Chapter-I
INTRODUCTION: THEORIES AND CONCEPTS

The importance of market study has achieved wide currency recently. It has become more contextual and situational because the rapid growth of vigorous market trend has percolated down to every nook and corner of the present society. Now the passage of time is no more unidirectional and abrupt as it tries to acquire new shape. It has given birth to the unconditional flow of modernism and fast changing world. It also further encourages the culture of consumerism, that wants to rationalize human thought process and action. In the process, the value-loaded definition of market never remains stereotyped and stymied; be that in simple or complex, non-monetized or monetized and tribal or non-tribal society. The popular ‘market culture’ or ‘market-structuralism’, therefore, ordains the economic and civic life patterns of present society in a new form. Due to its diachronic feature and symbiotic value, market study has emerged as a corollary of modernism and change.

The market economy is a modern adopted phenomenon which manifests new ideas and accommodates innovation for the sustenance of the prevailing order. The organization of market, according to ‘neo-classical economists’, allows
changes in prices to equilibrate supply and demand. In such market situation, there are multiple buyers and sellers whose transactions are basically impersonal.\textsuperscript{1} But the anthropo-sociological views of market are fundamentally different as they stress the embeddedness of market within the social matrix.\textsuperscript{2} The sociological view of market carries two elements to signify the social character of market situation: (a) the individual actor is decisively influenced by social ties, and (b) his/her dependence on social ties is necessary in order to accomplish a given economic goal.\textsuperscript{3} Contrary to the anthropo-sociological view of market, the contemporary market situation seems to be collaborating with the capitalist world system which will finally submerge into a unified world market scheme.\textsuperscript{4}

Therefore, the various dimensions of market economy put forth the fact that the world market is socially constructed as well as re-constructed. It has been structured in a particular direction as a result of political decisions and there is no single world market that exists independent of,

---
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and, prior to political intervention. Hence, the modern market system is a social construction that tends to amalgamate barter, exchange, reciprocity and redistribution in order to bring about a universal change. Subsequently, the growth and development of society justifies that the expansion of market is an ongoing process; because, for some, the market has never exclusively dealt with business transaction alone but encouraged social communication, regardless of primitive-marketless economy or modern self-regulating market economy. They tend to rationalize and legalize the dispositional and social nature of market economy as a congenial process that enhances human interaction and strengthens man-market relationship. Therefore, the global form of market economy has been well embedded, appreciated and accommodated by every society as it consolidates consociation and social action. For them, market envisages to be more ethno-bounded than merely restricted to business transaction.

5. Ibid., p.529.

While market economy patronises competition among a plurality of potential parties, it never excludes any tribal or non-tribal society. The advancement of time relatively influenced each and every community of people, irrespective of caste, community or ethnic group which either invited change or change coercively entered into its life. Because of the uninvited change, the tribals' simple interaction and social congregation get adversely affected. Though they remain highly concerned about their identity, culture and religion, the recent development in the society does not allow them to live peacefully. The development of the market economy has not only stratified the society into several classes but also played divisive role to antagonize many and sharpen social conflicts. All castes and communities of people (including tribals) are willingly or unwillingly drawn into the market economy, modernism and change. During such an atmosphere, the tribals are tactfully brought under the 'fold of distinct' category by the coerciveness of the modern market economy. Thereafter, they are targeted by the existing hierarchical, monetized and competitive market economy. Now the situation arises in which the tribals are forced to accept the modern market economy and its sanction without alternative choice. The growth of modern market economy has engendered new methods, policies and programmes
for the sustenance and enrichment of the 'privileged class' but marginalized, exploited and alienated the 'worker class'. The tribals certainly come under the second category because they are yet to be benefited by the modernism and change.

