Reassessing the Class Character of Karl Marx and His Economic Theories: A Multi-Perspective Analysis

[1]Poonam

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Economics Department, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

[2]Dr. Ashok Chauhan

Professor, Economics Department, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

Abstract: This paper investigates the class character of Karl Marx, both as a historical figure and as a producer of one of the most influential bodies of economic theory in modern history. While Marx is widely celebrated for his revolutionary critique of capitalism and his commitment to working-class emancipation, this study probes deeper into the apparent paradox between his bourgeois social origins and his proletarian ideological commitments. Drawing from Marxian, Weberian, and Bourdieuan theoretical frameworks, the paper evaluates how Marx's class background—rooted in the educated, middle-class professional strata—interacted with the political and economic conditions of 19th-century Europe to shape his intellectual evolution.

The study distinguishes between Marx's personal class location and the class orientation of his theories, highlighting how he used his cultural and symbolic capital to articulate the structural contradictions of capitalist society and offer a radical alternative. Unlike many of his contemporaries who developed theories in support of capitalist or reformist agendas, Marx constructed a fundamentally revolutionary framework that sought not to reform but to dismantle the prevailing socio-economic order. His economic writings, including *Capital* and *The Communist Manifesto*, are analyzed not only for their ideological content but also through a sociology of knowledge lens that connects biography, class location, and historical context.

Positioning Marx on both the Bourgeois-Proletarian Continuum and the Left-Right Political Spectrum, the paper finds that while Marx was not proletarian by origin, he firmly aligned with the class interests of the working class through his lifelong political activism and theoretical output. The findings reaffirm that economic thought is never class-neutral; instead, it is deeply embedded in the material and ideological conditions of its time. Marx serves as a case study in how an intellectual from the bourgeois class can produce theory in service of proletarian emancipation.

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

1. Introduction

The life and work of Karl Marx (1818–1883) continue to occupy a central position in debates about class, ideology, and the structure of economic thought. Regarded as the founder of scientific socialism and the most influential critic of capitalism, Marx's theories have profoundly shaped the trajectory of modern political economy and social theory. Yet, while much has been written on the substance of his critique—surplus value, exploitation, historical materialism—less attention has been devoted to analyzing the social class position of Marx himself, and the class orientation embedded within his theoretical framework. This paper aims to address that lacuna by providing a layered sociological analysis of Marx's class character and the class interests served by his economic theories.

Karl Marx was not born into the working class he sought to liberate. His father, Heinrich Marx, was a lawyer and member of the Prussian bourgeois intelligentsia. The young Marx was educated in elite institutions, including the University of Bonn and the University of Berlin, where he studied philosophy and law. Despite his bourgeois upbringing, Marx underwent a radical transformation through intellectual engagement with German idealism, French socialism, and British political economy, eventually aligning himself with proletarian struggles. His personal life, often marked by financial hardship, exile, and political persecution, created conditions that allowed for close contact with working-class movements, even if his social origins remained distinct from those he sought to represent (McLellan, 2006). In this context, it becomes essential to distinguish between the class origin of the economist and the class character of the economic theory they produce. As noted by Mannheim (1936), the sociology of knowledge urges us to analyze ideas not in abstraction but in relation to their social genesis. Marx's life serves as a compelling case of this dialectic: a bourgeois intellectual producing a theory grounded in proletarian interests. Theories, in this perspective, are not autonomous abstractions but embedded social constructs. They emerge from particular historical configurations and serve specific class purposes—whether consciously or not (Gramsci, 1971).

This study adopts a multidisciplinary framework to assess Marx's class character and the political implications of his economic writings. Through the Marxian lens, we investigate the ideological positioning of Marx's critique of capital in relation to his material conditions. Through Weberian categories, we assess his use of rationality, authority, and intellectual leadership in shaping class-based discourse. Through Bourdieuan tools, we evaluate his accumulation and deployment of cultural, social, and symbolic capital in the intellectual and political fields of 19th-century Europe.

