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孔子/Confucius said:
There was one who did not have to do much [無為/wúwéi] when ruling and he was Shun! All he did was to sit courteously facing south!
— 孔子/Confucius, 論語 / Lúnyǔ [Edited Conversations / Analects] 15.4 [in some versions 15. 5].

Θρασύμαχος/Thrasymachus said:
In all states there is the same principle of justice, which is the interest of the government; and as the government must be supposed to have power, the only reasonable conclusion is, that everywhere there is one principle of justice, which is the interest of the stronger.
— Πλάτων/Plato, πολιτεία [Politeia /De Republica / Republic], I.338.

कौटिल्य:/Kauṭilya wrote:
The sources of human livelihood are termed artha, wealth; the earth which contains the human beings and the resources for their sustenance is also called artha, wealth. The discipline which deals with the means of acquiring and protecting that earth is the Arthaśāstra, the Science of Polity.
—कौटिल्य:/Kauṭilya, अर्थशास्त्रम् /Arthaśāstra, Book XV, Chapter I.1-2.

अर्जुन, युधिष्ठिरं प्रति / Arjuna, to Yudhiṣṭhira:
Creatures exist at one another's expense; the stronger consume the weaker.
The mongoose eats mice, just as the cat eats the mongoose; the dog devours the cat, O king, and wild beasts eat the dog. Man eats them all— see dharma for what it is! Everything that moves and is still is food for life.
—Mahābhārata, Southern Recension: 12.15. 20-22.
Karl Marx wrote:

I examine the system of bourgeois economy in the following order: capital, landed property, wage-labour; the state, foreign trade, world market.
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This is a draft proposal for further extending the plural potentials of Karl Marx’s critique of political economy as a science in human history.

Keywords

Critique; Human History; Karl Marx; Political Economy; Science.

I present a draft proposal for further extending Karl Marx’s critique of political economy in the following sections.

§1. On Karl Marx’s papers⁠¹, published texts⁠², and his study of history⁠³ in the context of plural necessities and possibilities for further extending his investigations on political economy.

Political economy is about the control and management of surplus extracted by the rulers from the ruled. So far it has evolved in three successive forms. First: as undocumented
facts involving the social lives of some people, their culture and related forms of political power, prior to the emergence of organized forms of governments and their literati. Those facts have been partially reconstructed for some of the past and present tribal societies of the world by the combined efforts of some archeologists, anthropologists, and linguists. NEXT: as some descriptive, prescriptive, normative and analytical texts on the political economies of some areas in the course of emergence of organized governments—and even of some very large empires in some parts of Ethiopia, Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, Mongolia, Iran, Arabia, South Asia, Southeast Asia and Europe among others—and a corresponding literati. These texts were/are written under varying degrees of influences of the ruling ideologies of the given historical times, to rationalize the art and craft of controlling and managing the lives of the subject people living under a given government. FINALLY: since the eighteenth century political economy is also emerging as a science through some critiques of the speculative, utopian/dystopian ideological layers of the abstractions/concepts used in some of the texts related to the bourgeois system of economy. These three modes began to exist simultaneously from around the middle of the eighteenth century as: (1) the lived experiences of the people of the world within the political economies of the then colonizing bourgeois powers of some societies of Europe and, those of their colonies in the rest of the world as social facts; (2) the treatises on some systems of political economy as texts; and, (3) as a critique of a part of
those texts related to the bourgeois system of economy as it was then evolving in some societies of Western Europe. This critique was oriented on developing the discipline of political economy as a *science*. The first steps towards laying the foundations of this science were taken by Condorcet, Saint-Simon, Simonde de Sismondi, Eugène Buret, James Stewart, Richard Jones and Friedrich Engels among others."". It was further developed through the investigations of Karl Marx from around 1844.

Karl Marx began his *Economic-philosophical manuscripts (First Rendering):|Notebook I.|*; and, *Second Rendering):|Notebook I.| of 1844 with some observations on the three following domains: *wages of labour, profit of capital, and rent on land*. After about a decade and a half, he extended and rescheduled his research programme aiming to tackle six domains of the system of bourgeois economy in the following order: *capital, landed property, wage-labour; the state, foreign trade, world market*. During the subsequent decades his investigations on these domains gradually developed and went beyond the system of bourgeois economy of his time. He continued to investigate the related domains of many countries and many civilizations drawn into varying degrees of contact with the system of bourgeois economy through trade, war and colonial rule. He also studied many disciplines related to human thought and society in their interconnections with the rest of nature, in the context of his
investigations on political economy, and also for their intrinsic intellectual worth as disciplines.