Unlike the present society, earlier the tribal people were living in the deep forest areas, isolated and uninter­vened places, where there was no impact of outsider. They had more or less complete control over the forest and its goods. Their occupation was diverse, but mainly confined to settled agriculture in plain area tribes and Jhum in North-East India. Very few of them were engaged in other occupations. Their socio-economic and political institutions were unique. Whatever they were producing and collecting from their land and forest were sufficient and surplus too. Their pre-modern agriculture economy and forest produce were certainly meeting their household requirements -- consumables and durables. The tribal people were happy with their own way of life and allied socio-cultural values that were retaining their tribal identity in spite of occasional conflict or warfare. As economic life was well-adjusted they never felt the need to depend upon the outside world. They were self-sufficient, hard-working, and, nonetheless very innovative in their daily life. However, it may be
noted here that during antiquity the tribals were living without division and sub-divisions. But latter their tribal chieftain, being in commanding position, given priority to his kinsmen. He was more a benevolent person than status quoist ruler. Since they were living within the framework of political autonomy and economic freedom, there was no interference by monetized force and market economy. The market they had at that time was non-monetized, non-competitive and mainly catered to the need and requirement of the tribal people. At that time it was customary for them to meet regularly and exchange/barter the necessary goods and articles. Hardly one or two percent of the goods were sold by the caste merchants who were coming to the tribal area. They were supplying goods and articles like sarees, clothes and household durables to the tribals mainly in terms of barter. In this way the tribal market facilitated economic exchange and also fostered networks of socio-cultural ties. In the market, therefore, the minimum impact of the outsiders, non-tribal merchants and traders had never created any anti-tribal atmosphere.

Among the non-tribal people also periodic/weekly markets had facilitated economic transaction. The weekly markets had enabled rural people to buy or sell household goods, articles, agricultural implements etc. In fact on a large scale fairs are held in religious town, where agricultural implements and livestocks
especially cattle) were sold or purchased. The main difference between tribal and non-tribal market was that in the former barter was the main mode of transaction while in the latter money was being used.

For the proper understanding of tribal market, one needs sufficient feed-up and data base. While there are studies on the monetized, competitive and modern market by several scholars, the tribal market study has remained a neglected area of research. Very few research works have been undertaken by anthropologists, sociologists, economic historians and geographers. In fact, they have not examined intensively the changing aspects of the tribal society and more particularly the tribal market. They have mainly focussed on the growth of population, improvement of road, communication etc. They have discussed the other essential characteristics of the tribal market viz. tribe-caste ratio, ethnicity and socio-cultural and religious values. Further their arguments highlight that the market is a centripetal force, rotating around usable commodities and bringing forth two conflicting ethno-economic cultures in a face-to-face contact. None of them has looked at the tribal market from a participatory angle and thereby has not done any systematic study so far.
The other dimensions of the tribal market have also remained untouched. For example, in a growing society like India not much attention has been paid to the intricacy of the tribal market, their nature and feature. Almost all studies, both general and periodic market system reflect that market is irreducible, featured with structural differences leading to the global market economy. Similarly, most of the studies highlight that trading is an active system with spatial forms that maintain the smooth nature of the present society. But none of the tribal market study has so far touched the pertinent problems of the tribals, viz. intervention, exploitation and marginalization, which have been continuously threatening the tribals and putting them in greater hardships. Because of the influx of the outsiders and non-tribals, the tribals' eco-friendly environment is in the process of decline. These areas have never attracted the attention of non-tribal researchers. For them, the tribal market study is not much meaningful at the present hour of the society. Over and above, the scholars and researchers in general have treated the tribal market as an integral part of the society rather than placing it
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within the 'class framework'. However, they have never taken interest to highlight the fact that the tribals as a class of people are deliberately denied their rights by the hegemony of the ruling class. The modern market economy has been dominated by a profit motive which, in fact, is a recent development. The tribals are now almost in the process of losing their identity. The modern capitalist market economy has caused estrangement and coercive de-tribalization. Therefore, to touch upon all these grave and situational problems, being faced by the tribal people, it is necessary to develop a methodological formulation to suggest and show alternative approach to the removal of the tribal problems. The following two sections explore the alternative approaches.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY:

The theory has been pioneered by George Dalton in 1961 in his article: "Economic Theory and Primitive Society". In the article he pinpoints about some of the earlier ambiguities of the scholars concerning the relevance of western economic theory to the economic organization of primitive communities. His main emphasis is that the formal and

western economic theory cannot be universally applied to the study of the primitive communities, because the western economy has been dominated by rationality. Now both the method and content of economic theory have been shaped by two cultural features of the 19th century Britain. The first one is factory industrialism and the market organization is the second one. The market system functions in a self-regulating and unicentric way, dominated with highly decentralized mercantile economic control and utilitarian values. These are the major concerns of the classical or formal economic theory. The economistic approach indeed separates the primacy of economy from society as it calls economy as a system of economizing calculation with the main aspect that makes economic theory formal.9 Dalton further emphasizes that the western industrial society is organized through the market principles and the use of all purpose money which are pervasive, interrelated and tend to homogenize most sectors of production and distribution. But, in primitive or pre-literate society, the dominant centres were organized through non-market patterns of integration; such as reciprocity and redistribution. But, special purpose money has been in use and market place exchange is subordinated
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and contained. While differentiating between primitive community and modern market community of people, Dalton said that a primitive community often had a market place, but certainly not a market system. In primitive economy, mutual dependence was not structured through the market mechanism. And now the market structure implies the prevalence of money economy and the weakening of socio-cultural and inter-mutual relationship.