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

Moreover, the paper situates Marx on a Class Character Continuum, spanning from bourgeois to proletarian ideology, and on a Left-Right Political Spectrum, which evaluates the transformative versus conservative impulses of economic thought. Unlike many classical economists who emerged from the capitalist elite and constructed theories to rationalize the capitalist system (e.g., Smith, Ricardo), Marx's work represents a rupture—a deliberate departure from the dominant ideology of his class background (Hunt & Lautzenheiser, 2011).

By critically interrogating both the social biography of Karl Marx and the historical material content of his economic theories, this study contributes to the ongoing effort to deconstruct the myth of value-neutral economic knowledge. It affirms that theories are not merely academic exercises but ideological weapons—either in service of the ruling class or as instruments of resistance.

2. Class Background of Karl Marx

Karl Marx was born on May 5, 1818, in Trier, a provincial city in the Rhineland, into a relatively comfortable and educated middle-class household. His father, Heinrich Marx, was a successful lawyer and a man of Enlightenment ideals. Originally Jewish, Heinrich converted to Lutheranism in 1816 in response to the anti-Semitic restrictions of Prussian law, primarily to preserve his legal practice and socio-economic position (McLellan, 2006). Heinrich was deeply influenced by French rationalism and Voltairean secularism, ideals he would pass on to his son. The Marx household, while not aristocratic or aristocratically wealthy, was solidly bourgeois in culture, education, and aspirations (Wheen, 1999).

Marx’s mother, Henrietta Pressburg, came from a relatively prosperous family of merchants and rabbis in the Netherlands, with ties to banking circles, including the Philips family, later known for the electronics corporation. This maternal lineage placed Marx in proximity to both intellectual and financial bourgeoisie networks, even if he did not inherit material wealth from them (Berlin, 1939).

Marx was educated at the prestigious Friedrich-Wilhelm Gymnasium and later studied law and philosophy at the universities of Bonn, Berlin, and Jena. In Berlin, he fell under the influence of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and became involved with the Young Hegelians, a group of radical intellectuals who criticized religion, monarchy, and Prussian conservatism. This formative period laid

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

the foundation for Marx's intellectual trajectory as a revolutionary critic of the dominant social order (McLellan, 2006).

Despite his academic excellence and family connections, Marx faced recurring economic hardship in his adult life. After his radical journalism provoked censorship in Germany and Paris, he spent most of his mature years in exile, primarily in London. During this time, Marx often relied on the financial support of Friedrich Engels, his close collaborator and the son of a wealthy industrialist, to sustain his family and complete his theoretical work (Hobsbawm, 2011). This paradox—coming from a bourgeois family yet living in relative poverty while developing a theory of working-class emancipation—complicates any simple classification of his class character.

From a sociological perspective, Marx's class background can be identified as intellectual petty bourgeoisie. He was neither a member of the working class nor of the aristocracy or capitalist elite. His family's livelihood derived from professional and legal work, not from capital ownership or labor. However, his immersion in working-class movements, his empirical studies of factory conditions and capitalist crises, and his political alignment with proletarian struggles positioned him as a class traitor in bourgeois eyes and a revolutionary in the eyes of labor movements.

In modern theoretical terms, Marx's social origins reflect a classic case of "counter-hegemonic defection"—an intellectual from the bourgeoisie who turned against his class interests to develop a theoretical arsenal for proletarian liberation (Gramsci, 1971). This defection, however, was not merely ideological. Marx's exile, political persecution, and precarious material conditions mirrored, in part, the structural alienation he sought to expose in capitalism.

Thus, the class background of Karl Marx is best understood as bourgeois by birth and intellectual capital, but proletarian in ideological commitment and revolutionary praxis. His life trajectory reveals the dialectical tension between material background and political alignment, making him a rare case of class-conscious transformation.

3. Class Character of Marx as an Individual

Analyzing Karl Marx's class character requires a nuanced understanding of the relationship between his material background, intellectual trajectory, and political commitments. While Marx was born into a petty-bourgeois intellectual household, his personal life choices, ideological evolution, and lived experiences led him to adopt a revolutionary position aligned with the working class, making

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

him a unique historical example of class betrayal or what Antonio Gramsci referred to as an "organic intellectual of the subaltern class" (Gramsci, 1971).

