

and ahistorical elements -or as some call it the "dead" aspects of it [Godelier,1978; Saed, 1981; 1978]- while still making use of other components of it in their studies. Two elements of the AMP model in particular, namely, the concept of "despotism" and the "...image of Asia stagnating from millennia..." were dismissed as ideological and non-scientific (Godelier, 1978: 214; Saed,1978: 236). It must be added that these concepts demonstrate the Hegelian elements in Marx's writings. Attention should be called to Hegel's characterization of the "Hindoos" as those who "...have no history, no growth..." etc., (Hegel, 1956: 142, 154, 163) which later was echoed in Marx's statement: "Indian society has no history, at least no known history..." (Marx and Engels,1972).

Most opponents of the AMP reject the notion's lack of empirical validity with regard to two fundamental components: the alleged absence of private ownership of land and the alleged homogeneity of the peasantry (Singh,1985; Patnaik,1983; Barakat,1977; Habib, 1985; Chandra,1981; Saleh,1979). These studies emphasize the presence and exploitative role of independent classes of landowners. Scholars generally agree that Marx's information on Mughal India and the Ottoman state was based on secondary and unreliable sources. On this point, one scholar observed: "Marx and Engels neither studied Asian societies for their own sake- that is, as a specific historical or theoretical project- nor had adequate knowledge regarding them." (Chandra,1981:13)

There is ample evidence to suggest that 'Asiatic' societies were not static. Various studies have demonstrated that there were changes from communal to individual agriculture, as well as growth in the landowning class's claims for separate rents, under both the Ottoman