
Market as Engine of Historical Change: A Comparative Historical Analysis of Sociology of Market

*Radhika Devi Dahal**

Article History: Received 17 Dec. 2022; Reviewed 3 Jan. 2023; Revised 12 Feb. 2023; Accepted 11 March 2023.

Abstract

Market is social phenomenon. This article argues that market is social phenomenon because, people perform according to their social positioning. Historically, market was changing, as per the social change. There are different stages of the market development, it was started from kinship to capitalist market.

Keywords: *Comparative historical analysis, market, social construction, society*

Introduction

Comparative historical analysis is one of the most important methods of investigation. It has been used in macro-sociology as key figure to inquiry larger phenomenon since long ago. Renounced sociologist used it as a central mode of investigation. Comparative historical analysis has different features which I am going to discuss later among them causal relationship is one of the important feature of it. Comparative historical analysis inquires cause and effects relationship which is not short period but long period may desire. For long period, there should be specially specified and connected with each and every case with one another. It takes small number on cases because larger number are not desired or it is very lengthy where needs big, long term to study. First chapter will be based on importance of comparative historical analysis and features of it and second paragraph will be focus on critical writing and last paragraph will be based on conclusion.

Comparative historical analysis deals with history to study macro-sociology. It is the best way to understand causal relationship of larger phenomenon of society which is accumulated from long period. To know macro-sociology, it is important to know the method of study which is suitable to find precise work. Comparative historical analysis as a central mode of investigation, Mahoney and Rueschemeyer (2003). It is an important field of research which uses systematic comparison and analysis process of long time and large scale outcomes which is important to macro-sociological study. Comparative historical analysis can do much more than its detractors allow, Rueschemeyer (2003). The principle key features are explanation and identification of causal configuration, analyze historical sequences and take seriously the unfolding of process over time and systemic and contextualized comparisons of similar and contrasting cases. Firstly, causal relationship is necessary for comparative historical analysis and it uses very best methods of analysis which is renounced in inference and uses multiple approaches. Secondly, comparative historical analysis deals with historical sequences and process analysis.

* Faculty Member of Sociology, Saraswati Multiple Campus, TU, Nepal

Historically market dynamics always has been an engine of social change both in growth, and structural collapse. But since long back "market", remained outside from society, and often perceived in autonomous, independent, localized, and de-linked manner. Historically since stateless societies the nature of market was ever present and remained often as expansionary and capitalistic. Market is not a new phenomenon. Since long past for example from primitive communism to slavery, feudal and capitalist societies market was existed everywhere. Ultimate form of market was the ultimate form of society and the engine of historical social transformation. The contradiction within one form of market in process of its growth towards upward, super-ordinate, stratifying, exploitative, monopolized trajectory gave rise to the birth of state. According to Randal Collins (1990) the rise of state or some secondary and territory sphere of market is like a capitalist tower of Babel building endlessly towards the sky. Looking from the vantage points of Omni-market model, the rise of state is something like a return to a highest floor of market, the bureaucratic government. Following the footsteps of Max Weber, Collins (1990) points out that, structural collapse due to the contradictions within each monopolized and imperfect market system is to form a rational bureaucratic government to regulate the market. Both for Weber and Collins state is nothing more than a regulatory mechanism of markets. The function of state is to serve the market.

Over an extended period of time since kinship, slave, agricultural/feudal to capitalistic societies market remained one of the major motor force of social change. Throughout the human history monopoly market was the leading factor for growth, crisis, and eventual structural collapse. Each forms of market led different kinds of class structures, stratification, properties, and commodities. The contradictions within each forms invited the rise of state and different kinds of property and class structures. In this paper I will discuss how market is a leading factor of social change throughout human history since kinship to capitalist societies. To discuss on it I will dwell first on his Omni-market model and the Weberization of Marx and second I will put the historical evidences to shed light on how a kind of monopoly market had been developed in different historical phases and that remained a motor force of crisis and change. In different phases, what Collins (1990) argues is that monopoly, and pyramided market had been developed and that operated in imperfect competition and restrictive manner and that led the existing society and market system towards fall. Thus for Collins it is not the mode of production, class consciousness, class in itself and class for itself but it is the monopoly, imperfect, pyramided nature of market that is an engine of historical social transformation. After putting the cases, at third, I will conclude my own remarks on Collin's Omni-market model of historical transformation.