At the time of his death in 1883, his examination of even the very first topic of capital within the system of bourgeois economy remained incomplete. That incompleteness remains nested inside two successively higher orders of incompleteness. First, the incompleteness of Marx’s investigations on capital remains a part of the larger incompleteness of his critique of political economy, as the texts on the other five domains of this critique were not written. Next, Marx’s incomplete critique of political economy remains nested inside his incomplete study of human history. It is common ground that both as a social fact and as a discipline political economy is evolving within world history. These are very large, open-ended, interacting systems. Hence the various levels of incompleteness of Marx’s scientific investigations on them.

The results of some of his investigations related to the remaining five domains of the system of bourgeois economy remain partly indicated within what came to be called the “Capital” and in the preparatory materials related to it, now available in 15 volumes (containing 18 part volumes) of the MEGA², Section II. The rest of his papers containing his remarks, plans, notes, excerpts and manuscripts on the remaining five domains of the bourgeois system of economy and, on many other issues and disciplines, have either already been published or are yet to be published in
the various volumes of the $MEGA^2$, Sections I, III and IV. The publication of the $MEGA^2$ is now slated to be completed in 114 volumes, partly in print and partly in the digital mode.

Marx’s unpublished papers and published texts are of various kinds: journalistic and political writings, documents of the International Workingmen’s Association, letters, notes and excerpts from the works of other authors, drafts and manuscripts generated in the course of his scientific investigations. He studied many texts about the nature and history of agriculture, inorganic and organic chemistry, ethnology and ethnological jurisprudence, geology, health services, historical geography, prehistory, early history, history of ancient and medieval cultures, the constitutional, legal and political histories of many societies of Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, and Oceania, industrial technology, grammars and lexicons of some languages, law, aesthetics, art and literature, mathematics, mineralogy and mining, ancient, medieval and modern philosophy of some societies of Europe including their legal, political and social philosophies, physics, physiology, political corruption, political economy, political science, some religions, vocational training and women. From the 1840s he also actively studied the conditions of Germany, France, England, Ireland, Scandinavia, Poland, Russia, the Balkans, Italy, Spain, the United States, Latin America, Algeria, India, Indonesia and China of his time. In many cases, he also studied some texts and data related to the past societies of these countries. The very
large amount of excerpts, drafts and relatively finished manuscripts generated by these encyclopedic studies of Marx are available for systematic and exhaustive—topic by topic, discipline by discipline, and country by country—investigations in the years to come.

§2. On the editing of Karl Marx’s papers into published texts after his death.

After Marx’s death his works were edited and published first by Friedrich Engels, and then by some other Marxists of Germany and Russia. Engels had discussed several plans for publishing his and Marx’s texts in or out of Germany, with August Bebel, Franz Mehring and Richard Fischer before his death. In this context he wrote to Richard Fisher on 15 April 1895: “[...] I have a scheme for again presenting Marx’s and my lesser writings to the public in a complete edition—not, that is to say, by installments but all at one go, in whole volumes. I have already been in correspondence with August <Bebel> on the subject and we are still discussing it. So, you might have a word with him when he gets back. I am by no means certain that an enterprise like this is really your cup of tea, nor do I know whether you, i.e., the publishing side of the Vorwärts are the best people for the job—quite aside from the harassment of the press which has already inclined me to believe that we may be forced to have recourse to a publisher outside the German Empire” 9.
This is perhaps the first ever articulation of a plan for publishing the works of Marx and Engels lumped together in a single edition of whole volumes. This plan has been faithfully executed first by the editors of the MEGA\(^1\) and then by those of the MEGA\(^2\). This editorial decision was useful for constructing the myth of one amalgamated and synthetic “Marx-Engels” as the joint founder of Marxism as an ideology, and that of the subsequent ideologies like Leninism, Stalinism, Marxism-Leninism, Maoism etc., derived from it. This myth has erected a very large obstacle on the path of critically investigating Marx’s scientific research programme. It promotes the unhistorical and brazenly idealist notion that Marx was the first Marxist. It denies the fact that Marxism was founded as an ideology by some people after his death and hence only in ideological dreams can he be viewed as a person subscribing to that ideology.