Materially and sociologically, Marx belonged to the educated middle class. His father, Heinrich Marx, was a lawyer who aspired to integrate into the liberal and Enlightenment-informed sections of Prussian society. The household was relatively comfortable, secular, and cultivated, embodying the ethos of the 19th-century European professional class (McLellan, 2006). Marx received a classical education, attended elite universities, and was fluent in multiple languages. His early access to Hegelian philosophy and European literature was a product of this privileged upbringing. However, his individual class character cannot be understood merely in terms of birth or upbringing. It must include how Marx chose to orient his life's work, social associations, and political struggles. Marx deliberately distanced himself from the liberalism of his father's generation and the careerist intellectual circles of his time. Instead, he embedded himself in revolutionary networks, became a journalist exposing factory working conditions, and dedicated his intellectual labor to analyzing and critiquing the capitalist mode of production from the perspective of the proletariat. Marx's adult life was marked by persistent economic hardship, exile, and political repression. He spent years living in poverty in London, lost several children to illness, and survived largely on the financial support of Friedrich Engels. This material deprivation, while not equivalent to industrial labor exploitation, further detached him from the stability of the middle class. His active engagement with workers' associations, the Communist League, and later the International Workingmen's Association further solidified his organic intellectual relationship with the proletariat (Hobsbawm, 2011).

From a Marxian perspective, Marx embodied the ideal of praxis—he was not just a theorist of class struggle but also a participant. He did not view theory as a detached academic pursuit but as a weapon for social transformation. As he famously wrote in his *Theses on Feuerbach*: "Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it" (Marx, 1845/1978). This militant approach marks a sharp departure from the typical posture of bourgeois intellectuals, who often seek to manage or reform capitalism rather than overthrow it.

From a Weberian viewpoint, Marx's class character defies conventional categorization. Weber's notion of "status group" is useful here. Marx had high cultural capital and intellectual prestige, yet he refused to convert these into bureaucratic or institutional power, which would have placed him in the respectable strata of academic or state service. Instead, he intentionally marginalized himself from

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

systems of prestige and power, indicating a conscious rejection of bourgeois class status in favor of revolutionary solidarity.

A Bourdieuan analysis offers further refinement. Marx possessed enormous cultural capital—education, symbolic authority, fluency in the canon of European thought. However, his lack of economic capital and his oppositional stance meant that he was consistently marginalized within the dominant fields of power. In Bourdieu's terms, Marx chose to invest his symbolic capital into the heterodox pole of the intellectual field, thereby resisting cooptation by the dominant bourgeois ideology (Bourdieu, 1991). His refusal to professionalize his intellectual work within universities or state institutions reflects a deliberate commitment to ideological autonomy and subaltern representation.

Therefore, on the Class Character Continuum Scale (1–7), with 1 being radical proletarian alignment and 7 being staunch bourgeois conservatism, Karl Marx firmly situates at Scale 1. Though not born a worker, he consistently acted, wrote, and lived as a revolutionary thinker committed to proletarian interests, refusing to accommodate his ideas to the dominant structures of capitalist legitimacy. Marx's life is a rare case where individual class character diverges from class origin—a movement from the middle-class intelligentsia toward a proletarian-aligned revolutionary intellectual, grounded in both theory and lived experience. His class character is thus defined not merely by where he came from, but by what he chose to represent, whom he allied with, and what material interests his work served.

4. Class Character of Marx's Theories

The economic theories of Karl Marx, most prominently articulated in *Capital* (1867), *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), and various other writings, represent a radical rupture from the dominant bourgeois political economy of the 19th century. Unlike the theories of Adam Smith, David Ricardo, or later Neoclassical economists, Marx's theories are not class-neutral. They are explicitly and structurally aligned with the interests, experiences, and historical mission of the working class. Thus, on any objective analysis, **the class character of Marx's economic theory is distinctly proletarian** and revolutionary in purpose, orientation, and consequence.