Secondly, Dalton treats economic anthropology as the most powerful one to incorporate all social and economic problems, what economic theory in general is not able to prove so. He says that the literature of anthropology displays all aspects, like proper description of both economic and non-economic dimensions. Therefore, anthropology is less concerned with theoretical analysis and generalization. By contrast, the economist constructs a complete theoretical viewpoint on a macro-level but neglects the analysis of the nature and structure of primitive economy. Therefore, to Dalton, 'what the anthropologists do in a direct way of reflecting the institutional framework of a society -- both synchronic and diachronic -- the economists
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failed to treat the matter accordingly".\textsuperscript{12} In the process, he states that the formal economic theory is incapable of yielding analytical insight when applied to primitive structure and different functions. The primitive economy is different from market industrialism in degree and kind. Economic transaction cannot be vividly understood without social obligation and organization because the quantitative concern of the formal economists with more machinery, more road and more food will be inadequate to touch the social reality and institutional change.\textsuperscript{13}

George Dalton in his subsequent monographs (1971a, 1971b) reiterats the importance of anthropology as the most specific subject to uncover historical fact that concern every individual of the past and the present society. In the two books, viz. \textit{Economic Anthropology and Development} and \textit{Economic Development and Social Change}, he has intensively dealt with institutional features of social structure. Further, he delineates the fact that formal economic theory is not competent to analyse the traditional, tribal and peasant economies (1971a:7). By giving priority to economic anthropology, Dalton says that the economic anthro-

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., pp.17-18.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., pp.20-21.
pology deals with two different sorts of economies -- primitive and peasant, under two different sorts of conditions -- static and dynamic and with two very different aspects of economy -- organization and material performance (1971b:223). Therefore, in his view, economic anthropology covers all the pertinent aspects of the society what economics fails to do. Economic anthropology maintains a coherence and balance in society with profound understanding about each and every matter -- both economic and non-economic but the economic theory remains circumscribed within calculation, quantification and cost-benefit analysis.

Therefore, the anthropological theory, as envisaged by George Dalton, gives priority to the institutional aspect of non-monetized, tribal, agrarian and simple social structure. To empower the social institutions he says that the contribution of the economic anthropologists is essential to make the society more reciprocative and redistributive. A distinguishing characteristic of primitive life was the fusion of social and economic institutions. At that time, there was no awareness about the economy as a distinct set of practices apart from social institution. Transaction of material goods in primitive society was the expression of social obligations which had neither mechanism nor meaning of its own apart from the social ties and social situation.
In the western meaning of the word, there was no 'economy' in primitive society.\textsuperscript{14}

While talking about formal economic theory, he once again emphasizes the formal economic theory as an incomplete and unidirectional subject. The formal economic theory only talks about money, market, utility, demand and supply in the quantitative sense instead of recognizing the primacy of the social conditions and values. It has no capacity to formulate and synthesize a comprehensive theory to encourage the substantive aspects of the society. Therefore, George Dalton has talked about the ethno-economic aspects what the economists call as market industrialism. While the substantive meaning of economy is useful for the economic anthropologists, for scholars like George Dalton and Karl Polanyi, the formal nature of economic theory is relatively strong in the mind of some other anthropologists like Raymond Firth and M.J. Herskovits et. al. These latter economic anthropologists act like formal economists and introduce new dimensions to anthropological theory.

Raymond Firth in the continuous process of development of his idea solely remains affirmed over the social frame-