The practical priorities and perspectives of the Marxist editors were often very different from the theoretical demands of Marx’s scientific research programme. As a Marxist intellectual Engels was primarily concerned about the practical ideological requirements of the then emerging Social Democratic trade unions and political parties of Germany, and those of some other societies of Europe. The same holds good for the subsequent editors of Marx’s papers such as Karl Kautsky, August Bebel and Eduard Bernstein of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. The latter had the additional practical task of
trying to capture and manage political power within the then industrializing bourgeois system of economy of Germany. After them, the Russian Social Democrat turned Bolshevik editors like David Borisovich Riazanov and his team, engaged in editing and publishing what is now called the MEGA\textsuperscript{1}, were required to coordinate their editorial activities with their new political and ideological tasks. These tasks were related to managing the various transitions from some old agrarian and pastoral political economies to some new industrial political economies, in the territories of the erstwhile Soviet Union. These transitions were extended over a very large part of Eurasia, containing many civilizations, involving many people, living in multiple cultural-historical time zones. What is more, all of this was required to be handled without the hegemonic presence of a corresponding class of local bourgeoisie. Their responses to these tasks gave rise to various streams of Soviet Marxist political economy that were subsequently either endorsed and extended or criticized by the ruling Communist Parties and Marxist intellectual workers of China and of some other countries. In China, the corresponding political and economic transformations also involved the handling of some very deep rooted cultural legacies of the ancient and medieval past of multiple societies.

Throughout the twentieth century Marxist intellectual workers of the rest of Eurasia, Africa, Oceania and the Americas also made their own attempts to respond to the theoretical and
practical developments related to the political economies of their respective societies and, to some of the cognate theoretical developments in the USSR, some countries of Eastern and Central Europe, China, Vietnam and Cuba. In and through this process there emerged many texts of Marxist political economy that extended the territories of political economy as a discipline.

The project for publishing the $MEGA^1$ was never completed. As a consequence of the power struggles within the rulers of the USSR, Riazanov was relieved of his editorial duties in 1931, and shot dead in 1938. In between these two events, the publication of the $MEGA^1$ was brought to an end in 1935, by some people engaged in managing the ideology of the CPSU.

After a gap of about 40 years the $MEGA^2$ (1975-) began to be published as a joint project of the Institutes of Marxism-Leninism of Moscow and Berlin. It was edited by some Russian and German Marxist-Leninists from around the early 1970s to around early 1990s. Since the withering away of the GDR in 1989 and that of the USSR in 1990, the remaining volumes of the $MEGA^2$ are currently being edited by some people engaged by the Internationale Marx-Engels Stiftung [IMES]. The process of Marx editing mainly by the Marxists, Bolsheviks and Marxist-Leninists has given rise to a very serious and stubborn conflation of Marx’s *critique* of political economy with the subsequent schools of Marxian, Marxist and Marxist-Leninist etc. political economy. Consequently, the
trajectories of Marx-reception got mixed up with those of the reception of Marxisms almost all over the world. This conflation is so stubborn and its influence runs so deep that even some of those who are interested in some aspects of Marx’s scientific research programme, at least in the domain of capital, have also succumbed to it\(^{10}\).

As in Marx’s time, so in ours, only by continuously throwing out the baggage of rationalizing ideological rhetoric of all kinds can political economy move forward as a science. Right now we have two interrelated types of Marxisms and their corresponding texts on Marxist political economies: (1) partocratic and (2) academic. The authors of these texts share several common grounds thanks to their training within the various sectors of the educational-industrial complex and, due the constraints imposed upon them by the conditions of their political or academic bread labour. Their bread labour has taken place and continues to take place within the political economy of their given geographical space and social-historical time. The editors of the \textit{MEGA}^1 (1927-1935) and those of the earlier period of the \textit{MEGA}^2 (1975-1990) were wage slaves of the partocracies of the USSR and the GDR. The editors of the current period of the \textit{MEGA}^2 (1991-) are wage slaves of the German and global academic-industrial complex. In the best case scenarios the Marxist wage slaves under the partocracies could write half-truths and get thrown out of their jobs, framed, jailed or killed. In the worst case scenarios the wage slaves of the
academic-industrial complex subject themselves to self-censorship to please their employers, retain their jobs and get rid of all commitment to science. These people have read and continue to read Marx’s texts under the constraints of their bread labour. In contrast, Marx’s critique of political economy was and continues to remain a product of his free search for truth, not one of bread labour under some employer. That is why the texts of both the partocratic and the academic Marxisms and Marxist political economies must be subjected to rigorous critique along Marx’s lines.