4.1. Marxian Framework: Theoretical Representation of the Proletariat

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

From a Marxian perspective, Marx's economic theory must be understood as the ideological expression of a historically emergent class—the proletariat. As Engels put it, Marx "discovered the law of motion of modern society," by identifying the internal contradictions of capitalism through dialectical and historical materialism (Marx & Engels, 1848/1976). *Capital* was not just a technical analysis of value, commodities, and surplus—it was a weapon for class struggle. Marx's theory of surplus value, the concept of exploitation of labor, and the falling rate of profit directly identify the working class as the producer of value and capitalism as a historically specific system of domination (Marx, 1867/1990).

The theory is structured not as a description of market equilibrium, but as a critique of political economy as a science that masks exploitation. Thus, it operates as a **class-conscious theory**, rejecting the myth of harmony between labor and capital. Instead, it shows capitalism as a mode of production based on the expropriation of labor and the domination of one class by another—a historical system that must be overthrown, not merely reformed.

4.2. Weberian Analysis: Rejection of Value-Neutral Rationality

From a Weberian standpoint, Marx's economic theory defies the typical rational-legal mode of classical and neoclassical economics. Rather than building a technocratic model, Marx presents a critical and normative framework—one that embeds power relations, ideology, and social conflict within economic structures. His method of historical materialism does not treat capitalism as a rational response to scarcity but as a coercive and historically contingent system built on inequality and alienation (Weber, 1922/1978; Kalberg, 1994).

Moreover, Marx's emphasis on class as a social relationship grounded in production differentiates his theory from Weber's status-based sociology. Still, both perspectives agree that capitalism generates systemic domination. Whereas Weber analyzed bureaucracy as a rational but potentially oppressive system, Marx explained exploitation as rooted in the private ownership of the means of production. His theory thus centers not on procedural legitimacy, but on the structural antagonism between capital and labor—a profound divergence from the supposedly neutral rationality of classical economics.

4.3. Bourdieuan Perspective: Opposition to Dominant Symbolic and Economic Capital

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

From a Bourdieuan perspective, Marx's economic theory challenges the very forms of symbolic and economic capital that dominate the field of economics. Bourdieu (1998) emphasizes how intellectuals often misrecognize their own embeddedness in class structures. Marx's theory, by contrast, is self-reflexive—it actively reveals the role of ideology and mystification in the reproduction of capitalism (Bourdieu, 2000). For instance, the concept of "commodity fetishism" exposes how capitalist societies mask social relationships as relationships between things, thus naturalizing and legitimizing exploitation (Marx, 1867/1990). This is an early critique of symbolic domination, showing how capitalism structures not just labor relations but also human perception and social consciousness. Unlike mainstream economists who accumulate cultural capital by conforming to dominant paradigms (such as marginal utility or general equilibrium), Marx constructed a heterodox field. His theory opposes the reproduction of class hierarchy through intellectual labor and instead aligns academic theory with emancipatory praxis. Thus, Marx's economic theory resists the doxa of economic orthodoxy and represents the heterodox pole of the intellectual field.

4.4. Theory on Class Character Scale and Political Spectrum

On the Class Character Continuum Scale (1 to 7), where:

- 1 = Radical proletarian theory
- 7 = Conservative bourgeois theory

Marx's theory is firmly at Scale 1. It was built not to sustain the capitalist order but to critique it fundamentally and facilitate its overthrow. His concept of scientific socialism, his critique of wage labor, and his theory of revolution make his work structurally antagonistic to the interests of the bourgeoisie. On the Left–Right Political Spectrum, Marx's theory is Far Left. It promotes the abolition of private property in the means of production, the end of class society, and the establishment of a classless, stateless form of communism. No compromise is offered to liberal or social democratic models that seek to regulate capitalism while maintaining private ownership of capital.