Weberization Of Max and Omni Market Model

Borrowing the workable classification of human history from Marx, like primitive communism, slavery, agrarian, and capitalist stages, Collins (1990) dwell on social transformation from the polemic view of 'market'. For Marx, it is the mode of production, class consciousness that is the engine of social change, but by contrast for Collins it is the monopoly market, and the mode of exchange that works as an engine for historical social transformation. Blending Marx and Weber and fitting them into his Omni-market model Collins analyzes changes from one sided schema of 'market'. On the one hand he follows the footsteps of Weber being concentrated on market situation, the center of exchange, and production, and on the other he inherits the conflict thesis of

Marx and scrutinizes the contradictions happened within upper layers of each market that led their eventual fall. Thus his Omni-market model inherits both of the intellectual traditions of Weber, Karl Polanyi, Levi Strauss, and Marx in part and parcel form. For me it looks like he is more bent towards Weber rather than towards Marx. He only selectively uses the conflict thesis of Marx and fits it into his market model.

He looks market from his Omni-market lens. It means that market was universal and ever-present. His Omni-market model looks everything as a market. For Collins (1990) even politics, warfare, education, religion, and cultural goods are the forms of market. Politics and warfare market invite armament making industries into existence and education market invite school and universities into existence. For him the monasteries and Churches are also the forms of market which work as Banks, investors which are engaged on what they can gain and what they can save guiding by Weberian universalistic values, calculative rationality, work ethic, and disciplines. For him since kinship to slave, feudal, and capitalistic societies market was ever-present and the nature of that market remained always expansionary, monopolistic, and capitalistic. In stateless society there was a kinship market based on women, in slave societies there was slave market based on slaves, and in agricultural societies there was an agricultural market based on land and its produce, and in capitalistic societies we can see the market based on various commodities. In all these different phases of human history the ever present market remained always pyramided, unequal, exploitative, monopolized, and super-ordinate and that led system towards growth, crisis, and collapse. Collins looks his polemic market thesis of transformation from following principles.

- 1) Market is based on particular kind of property and commodity.
- 2) Market varies in their openness. Monopoly, imperfect competition, secrecy, subtleness, deviousness, and conspiracy are the inherent nature of market.
- 3) Market expands in evolutionary way. It is expansionary, pyramided, and stratified and passes higher tipping points over its life span.
- 4) As market expands structurally it led economic growth, stagnation and downturn.
- 5) Markets for a particular item of exchange tend to give rise to super-ordinate markets which is more stratified, hierarchical, and unequal.
- 6) Growth, crisis, and structural collapse often come in the life of each market and it led social change.

Now let me shed light on how historically expansionary ever present monopoly market remained the major force of social change in different form of societies.

Kinship Market

The kinship market is made by intermarriages for the sake of alliances. It was prevalent in stateless, kin-based societies in ancient human history. For Marx and Engels, primitive societies were based on collective property and communal mode of production, but for Levi Strauss those societies were based on sexual property and sexual mode of production. Collins (1990) departs with Marx and explains kinship market from the vantage points of Levi Strauss's sexual mode of production and makes some of his complementary arguments. Women were not the producers as

Marx argues, but were the commodity and property in kin-based societies as Levi Strauss argues. Women used to be appropriated and exchanged particularly during that kinship markets.

According to Levi Strauss the bedrocks of kinship market were intermarriage rules, the women, and kin-relatives. The families were associated with two types of marriage rules; short scale and long scale, or restricted and generalized. As women were central form of property and commodity and the producers of sons and daughters, and the creators of wider kinship network; the source of ultimate richness and production, there was a competition over the access to women between families associated with two kinds of marriage rules. By custom the families associated with short scale/restricted marriage rules confined on very local limited clan could not build wider marriage alliances and they became unfit to expand their wider kinship ties and ultimately so as to become unfit to increase their own population which was the source of power and the source of military at that time. On the contrary, the families associated with large scale or generalized marriage rules became able to build wider marriage allies, and wider network of kinship and big population (Levi Strauss, 1969). The huge population of relatives, wider marital alliances, and access with good women was the source of military and political power at that time.