§3. On the emergence and development of many schools of Marxist political economy in many societies of the world.

Many schools of Marxist political economy have come up in many languages, in many societies around the world since the death of Marx. The totality of all these texts need to be critically investigated. The required survey of literature has to start from those papers and texts of Marx’s close friends, colleagues, comrades and editors, which they wrote after coming under the influence of some ideas of Marx.
One may reasonably begin this survey from Engels’ texts published within the MEGA² I-IV together with his papers (1845-1895) available at the archives of the International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam and at the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History, Moscow. The same holds good for the available papers and texts of the other early Marxists like Roland Daniels (1851/1988), Podolinsky: Сергей Андреевич Подолинский (1880,1883), and Sieber: Николай Иванович Зибер (1871, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1883, 1885, 2022).

Some of these texts are available for inspection on the web portal of the Marxists Internet Archive¹¹. For the rest, it will be necessary to go for a language by language, literally 360° search, from one longitude to another, circuminspecting the global textual spaces of all past and present Marxisms. This will entail a thorough investigation of the digital stock of relevant literature located on the World Wide Web, together with the so far undigitized physical stocks of books and articles in the major libraries of the world. One may begin this search from the existing archives and literature surveys¹².

The various Marxist texts of political economy were/are produced, since the death of Marx, to fulfill a part of the political-ideological tasks of the Social Democratic and Communist movements and parties of the period of many industrializations that was/is being led by the bourgeoisie in some parts of the world economy. In the absence of a
corresponding bourgeois class in the other parts of the world, this process of industrialization was/is being led by some sections of the literati/intelligentsia. All existing schools of political economy have arisen in response to the ideological tasks of these ongoing industrial revolutions. The neoclassical and other bourgeois political economists deny, and Marxist political economists do recognise, the ideological role played by their texts. Beyond these denials and recognitions there exists the fact on ground that all of these texts do contain layers and layers of ideologies. It is for this reason that all of them have to be subjected to rigorous critique in the light of verified facts by using testable arguments.

§4. On some of the political economic facts related to the lives of some past and present tribal societies and, some texts on the political economy of some ancient, medieval and modern societies.

The disciplinary boundaries of political economy have been considerably expanded by the texts of the many schools of Marxist political economy. These boundaries have also been considerably expanded by many archeological, ethnographic, anthropological, epigraphic, linguistic and historical narratives on the political and economic lives of some tribal societies. Many studies on some of the political economic texts of some
ancient, medieval and modern societies of the world have further enriched political economy as a discipline. As in the case of the survey on the many schools of Marxist political economy indicated above, here too, it will be necessary to go for a 360° search, from one longitude to another, discipline by discipline, and language by language, circuminspecting the global textual space of all cognate literature. This journey may literally begin from around the prime meridian or 0° longitude, namely, from the city of London, where Marx lived and worked for many decades in the nineteenth century.

It is common ground that Marx had studied and excerpted from some texts on ethnology\textsuperscript{13}, and on the history of land relations in some countries of the Americas, North Africa and South Asia\textsuperscript{14}. He also inspected quite a large amount of literature on the legal, constitutional, political and cultural history of many societies of Africa, Eurasia and the Americas\textsuperscript{15}. Some important pertinent archeological and anthropological investigations were conducted and some very important texts and commentaries from ancient China and India, and medieval al-Maghrib\textsuperscript{16} were published and translated decades after Marx’s death. Consequently, there exist many archeological, anthropological, linguistic and historical studies, including some Marxist studies, such as those by Sieber and Engels among others\textsuperscript{17}. These studies on the political economies of early societies, on some ancient and medieval texts on political economy, and the related texts on various streams of archeological, anthropological, economic and
Historiographical thought have to be subjected to thorough critiques for the future advances of political economy as a science\textsuperscript{18}.

Contemporary political economy also has some new concerns related to the current phase of industrialization on planet earth\textsuperscript{19}. These are about the interfaces: of global finance capital and regional governments; of the relatively freer flow of capital, commodities and digital transmission of some services on the one hand and the various restrictions imposed upon physical migration of people across state borders on the other; of climate, natural resources and human society; of labour and value; of informal/less organized and formal/more organized economic activities; of unpaid and paid labour; of human labour and use of intelligent machines; of governments and very large technology companies, etc. etc. Some investigators\textsuperscript{20}, including some Marxist political economists, are already addressing some of these issues.

Further, since Marx’s time the domains and disciplines that he investigated and/or planned to investigate have undergone some changes. Let us take a look at the current state of the six domains of the bourgeois system of economy that he planned to tackle.

*Capital*, which grew within the boundaries of some specific nation-states of Europe, has gradually become *transnational*. It
aims at total dominance over the entire political economy of our planet. It has been trying to arrive at this goal for the last five hundred odd years through commerce, politics and war \textsuperscript{21}.

Today a very large amount of political and economic activity is conducted on rented cloud platforms held by the technology companies as their private property. Hence the ongoing extension of the studies on \textit{rent on landed property} over the geographical space on earth, to the study of \textit{rent on cloud platforms} \textsuperscript{22}.

In spite of all the wars waged at home and abroad for the last five hundred years or thereabouts, the era of \textit{capital} is still a gigantic failure, not only in light of its recurrent systemic crises, but also in its own terms. It is still way behind its cherished goal of hegemony over all the aspects of global political economy. It has failed to come out of the era of status and establish an era of contracts everywhere in and through the markets. Till date the larger part of global wealth is produced outside the contractual nexus of \textit{capital} and \textit{wage labour}: by the unpaid labour of women and children in the families, of people held in slavery of various kinds in the informal sector in all continents, of the convicts in jails, of the underpaid slave-like workers employed in the police and the military, and more recently by the billions of internet users drawn into the vortices of the search engines by their very many compulsions. Capital, it is true, appropriates the cumulative surplus of all this labour on earth; however, it does
so not through some up front contractual exchange in the labour market, but by deceit, fraud, lies, threats and violence, just like the aristocrats of the earlier era before the arrival of the bourgeoisie on the global scene. That is why the emerging studies on the huge amount of *familial, virtual and other forms of unpaid or wageless labour* on earth are required to be taken into consideration while studying the relatively smaller domain of *wage-labour* in the market.

The contemporary studies on the *states/governments* have to take into consideration the fact that in the wake of, and inspired by the emergence and development of multinational corporations, some very large unrepresentative and self-appointed multilateral agencies and non-governmental organizations are working within and around all the existing states and their governments. Governments are being unmade and made by the ebb and tide of transnational capital as investment; by their multilateral agencies mediating global and local governance through the imposition of policy discourses favourable for that investment; and, by charity capital controlling the contemporary business of social work, executed by the non-governmental organizations selected by the managers of that capital. They masquerade as liberal paragons of probity, fighting corruption, defending human rights and democracy and finally as builders of a global civil society. These claims need to be meticulously checked out by conducting forensic auditing of their books of accounts and embedded anthropological
investigations on and around their organizational structures and of their practices on ground.

*Foreign trade* in the labour-time of *outsourced services* together with the growing use of *digital currencies* are among the other contemporary developments that have to be taken care of.

Finally, thanks to the internet now we have *real time interpenetration of the local and global financial and commodity markets*. Hence the local market/ world market binary today is not what it was in Marx’s time. It needs case by case study: from the local food markets of the still relatively isolated hill tribes, to the interconnected local and global markets of financial and other business process related services\textsuperscript{24}.

It stands to reason that the work related to present and future critique of political economy in the domain *capital* may find better bearings after we register some progress in the above indicated five domains of *landed property, wage-labour; the state, foreign trade, and world market*.