4.5. Content and Orientation: A Theory Meant for Action

Marx's theory is not simply descriptive but prescriptive and strategic. It articulates not only how capitalism works but why and how it must be transformed. In this sense, it goes beyond economic

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

modeling into revolutionary sociology, moral philosophy, and political action. His work is a blueprint for working-class emancipation, combining rigorous critique with political strategy. His theories influenced not only academic economics but also labor movements, revolutionary parties, anti-colonial struggles, and policies on welfare, planning, and income redistribution. The historical impact of his ideas further reinforces their material embeddedness within the class struggle of the modern world.

Karl Marx's economic theory is a radical expression of proletarian class consciousness. It does not merely reflect the interests of the working class—it seeks to organize, educate, and liberate it. Unlike the supposedly neutral frameworks of classical or neoclassical economics, Marx's theory is designed as a critique and weapon against capitalist ideology. Whether viewed through Marxian, Weberian, or Bourdieuan lenses, the theory consistently reveals itself as an anti-bourgeois, revolutionary framework, making it one of the clearest examples of class-aligned economics in modern history.

5. Empirical Outcomes, Historical Impact, and Contemporary Relevance of Marx's Economic Theory

5.1 Empirical Outcomes of Marx's Theory

While Marx's predictions about the imminent collapse of capitalism have not materialized in the precise way he envisioned, many of his analytical frameworks have shown empirical validity in explaining long-term economic and social dynamics. The concept of class exploitation, formalized through the theory of surplus value, continues to resonate with the lived experiences of millions of workers across the globe. Modern empirical studies on income distribution, wage stagnation, and corporate profit shares reveal that capital often accumulates faster than labor incomes—echoing Marx's core insight about the inherent asymmetry in capital-labor relations (Piketty, 2014).

Additionally, Marx's crisis theory, which links overproduction and falling profit rates to cyclical economic collapses, has gained renewed attention, especially after the 2008 global financial crisis. Scholars such as David Harvey (2010) have drawn directly on Marx's *Capital* to explain the speculative bubble, crisis of capital overaccumulation, and financialization of economies. Empirical data on global inequality, wealth concentration, and declining labor share of GDP further support Marx's prognosis of a system marked by increasing polarization between capital and labor (ILO, 2019; UNCTAD, 2020). Moreover, the rise of precarious labor conditions—gig work, informal

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

economies, and casualization—has revived Marx's proletarianization thesis, in which capitalist accumulation proceeds by stripping workers of control and security (Standing, 2011). Empirical research from the Global South shows that Marx's critique of primitive accumulation and dispossession remains highly relevant in contexts of land grabs, forced migration, and the commodification of public goods (Harvey, 2005).

5.2.Historical Impact of Marx's Theories

Marx's theoretical framework has profoundly shaped political movements, state formation, labor organizing, and academic disciplines. His ideas inspired revolutions in Russia (1917), China (1949), Cuba (1959), and numerous anti-colonial movements throughout the 20th century. Though many of these states deviated significantly from Marx's vision of classless communism, the historical fact remains that his theories served as the ideological foundation for multiple transformative socio-political upheavals. In the academic world, Marx's ideas have catalyzed entire disciplines—sociology, political economy, cultural studies, and critical theory owe much of their foundational critique to his work. Marx's mode of inquiry—dialectical materialism and historical materialism—has been adopted by scholars seeking to understand the dynamics of capitalist development, imperialism, and social reproduction (Brenner, 1977; Wallerstein, 2004). Moreover, Marx's critique of commodity fetishism and ideology has become central to contemporary studies of media, culture, and subjectivity, influencing thinkers such as Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, and the Frankfurt School. In global political economy, his conceptual triad of capital, labor, and state continues to guide structuralist analyses of inequality, dependency, and globalization.

5.3 Relevance of Marx's Theory Today

Despite the collapse of several Marxist-inspired regimes and the rise of neoliberalism, Marx's critique of capitalism remains profoundly relevant. In an era marked by climate breakdown, rising inequality, financial instability, and resurgent authoritarianism, the analytical tools of Marxism have gained renewed traction. Movements such as Occupy Wall Street, climate justice initiatives, and labor uprisings in Amazon and other corporate giants frequently invoke Marxian critiques of exploitation, commodification, and alienation.