According to Levi Strauss (1969) as large scale/generalized families became more expansionary, as they built wider marriage alliances across various geographical boundaries, as they increased their own huge kinship network a kind of super-ordinate, stratifying, and monopolized market emerged from that families. They became overly expanded, penetrated beyond one geography, cultures, and societies to build their wider marital allies thorough which they could get access with more and good women. Ultimately large scale families built political allies and military network through which they monopolized access over women. Collins (1990) diverges with Levi Strauss, and makes some of his complementary arguments on his thesis of sexual mode of production. For Collins there were also some contingent, political, and structural factors that led the origin and growth of super-ordinate kinship market. Thus, according to Collins, in addition to marriage rules, and short scale/versus large scale families the family geopolitics, other contingent, and structural factors used to matters behind the origin and development of super-ordinate kinship markets. For example even short scale families sometime dominated kinship market forming their military on the basis of their common ancestry. In the name of common ancestry sometime they used to become united and formed the military and built their wider marital allies and monopolized their access with more and good women. Thus, for Collins the families who could built their political and military allies either from the short scale or large scale families could built wider marital alliances and could monopolized their access over women.

As kinship market became overly expanded, reached into higher stage of super-ordinate form, societies shifted into two classes namely kinship capitalist and kinship proletariat or alliance rich and alliance poor. The large scale families those who were large in population, and militarily and politically powerful shifted into kinship capitalist whereas short scale marriage families few in numbers, and politically less powerful shifted into kinship proletariat. There were other classes as well the male and female, and the aged and young, but the development of classes like kinship capitalist and kinship proletariat played a key role in social change. At ancient past the kinship market was the engine behind large scale shift in horticulture, animal husbandry, metallurgy, and urban revolution. Women had been commodified since that age. Females were controlled generally by males and particularly by kinship capitalists. In later period of kin-based societies as outer productive activities such as heavy plowing, herding, and fishing had been taken by men

from women, women turned into the producers of children. As the kinship market reached into more super-ordinate form, as it became more and more exploitative, monopolized, and stratified, a kind of split occurred between kinship capitalist and kinship proletariat. As kinship capitalist hold monopoly over women and other resources, it restricted the hold of poor allies or kinship proletariat over women and other resources, and it led eventual crisis and invited change. The stateless societies invited the rise of state. The class structures had been changed. The kinship capitalist shifted into feudal lords and kinship proletariat shifted into slaves and serfs. Thus as kinship market became super-ordinate, exploitative, stratified, unequal, and monopolized it fall on crisis and invited change. Aforesaid kinship market were existed and later became the source of change in highland Burma, India, China, Henan Japan, Italy, ancient Greece, Rome and Norman state.

Slave Markets

In slave based societies slave market was the vital motor force of change. Over an extended period of time various forms of slave markets had been existed such as incidental bondage in kin based societies, debt slaves in Greece, military and administrative slaves in Rome, agricultural slaves in a form of serfs in Russia, slaves for massive capitalistic plantations in America, and contractual labors of modern days. In slave markets, slaves were not the producers but they were principal form of property and commodity which were subject to buy and sale. The producers were the military who used to produce the slaves by internecine wars. The major task of military working class was to fight the internecine wars and to capture the slaves. Slaves were the principal form of property and commodity that could be owned, sold, and bought. Thus the slave market was concentrated mainly on how to own more and more slaves. To produce more slaves from internecine wars ancient states used to keep huge military. For example in ancient Rome more than half of its total population was in military service. Those states which used to own more slaves used to be rich in agriculture, herding, fishing, crafts, commerce, and industry. Thus the slaves were the ultimate source of richness and prosperity.

Slowly and gradually slave markets had been expanded across far distant geographical boundaries. Transportable slaves used to be supplied in Rome and Greece from Barbarian states such as upper part of Egypt, Asia, Ethiopia, Russia, and Finland and again they had been supplied into far distant areas such as in Germany, Britain, and Scandinavian countries. Across time the captured slaves started to be supplied in far distant geographical regions (Collins, 1990). As slave market became expansionary, and penetrated in various peripheries out of Roman Empire, more and more investment directed towards it. The slave market started to reach in upward level. After Punic war, because of its victory, Rome gained a lot of slaves and it shifted into empire. After that war the majority of Roman high ranking military officials and politicians started to involve on slave markets. They started to invest in slave markets. As high ranking military officials, politicians, and the states started to invest more and more investment on slave trade, a kind of super-ordinate, exploitative, stratifying, and monopolized slave market had been emerged. Slave trade became one of the major sectors of investment for traders, high ranking military, and the politicians. Working class segment encouraged to join in the military leaving their nominal peace of lands. But what happened was that the access with slaves became unequal, restricted, and stratified. The powerful military, politicians, traders, and state control the slave market and

working class military soldiers had been prevented from access. Working class military lost their land, became disappeared, and alienated. Thus, a kind of split arises between high ranking military, politicians and working class military soldiers. The conflict between these top layers accelerated the crisis within slave markets. In addition to it geo-political limit also created the split between slave traders. It ultimately fall slave market into crisis.

But in the case of Islamic Middle east, the Sultans who had kept military soldiers as their personal armies, and administrative personnel, in process of upward growth of slave markets, they became unable to pay for slave military soldiers. As they became unable to pay for personal slave soldiers, the production of slaves started to be downturn. As the slave market became stagnant and downturn, that fall into crisis and invited the origin of feudal states (Collins, 1990). The expansionary high ranked military officials and politicians shifted into feudal lords and the slaves turned into serfs. Thus the class structure also had been changed.

Another historical social change brought by slave market is the commodification and commercialization of everything. Human beings in the form slave; sex, open prostitution, vote, and court support in an exchange of certain recognized fee was initiated and institutionalized by slave market. If human beings are started to be bought and sold then what else remained to buy and sell. That beginning was the bedrock for the later history of bought and sold of every commodity and property. Later years as we know all forms of property are subject to bought and sold. Each form of property such as cultural goods, skills, services, and education are subject to bought and sold. Each services and commodities started to bought and sold since the period of slave markets.

Agrarian Coercive Exchange

The central property in agrarian market was land and its products. The agrarian production was extracted in a form either products or labor services. In Europe and China there were two kinds of agrarian coercive exchange markets: rent coercion and tax coercion (Collins, 1990). The first one was more decentralized, expansionary and the later one was centralized and restricted. As rent coercive exchange markets permeated everywhere in the level of local landlords, monasteries, universities, and cultural goods a kind of competition arise among landlords, monasteries, and universities to control over the particular commodity and property. For example, competitions arise between landlords and monasteries for the sake of agricultural production and labor services produced by peasants. Later it turned into unfair competition or imperfect competition to capture the agricultural production and labor services between landlords and monasteries. It should be noted that the monasteries were working as landlords both in Europe and in China. Monasteries were guided by Weberian universalistic values, work ethics, and disciplines. Monasteries used to buy, own, and sell the land. They were engaged on what they can gain and what they can save. Monasteries acted as Bank, stores of values, and centers of investment. Both of the monasteries from Europe and China moved in similar trajectory. As unfair competition arise between landlords, monasteries, and peasants to control over agricultural land, its products, and serfs, a kind of stratified, exploitative, monopolized market had been emerged. The landlords and monasteries monopolized the land and its produce and restricted large sections of peasants from out of reach. That exacerbated the split between landlords, monasteries, and peasants. Military war spread out between them in navel and land areas for the sake of land, its rent, and labor

services. As a result the monasteries and landlords became unable to bear the military cost. On that chaos local landlords and monasteries invited the absolutist state (Collins, 1990). The properties of churches and monasteries had been confiscated. The land produce and its labor service shifted into the hands of state aristocrats. Later years the agrarian market permeated, and penetrated into the level of state. Earlier decentralized land rent shifted into centralized tax by state aristocrats. Later again as split occur between state aristocrats and local landlord and tax coercive market fall on crisis and it shifted society into another form.

Collins added that another super-ordinate market emerged in the sector of education. As education became the main commodity of the market, as that commodity became most of the common people's choice, as education became the government enforced license, and the credentials of ability, educational entrepreneurs such as universities, and schools had been emerged to respond that need (Collins, 1990). After that as education reached merely into the hands of few and excluded many then it led crisis and invite the rise of capitalist state to respond all common problems seen in various forms of market. Cultural tokens, status goods also concentrated in certain few hands and excluded many. Out of all aforesaid wombs a kind of monopolized, stratifying, exploitative, and super-ordinate market originated and it led system towards the fall.

Capitalist Market

Proliferation of capitalism represents the growth, and penetration of markets. Thus the capitalism is an Omni-market society. The take off stage of market within capitalism began since the emergence of monasteries in Europe and in China at 13th centuries (Collins, 1990). Abu-Lughod (1989) proposes that market dynamics also existed in the 'world system' of long distance trade in Eurasia around the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. There is no confusion on the fact that market dynamics matters in historical social change. But let me shed light on historically how market dynamics accelerated social change in Omni-capitalistic and Omni-market society. As I have already mentioned, ever present market reached in its take off stage since the emergence of monastic capitalism in 13th centuries and it had been superseded by secular capitalism. Since then to now ever present market increasingly has been moved towards more super-ordinate form. Each earlier form of market and capitalism has been superseded by new market form. Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) points out different process and incarnations of capitalism superseded one by another such as mercantile, competitive, and monopolistic capitalism. According to him earlier form of religious capitalism based on monasteries has been superseded by 16th century's mercantile capitalism. Mercantile capitalism has been superseded by 18th century's competitive capitalism. And the competitive capitalism has been superseded by 19th century's monopolistic capitalism. And ultimately monopolistic capitalism has been superseded by financial capitalism (Wallerstein, 1974). In these different forms of capitalism and its unhindered market expansion capitalism became inevitable because, it has been modified in different forms. Across its different incarnations, and modifications capitalism embraced and hugged multifarious local cultures and subsistence economies. That's why capitalism and its unhindered markets became inevitable force in shaping social change. Collins (1990) departs with Wallerstein and argues that it is not something that capitalism became more adaptive, or it has been modified across time and history, hugged multiple cultures, that's why it became inevitable force in shaping social change, but it is because market has passed higher tipping points in aforesaid different historical past. The

penetration of market in each historical phase became increasingly upward and more and more expansionary. It has been penetrated into multiple local cultures and subsistence economies. In this way market reached in highest boiling moments and tipping points. It crossed and over-crossed the thresholds. In each historical stage, it became more expansionary; more penetrated, and became more monopolized. In this light, super-ordinate, exploitative, monopoly market which was reaching in highest boiling points was the leading cause of the victory of Europe over Asia and North Africa (especially, China, India, and the Islamic Middle East) rather than other reasons (Collins, 1990).

In process of proliferation of super-ordinate markets and Capitalism more and more versions of production sectors are drawn into the markets and new forms of markets have been emerged. In process of this emergence old forms of markets such as kinship, slave, and agrarian coercive markets have been superseded by new forms of markets such as Banks, stock markets, money markets and international rate of exchange, insurance, pension plans, gigantic transnational corporations, international humanitarian organizations, and universities. The profit is divorced from production. One can make money based on center of exchange for example one can make money either investing on bull or bear market. Differentiation and stratification is based on who is closest to this center of exchange.

Conclusion

During the period of stateless society kinship market accelerated change in horticulture, animal husbandry, metallurgy, and urban revolution. During slave based society the major change derived by market is that of the commodification and commercialization of everything. If the human beings in the form of women, slave, serf, sex, and open prostitution had been bought and sold during kinship and slave markets then question arise what remained to be bought and sold? In this age, human futures, dreams, options, education, credentials, and cultural goods are subject to buy and sale. Educational entrepreneurs have been emerged to respond the need of education opening up new universities and schools. There is growing competition among common people to get access with school and university education. Government licenses for mining, water, and forest are also bought and sold. Market is penetrated everywhere. The food we eat, the dress we wear, the dream we see, everywhere there is market. Old forms of property such as women, slave, and serfs have been superseded by land, cash, education, skills, entrepreneurship, power-networks and cultural goods. In addition to it old form of property has been strongly prohibited in capitalist markets. The women as sexual property truncated into bilateral relations. It became the matter of emotions and cult of love between married couples in new age of capitalist market.