Whatever happens within social history needs to be mapped onto the emerging science of political economy, and every other discipline within that history requires to be investigated in light of it. A lot of changes have taken place in the realm of the many disciplines evolving within and influencing political economy and world history since the days of Marx. More and more areas
of mathematical and statistical work are now being handled using mathematical and statistical softwares. The old and new physical, biological and social sciences, technologies and humanities are continuously becoming more and more computational and digital. Use of fast algorithms for handling very big data has become commonplace for the multidisciplinary teams of scientists and engineers trying to solve any problem. Algorithm driven intelligent machines are being used to handle many tasks everywhere from climate simulation to food production through commerce and industry, education, health care, for surveillance and management of various components of statecraft and, at all levels of warfare. Robots are replacing human workers in many of these fields and this trend has the potential to further accelerate in future. Some corresponding changes have also appeared at the level of human social behaviour influencing demographic trends. In many industrialized and urban societies of the world the rate of birth of the human child—that is of the future human worker, so far supplied through heterosexual familial reproduction of children—has gone down, and it is steadily going down. With this reduction in the role of reproductive sexuality, the recreational roles of many fluid sexualities, up to and including developments in human-robot intimate relationships, are now poised for greater social attention and recognition. The phenomena of coevolution of robots, with that of the demands for recognizing recreational sexual rights as basic human rights, the recognition of human rights of the LGBTQIA+ people, and
the emerging interfaces of human-robot intimacies deserve systematic investigation\textsuperscript{25} within the discipline of political economy. These are some of the existing and emerging trends pertaining to several domains of political economy that are required to be included in the present and future scientific investigations on all aspects of political economy and human history in light of all available sciences and technologies.

The tasks ahead of us are twofold: (1) continuous and systematic \textit{construction} of the entire history of political economy since the emergence of political power on planet earth; and, (2) \textit{critical reconstruction} of this history of political economy for its further development as a science. For this one of the necessary first steps is: \textit{discipline wise reediting} of the published texts and unpublished papers of Karl Marx in light of the latest advances in \textit{Editionswissenschaft} and text-editing technologies\textsuperscript{26}.

Success in critical handling of these tasks will help us tackle another cycle of related tasks that were undertaken and left unfinished by Karl Marx, namely, the study of history in the widest necessary and possible senses of the word history, as indicated in what are known as his \textit{Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts} of 1844 [\textit{MEGA}\textsuperscript{2} 1/2: 396:22-26; \textit{MECW} 3:303-04] and, \textit{The German Ideology} [\textit{MECW} 5: 28-29; \textit{MEJB} 2003:312]. His works published so far within the \textit{MEGA}\textsuperscript{2} and his still unpublished papers together bear testimony to the encyclopedic
range of Marx’s study of history. This is another legacy of Marx that needs to be extended further.

Continuous and mutual interpenetrations of the sciences and ideologies are facts of human history. Continuous critique of ideologies in the interests of the sciences are also a part of the theoretical tasks tackled within that very history. Karl Marx had critically reconstructed the pertinent literature that came before and during his lifetime to the best of his capabilities. Present and future generations of intellectual workers interested in extending his research programme are analogously required to reconstruct the entire cognate literature available till date.

Notes

1. The links to the Marx, Karl/Friedrich Engels Papers have been indicated within the References below.
3. Id. 2021b.
6. This rescheduling remains indicated in four places: (1) in a letter to Ferdinand Lassalle dated 22 February 1858 \([MEGA^2 III/9: 72-73]\); (2) in another letter to Lassalle dated 11 March 1858 \([MEGA^2 III/9: 99]\); (3) in a letter to Friedrich Engels dated 02 April 1858 \([MEGA^2 III/9: 122]\); and, in the very first sentence of Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie: Erstes Heft, Vorwort \([MEGA^2 II/2: 99]\).


8. Kautsky (1897); Wilbrandt (1918); \(MEGA^2\) Section II: “Das Kapital” und Vorarbeiten (1976-2013); and, van der Linden and Hubmann 2018.

9. \(MECW 50\): 497.


11. The link to the Marxists Internet Archive has been indicated within the References below.


14. Marx, excerpts from Kovalevsky 1879; archived within the Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels Papers at the IISG, Amsterdam: https://search.iisg.amsterdam/Record/ARCH00860#A072e534c6

Hongdao published in Beijing 1987 and 1993 [I do not know the details].


22. Sadowski 2020; Yan, Cai and Li 2020.


25. The texts on the link to the Socialism and Sexuality Seminars indicated in the references below; Wolf 2009; Yuefang and Fischer [Eds.] 2019; Srinivasan 2021.
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