work of economic organization.15 As an economic anthropologist, his prime concern has been to establish anthropology as a major subject that includes all pertinent aspects of the social structure. To substantiate his views he says that the anthropologist is interested in the structure and organization of economic activity for two reasons: the first one is that most social relations have an economic coefficient and the second one is that many social relations are primarily concerned with economic values.16 Unlike formal economists -- who tend to ignore the simpler society and the values attached to that, the anthropologists struggle with a diversity of types and treat the economic organization as a type of social action.17 Further, Firth categorically envisages that the anthropologists are benefitted by the growth and emergence of cross-fertilization of ideas, in patterns and processes that maintain the social structure and choice, demand and other economic aspects.18 In his own view:
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"The anthropologist is not setting out to discover the principles of economics in the abstract sense or body of theory that attempt to explain economic aspects of human behaviour at the most general levels. His task is to examine how these principles work in specific social or cultural contexts. The principles of economics with general attributes have less application, most of those which purport to be general have been constructed primarily within the framework of ideas of an industrial, capitalist system covering machine technology, monetary medium of exchange, credit system, private enterprise, with utilitarian, individualistic and western kind. The anthropologist both social and economic -- matches different types and fits that models within social fabric... The anthropologist looks at the interplay of 'real' units of manpower and materials, output and income, not veiled by the 'money illusion' of the western economy. He finds it necessary to examine the picture of economic relationship in that kind of frame in which the people themselves have set it. What results has he achieved? And what is their relation to the study of economics as ordi-
Therefore giving priority to anthropology and particularly economic anthropology, Firth raises the status of anthropologists to a higher level through his industrious work which he places before the formal economists. Again in the subsequent part of his works such as *Social Change in Tikopia* (1959) and *Themes in Economic Anthropology* (1967), he more openly argues in favour of economic anthropology as he expands and interrelates economic anthropology with present situation. In the first chapter of his edited book, *Themes in Economic Anthropology* he brings economics closer to anthropology as he says, "Economic behaviour makes to maintain social system." Further, he says that in recent years the growth of economic anthropology suffices to cover all aspects including market. The term market has three different connotations in the literature of economics as it referred to (i) institutionalized locus of exchange, the market place with its booths and traders, its competition and its conventions, (ii) non-traditional, with the total field of interests of any goods or service in which a particular type of labour or skill required to grow or prosper,


allocation of resources with reference to impersonal criteria which disregard personal ties and social ends in favour of an immediate maximization of principle of profit making. Except the third aspect, the other two factors have been highlighted not only by economists but also by the anthropologists. Therefore, in no way economics is superior to anthropology, and formal economists do not have special quality only to work upon the market force because in the primitive or peasant economic systems the absence of general market for goods and services of all kinds and lack of impersonal market relationship does not mean the lack of any concept of economic advantage. 21 Now economic anthropology is through its description or analysis enhances pure knowledge to work properly upon the various aspects. Indeed, he says that two major sets of problems confront both anthropologist and economist alike: one is economic viability in the process of high consumption and advancement of mobilization, and the other is the possibility of the radical realignment of existing systems of control of resources and economic choices. 22

Therefore, Raymond Firth's voluminous work clearly explains the embeddedness of 'primitive marketless' economy/peasant economy, where the people of Polynesia and particularly the community of Tikopia\(^{23}\) are peacefully living with their indigenous rationality. The people have been conscious enough to decide their economic life with cost benefit analysis and equate the exchange commodity with market value though money was not the medium of exchange at that time.\(^{24}\)

Melville J. Herskovits equally remains highly concerned, about the importance of economy and market situation in every society: whether, non-pecuniary, non-machine or pre-literate society; in his book *Economic Anthropology* (1952). In the book his main thrust of analysis is that every individual and society is economizing his/her rational behaviour\(^{25}\) from the beginning of their existence/emergence. Giving priority upon want and choice, he says that in every society even the provisions of basic goods, food and shelter, and clothing involve choice and the choices are dictat-
ed not only by the alternatives between available items, but by the patterns of culture of the individual who chooses the theory. Hence, economizing is carried on in a cultural matrix. 26

Differentiating among the three types of societies, viz. (a) highly specialized and complex society, (b) intermediate society and (c) highly generalized and different non-literate and isolated society. He explains that in all these three societies, the market system remains universal. In the first category of society, high competition and pecuniary processes decide the economizing action of the people. In the latter two societies, because of their more complex systems (intermediate society), the institutional forms of market structure is based on exchange, partial reciprocity and the use of money. But unlike the present commercial transaction, the non-literate people possessed an objective and formal market character in order to live comfortably with capital accommodation and economical consumption. This mechanism facilitated the exchange of goods between members of different communities rather than between the members of the same group. In the market the absence of pecuniary mechanism and element of profit, never deterred
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the people as the supply and demand of goods was quite unexpected and high because traders never compromised (lower) the price of the commodity. 27