Collins concluded that since kinship to capitalistic stage market moved towards its growth because of its expansionary nature and it fall on crisis and eventually it reached towards collapse because of its exploitative, monopoly, and stratifying nature. The collapse of market gave rise different kinds of class structure, stratification, and different mode of social organizations. In these different historical epoch split and contradiction occurred in between top layers such as in kinship market it happened in between alliance rich and alliance poor, in slave market it occurred in between high ranking military officials, politicians, and low ranking military soldiers, and in agrarian market it happened in between local landlord, monasteries, state aristocrats, and the peasants. The split between upper layers invited the rise of the state to form a bureaucratic

government, the ultimate aim of which was to regulate the market forces. Thus state is a secondary and tertiary sector of market. Where there is not market? Market is everywhere. Collins make such a sense that the boundaries between market and societies are not clear cut, which are very much intermingled, overlapped, and very much penetrated and embedded to each other. The ultimate form of market is a ultimate form of society. In these all historical epochs, the expansionary, pyramided, exploitative, monopolized, and super-ordinate nature of market is an engine of historical social transformation. Collins concluded that it is not the mode of production, class consciousness, class in itself, and class for itself but a monopoly market is a leading factor of social change. West could permeate market everywhere in decentralized way that east could not. Market has been controlled by strong central government in the east particularly in China. In this light, market could be flourished in west than that of the east which was one of the major factors of the rise of west. There is no such sector that have not changed and influenced by market. For example, even communist countries such as China have been changing due to the cause of market. Market has been permeated everywhere in Chinese society and it has been adopting market economy to compete with its global partners. Everything has been changing by expansionary and super-ordinate market forces.

References

- Abu-Lughod, J. L. (1989). *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Randall. (1990). 'Market Dynamics as the Engine of Historical Change'. *Sociological Theory*. Vol. 8, No. 2, Pp111-135.
- Gernet, J. (1982). *A History of Chinese Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Girouard, Mark. (1978). *Life in the English Country House*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goitein, S. (1967). *A Mediterranean Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goldstone, J. (1991). *State Breakdown: Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World, 1640-1848*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Hodgson, Marshall G. (1974). *The Venture of Islam*. Vol. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hopkins, K. (1977). "Economic Growth and Towns in Classical Antiquity." In *Towns in Societies*, edited by P. Abrams and E.A. Wrigley. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, A. (1987). *The Evolution of Human Societies: From the Foraging Group to the Agrarian State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Jones, Eric L. (1988). *Growth Recurring: Economic Change in World History*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. (1966). *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Stratification*. New York: McGraw-Hill. L6vi
- Levi Strauss, C. (1969). *The Elementary Structure of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1969 (1914). "Les Origines de la Notion de Monnaie." Pp. 106-120 in *Oeuvres*, Vol. 2. Paris: Editions de Minuit. . 1967 (1925). *The Gift*. New York: Norton.

- McNeil, W. (1976). *Plagues and Peoples*. New York: Doubleday.
- McRae, J. R. (1986). *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Murphy, R. (1988). *Social Closure: The Theory of Monopolization and Exclusion*. Oxford: Clarendon. Patterson, Orlando. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Harvard University
- Mahoney, J. (2004) *Comparative historical methodology, annual review of sociology, vol. 30* (2004), pp 81-101.
- Mahoney, J. and Rueschemeyer, D. (2003) 'Achievements and agendas' comparative historical Analysis, New York: Cambridge University.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich (2003) 'can one or few cases yield theoretical gains?' comparative Historical analysis in the social sciences, New York: Cambridge University
- Theda, S. (2003) doubly engaged social science: the promise of comparative historical analysis
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and Origins of the European World-Economy in the 16th Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Weber, M. (1961) (1923). *General Economic History*. New York: CoUier-Macmillan. . 1968 (1922). *Economy and Society*, edited by Guenter Roth and Klaus Wittich. New York: B. -. 1976 (1909). *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations*. London.
- White, Harrison C. 1981. "Where Do Markets Come From?" *American Journal of Sociology* 87:517-47.
- Wickham, Chris. 1984. "The Other Transition: From the Ancient World to Feudalism.
- Zuhu, S. (2003). Women and empowerment in the Arab world. *Arab Studies Quarterly*, 25(4), 17-38.
- Zukerfeld, M. (2017). *Knowledge in the age of digital capitalism*. University of Westminster press. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv6zd9v0.9>