The post-2008 economic order—characterized by state-supported capital, precarious labor, and intensified wealth concentration—has made Marx's framework indispensable in explaining systemic

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

contradictions that neoclassical models cannot resolve. His prediction that capitalism would generate its own grave-diggers through internal contradictions and globalized labor exploitation continues to guide contemporary class analysis and global justice movements. Academic work by Thomas Piketty (2014), Nancy Fraser (2019), David Harvey (2010), and others show that even when not adopting Marxist labels, leading economists and theorists are grappling with the same fundamental issues Marx raised: inequality, accumulation by dispossession, crisis, and alienation.

In climate politics, Marx's insights into the metabolic rift between nature and capital have gained relevance, with ecological Marxists arguing that capitalist growth is incompatible with planetary limits (Foster, 2009). As such, Marx's theories now intersect with ecological economics, postcolonial theory, and feminist political economy in framing the systemic roots of crisis.

Conclusion

Karl Marx remains one of the most original, radical, and enduring figures in the history of economic thought. His own class background—born into a relatively privileged intellectual and professional family—did not prevent him from adopting a proletarian standpoint and producing theories aligned with the interests of the working class. From the perspective of Marxian, Weberian, and Bourdieuan frameworks, Marx represents a rare intellectual who consciously rejected his own class position to develop a theory of and for the oppressed. The class character of his theories is unequivocally proletarian. Unlike classical or neoclassical economists, Marx did not seek to refine or reform capitalism but to dismantle it. His theory of surplus value, exploitation, alienation, and crisis laid bare the mechanisms by which capitalism reproduces inequality and power. His work does not mask class relations under abstractions like utility or equilibrium—it foregrounds them as the central axis of historical and economic development. Historically, his theories have shaped revolutions, political systems, academic disciplines, and critical consciousness. Empirically, they continue to explain patterns of inequality, crisis, and capitalist reproduction better than many mainstream alternatives. Politically, Marx's relevance is expanding in a world facing economic precarity, social unrest, ecological collapse, and the failures of neoliberal governance.

In conclusion, Karl Marx's class character and his theoretical framework form a dialectical unity: an intellectual from the middle strata who transcended his origins to construct a scientific, revolutionary

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

critique of the capitalist system. His theories remain not just historically significant but urgently necessary in the ongoing struggle to understand—and transform—the world.

References

Berlin, I. (1939). *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*. Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market*. New Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Stanford University Press.

Brenner, R. (1977). The origins of capitalist development: A critique of neo-Smithian Marxism. *New Left Review*, (104), 25–92.

Foster, J. B. (2009). *The ecological revolution: Making peace with the planet*. Monthly Review Press.

Fraser, N. (2019). *The old is dying and the new cannot be born: From progressive neoliberalism to Trump and beyond*. Verso.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Eds.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Harvey, D. (2005). *The New Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2010). *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. Profile Books.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (2011). *How to Change the World: Reflections on Marx and Marxism*. Yale University Press.

Hunt, E. K., & Lautzenheiser, M. (2011). *History of Economic Thought: A Critical Perspective* (3rd ed.). M.E. Sharpe.

International Labour Organization. (2019). *Global Wage Report 2018/19*. ILO.

Kalberg, S. (1994). *Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.

Mannheim, K. (1936). *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR

Marx, K. (1845/1978). Theses on Feuerbach. In R. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader* (pp. 143–145). W. W. Norton.

Marx, K. (1867/1990). *Capital: Volume I* (B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Books.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848/1976). *The Communist Manifesto*. In *Collected Works, Vol. 6*. International Publishers.

McLellan, D. (2006). *Karl Marx: A Biography* (4th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press.

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. Bloomsbury.

UNCTAD. (2020). *Trade and Development Report*. United Nations.

Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Duke University Press.

Weber, M. (1922/1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. University of California Press.

Wheen, F. (1999). *Karl Marx: A Life*. W. W. Norton & Company.

ISSN2277-3630(online),Published by International journal of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Research., under Volume: 14 Issue:01 in Jan-2025
https://www.gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR