists, is built into the framework but never incorporated into the narrative proper.

Where Chomsky falters is in his assumption that his position as dissident laureate of the United States gives him the expertise to diagnose the conditions and needs of Syrians and Cambodians better than they can. In his 1993 Reith Lectures titled *Representations of the Intellectual* Edward Said draws a distinction between the amateur and professional intellectual. He writes “The professional claims detachment on the basis of a profession and pretends to objectivity, whereas the amateur is moved neither by reward nor by the fulfilment of an immediate career plan but by a committed engagement with ideas and values in the public sphere.” (Said, 109) Chomsky is certainly not a careerist, but Said’s insights into the perils of professional affectations of objectivity are valuable for understanding Chomsky. Chomsky assumes that his status as radical anti-imperialist makes him a natural ally of the powerless and enemy of the powerful. But his presumption of objectivity and authority blind him to those occasions, which I have detailed in this paper, where he and his colleagues do far more harm than good. Earlier in the same lectures Said writes “There is no getting around authority and power, and no getting around the intellectual's relationship to them. How does the intellectual address authority: as a professional supplicant or as its unrewarded, amateurish conscience?” (Said, 83) Chomsky has attempted to be the conscience of Western power and authority but he mistakes his cause as one that must therefore be sympathetic to, apologetic about or at best loudly silent on the authorities that oppress the subaltern world.

In his debut political essay ‘The Responsibility of Intellectuals’ Chomsky writes “WHEN WE CONSIDER (sic) the responsibility of intellectuals, our basic concern must be their role in the creation and analysis of ideology.” But ideology is not a steady stream in one direction but a constant process available even to self-styled dissidents. Though there is a ruling ideology, it is important to recognise that it is not the sole ideology and the ruling class is not a universal but a

shifting oppressor from region to region. Chomsky's failure is that he views imperialism as a product of propaganda. Chomsky is an exceptionally influential figure in left politics because of his ability to make statements like this. "IF IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY (sic) of the intellectual to insist upon the truth, it is also his duty to see events in their historical perspective."

The American sociologist C. Wright Mills wrote in his essay *The Powerless People: The Social Role of the Intellectual* that

The independent artist and intellectual are among the few remaining personalities equipped to resist and to fight the stereotyping and consequent death of genuinely lively things... These worlds of mass-art and mass- thought are increasingly geared to the demands of politics. That is why it is in politics that intellectual solidarity and effort must be centered. If the thinker does not relate himself to the value of truth in political struggle, he cannot responsibly cope with the whole of live experience. (Mills, 238)

Chomsky's application of anti-imperialism seems limited by something resembling political expedience. He is quick to criticise (rightly) U.S. and European imperialism but chooses to ignore the imperialisms of Russia or the cruelty of the Khmer Rouge when doing so would in some way undermine the narrative of absolute Western power and malice that Chomsky weaves. His approach to anti-imperialism accepts many of the orientalist assumptions of imperialists and refuses to acknowledge the voices of the many regional anti-imperialists, refugees, writers, and activists who offer less ideological versions of imperialism grounded not in the comfort of Chomsky's university radicalism but in actual material struggles for survival and recognition.

The principles of solidarity that gird much of leftist politics must be precisely that, a principle. If solidarity with the oppressed and marginalised is a principle only exercised when politically convenient then it is no principle at all but realpolitik under a red banner.

Works Cited

- “500 More Foreigners Leave Cambodia.” *Los Angeles Times*, 9 May 1975, p. 9.
- “Annual Reports.” *Annual Reports | International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia*, www.icty.org/en/documents/annual-reports.
- “Distortions at Fourth Hand”, Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman *The Nation*, June 25, 1977
- Chomsky, Noam. “Genocide Denial with a Vengeance: Old and New Imperial Norms.” *Monthly Review*, 22 Dec. 2010, monthlyreview.org/2010/09/01/genocide-denial-with-a-vengeance-old-and-new-imperial-norms/.
- Diken, Bülent, and Carsten Bagge Laustsen. “Becoming Abject: Rape as a Weapon of War.” *Body & Society*, vol. 11, no. 1, Mar. 2005, pp. 111–128, doi:10.1177/1357034X05049853.
- Genocide : New Perspectives on its Causes, Courses and Consequences*, edited by Ugur Ümit Üngör, Amsterdam University Press, 2016. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/depaul/detail.action?docID=4603083>
- Hensman, Rohini *Indefensible: Democracy, Counterrevolution, and the Rhetoric of Anti-Imperialism* Haymarket Books. 2018. Kindle Edition.
- Herman, Edward S., and David Peterson. *The Politics of Genocide*. Guilford Publication, 2012.
- Herman, Edward S., and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: the Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Vintage Digital, 2010.
- Chomsky, Noam. “The Responsibility of Intellectuals.” *The New York Review of Books*, 23 Feb. 1967.
- Hildebrand, George C., and Gareth Porter. *Cambodia: Starvation and Revolution*. UMI Out-of-Print Books on Demand, 1992

Herman, Edward S. “‘The Cruise Missile Left’: Samantha Power and the Genocide Gambits.” *Global Research*, 22 Sept. 2013, www.globalresearch.ca/the-cruise-missile-left-samantha-power-and-the-genocide-gambits/5350858.

John Barron and Anthony Paul. *Murder of a Gentle Land*. Thomas Y. Crowell (1977)

Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism; a Popular Outline. Revised Translation*. Lawrence & Wishart, 1948.

Mills, C. Wright. “The Powerless People: The Social Role of the Intellectual.” *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (1915-1955)*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1945, pp. 231–243. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40221218. Accessed 16 Mar. 2020.

Noam Chomsky, “Identity, Power, and the Left: The Future of Progressive Politics in America” *Youtube.com*, 22 Sept. 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JFiCg67cDTs&t=60m20s>. Accessed 16 Mar. 20

Noam Chomsky, Interview by David Barsamian. *International Socialist Review*, Issue 32, Nov. 2003, <http://www.isreview.org/issues/32/chomsky.shtml>. Accessed 16 March 2020.

Noam Chomsky, Interview by Mehdi Hasan. *Al Jazeera Upfront*, 22 Jan. 2016, <https://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/upfront/2016/01/noam-chomsky-war-isil-160122112145301.html>. Accessed 16 Mar. 20

Power, Samantha. *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. Basic Books, 2013. Releases, Posted on News Press. “Latest Facts and Figures on Srebrenica.” *ICMP Latest Facts and Figures on Srebrenica*, www.icmp.int/news/infographic-provides-latest-facts-and-figures-on-srebrenica-genocide

Said, Edward, *Orientalism*, Vintage Books, 2003

--- *Representations of the Intellectual*, Vintage Books, 1996

Tyrrell, Ian, and Jay Sexton, editors. *Empire's Twin: U.S. Anti-Imperialism from the Founding Era to the Age of Terrorism*. 1st ed., Cornell University Press, 2015. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt20fw6c7. Accessed 16 Mar. 2020.

Walzer, Michael. *A Foreign Policy for the Left*. Yale University Press, 2018.

Works Cited

Edelman, Murray J. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. University of Illinois Press, 1985.

Marx, Karl. *Das Kapital, a Critique of Political Economy*. Chicago. H. Regnery, 1959.