

Rey's position on this "external" force is ambiguous. In Class Alliances he refers to this force as "extra-economic coercive measures," (e.g., the juridical-political role of the colonial state) (Rey,1982:48). Yet, in an earlier article on transition in the Congo-Brazzaville (1968), reproduced in English (1980), Rey identified the "external" force as a "transitional mode of production," which according to him, was independent from the capitalist mode and different from the pre-capitalist one (Rey,1982:157).

Rey provides very little reasoning as to why non-feudal social formations are perceived as necessarily stagnant and "resistant" to change. Change in non-feudal formations, the model suggests, must come from the outside because in these formations:

Capitalism can never immediately and radically eliminate either the preceding modes of production or, more importantly, the relations of exploitation that characterize these modes of production. On the contrary, it must over an extended period reinforce those relations of exploitation whose development alone assures that capitalism will be able to extract goods or men from these modes of production.." (Rey, 1982:XI)

In Class Alliances, Rey divides pre-capitalist modes of production into two sets: the feudal mode of production and the non-feudal modes of production. The non-feudal modes of production, which include the "Asiatic" mode and "other modes of production", are characterized as "...modes that have not accepted capitalist development without outside intervention, because their own course precludes such an evolution." (Rey,1982:51)

The distinct course of non-feudal modes of production appears to be derived from Rey's basic assumption that the "Asiatic" and "African" or "lineage" modes of production, as he refers to them, lack "...private property in land..." which seen by Rey as the