Hence, the pre-literate, non-monetized, and non-machine people, without strict division of labour, were very much articulated with all ideas and in depth they calculated the price value, after knowing the scarcity of goods and accordingly limit their choices. There was no contrasting difference as Herskovits says, "The dissimilarities between any society and any other in those respects is one of degree and not of kind and economic universalism in human society from the antiquity." 28

Therefore, the anthropological theory in its totality represents the efforts of the anthropologists to cover all aspects of the society -- both non-economic and economic. All of them (scholars) have put anthropology and economics together, and developed a substantivist and formalist theories that act to reduce the gap between proliferate and modern economic systems. Though their theory is pertinent to the present society, another theory, called 'Marxist approach' touches upon some other dimensions to understand

the unexplored matter and meaningfully construct the market economy from a different angle

MARXIST THEORY:

The theory still remains the most vibrant one, as it covers all the pertinent aspects of humankind, unlike any other specified theory. The original ideas of Karl Marx, though elaborated by many both Marxists and non-Marxists, at different levels, always strive to keep a close acquaintance with every society and human being. The Dialectical-Historical Approach of Karl Marx very clearly delineates that no society remains static and the development of one society supersedes the earlier one. This trend is the regular feature of each and every society, from the ancient day to the present form. With the passage of time, from the ancient age, to feudal stage to modern bourgeois society, the change occurs and reinforces class antagonism. It establishes new classes, new conditions of oppression and exploitation. From the ancient age up to the age of capitalism every stage witnesses a hierarchical and class society like free man and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild master and journey man, oppressor and oppressed and
bourgeoisie and proletariat. The ownership of private property, surplus value and state combine to stratify the society into various class categories. These factors dominate over all societies except the stage of socialism and communism. The emergence of private property polarizes the society and monopolizes the modern industry -- 'private property as activity for itself' says Karl Marx. Further, Marx says that surplus value acts to proliferate the interests of the capitalist and bourgeoisie, which directly estranges the labourer and through inimical relationship. The state, moreover, becomes triumphant with the deliberate protection of the ruling machineries and capitalists who use state as the tool of exploitation and alienation.

Secondly, Karl Marx says that as time passes, the rate of exploitation, marginalization and alienation continues to expand further with the active participation of the bourgeoisie. In his view:


"The pre-modern industry, under which industrial production was monopolized by close guilds now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new, competitive markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle classes; division of labour between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labour in each single workshop. Meanwhile, the market system kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken over by the giant, 'Modern Industry', the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois. Because of the fast competition and expansion modern industry has established the world market, for that America paved the way. The modern industrial market has given an immense development to commerce, navigation, communication by land, on the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital and encouraged class division down from the middle
ages. So the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development after a series of revolution in the modes of production and exchange."\(^{32}\)

But the next development in the arena of Marxist thought is not the same, not even similar to certain extent. The concept of a Marxist theory does not refer to a closely defined approach for social research, indeed, it is now employed so widely that it has begun to lose meaning. The ambiguity of the term stems from the multiplicity of interpretations of the work of Karl Marx and Friedrich, Engels by several Marxists.\(^{33}\) Now many schools of Marxism are in force and they are in competition with each other to spread popularity, establish adaptability and regard usefulness. All of them (scholars) invariably acknowledge the contextual relevance of Marxism and they put Marx's paradigm and methodology with individual/collective framework to articulate, modify or alter his original ideas. To establish their ideas profoundly several approaches, viz., structural-Marxists (orthodox), neo-Marxists, analytical Marxists, post-

---


structuralist Marxists, and cultural Marxists, are formed to reckon with modernism and change.

Since there is no dearth of theories to be developed by any individual scholar or a group of followers, the original ideas of Karl Marx have got many denominations. The potential influence of the Frankfurt School, Dependency Theory and Orientalist Theory, added further dimensions to the present society which is undergoing tremendous/structural change. The various theories/schools now become more essential, because, as the scholars feel, they are sensitive to the currents of the present society. Their arrival at the present moment of the society certainly changed the situation as they like to introduce and encourage all processes of development and change. The crisis is further deepened because, they seriously amend the broader significance of the Dialectical-Historical interpretation of society and

34. Under these schools, there are many scholars who gave different shape/version to Marxism as they liked. They couldn't subscribe to the original ideas of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Some of these contemporary and, above mentioned, Marxists are, viz. M. Godelier, Paul Baran, Paul Sweezy, Tom Bottomore, A.W. Gouldner, Antonio Gramsci, Ralf Dahrendorf, B. Ollman, Louis Althusser, Perry Anderson, D. Kellner, R. Miliband, N. Poulantzas, E. Gallner, C. Meillassoux, etc. They are known as revisionists and conformists as they show the alternative paths for social development that comply with the present society and wider world system. To be specific they act with the model of Immanuel Wallerstein and their views are not less than functionalists.
further flexibly put it in the framework of positive (empirical) science of capitalist society. For example, the structural Marxists (orthodox) say that the base-superstructure relation is more complex, involving functional relation that ensures the relative autonomy of cultural factors, even if the economy is determinant in the last instance (Godelier, Gramsci and Althusser).

Maurice Godelier in his book, *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology* (1977) remains critical about the universality of Marxism. He says that Marxism turned to be vulgar materialism because Marx's sole emphasis upon infrastructure and superstructure did nothing but help to form a hierarchy of functional distinctions and structural causalities without overwhelming the nature of the structures. In his view, "In adopting Marx's materialism as the epistemological horizon of critical work in the social sciences, we must discover and examine by ways it to be found, the visible network causes linking together forms, functions, modes of articulation and the hierarchy, and moreover, the appearance and disappearance of a particular social structure." Again he
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says that Karl Marx's theory of infrastructure and superstructure, does not have the same applicability in every setup. Marx does not propose an invariable form, content or place where relations of production might function. To understand Marxism properly and to put that in everyday schedule the Phantasmic nature of social relation, the question of religion and the symbolic practice and dominant ideology in general should be given prime importance as they cause hierarchy in societies, create caste and class societies unlike the primitive societies. Therefore, for Godelier the relations of production and not base stand to bifurcate the society and disturb the systematic and appropriate change. 38

Antonio Gramsci emphasises upon the 'hegemonic ideology' of the ruling class which makes the cleavages in the society - both ruler and ruled - to be separated. So for him "everything starts from the ideological plane that widens the disparity". 39 Louis Althusser taking an ideological plank repeatedly emphasizes that Marxism is a developing theory and it is a cloistered knowledge within a com-
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plete circular, self-validating conceptual realm. 40

The neo-Marxists like Samir Amin, A.G. Frank, C.W. Mills etc. also go to the point of discussing the centre and periphery approach to expand the horizon of Marxism. 41 The 'analytical Marxism' defines more the methodological stance of Marxism than its substantive context. It thus, differentiates itself from traditional Marxism in its commitment to abstract theorizing and a search for rethinking the foundations by asking heretical questions and using state-of-the-art methods of analytical philosophy and positivist social science. They are John Roemer, D. Sayer etc. 'The post-structuralist strategy' is evident in the work of some former Marxists who have retreated from orthodox class concepts, arguing that a post-Marxism is required that involves eliminating the notion of the working as a 'universal class' and resurrecting a new concept of socialist democracy. The scholars specially Laclau and Mouffe have provoked important debate about the role of new social movement and bureaucratic process. 'The cultural Marxism' acts against structural Marxism and establishes functional-
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ist temperament. 'The contemporary postmodern society' seems to favour the cultural Marxist tradition. It is actively engaged to develop a wide variety of non-Marxist approaches. Further, many of the recent works carry out in the name of 'cultural Marxism' increasingly blends with post-structuralist and critical theories of culture, reflecting the circumstance that Marxism is no longer a single, coherent, discursive and political doctrine. The scholars who favour the emergence of cultural Marxism are C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, Meillasoueux etc. 42

CONCLUSION

In the broad framework of the two theories -- Anthropological and Marxist -- the nature of change is evident and clear. The two theories talk about the pre-eminent change, though with degree of differences. Karl Marx stated that the change is only meaningful in the due arrival of socialism and communism. The classless communist society becomes only possible when the workers of all countries unite and the change will certainly accomplish all without class differentiation and exploitation. But the latter Marxist theories mentioned above have modified the original ideas of Karl Marx as they say that change is universal and imminent.

To them change occurs even in the positivist, rational and utilitarian society. Most of the scholars accept the irrevocable and irresistible multi-levels of change. To inculcate change more focus is led down by the substantivists (Polanyi et. al.) and latter Marxists. The latter/contemporary Marxists, further, emphasize that Marxism needs to be thoroughly reviewed and contextualized keeping the changing aspects of modern society. Hence, with their different purposes both anthropological theory and Marxists theory have attempted to study change in different societies. Accordingly, the present study also shows that the changes that come into being in the economy of the tribals bring about an unexpected turn in their life style.