SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

MixCache.com

From the MixCache.com library

SAMPLE COPY

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

Empires of Need: Colonialism, Extraction, and the Making of Poverty

MixCache.com

SAMPLE COPY

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

Table of Contents

SAMPLE COPY

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

Introduction

Empires of Need argues that poverty in the Global South was not a natural condition, a cultural inheritance, or a simple failure of postcolonial governance. It was produced—deliberately and methodically—through imperial strategies that reorganized land, labor, and trade to serve interests far from where value was created. This book traces how those strategies took hold and why many of their effects endure. By following the institutional threads that link conquest to contemporary policy, it shows that deprivation is not merely an absence of resources; it is the presence of systems that allocate risk and reward along lines first drawn under colonial rule.

The focus is deliberately comparative and regional. Africa, South Asia, and Latin America experienced different empires, legal regimes, and settlement patterns, yet their colonial economies were built on common logics: dispossess land to unlock export commodities; discipline labor to ensure steady supplies of cheap work; and engineer trade, finance, and infrastructure to funnel surplus outward. In Africa, survey and concessionary systems transformed communal landscapes into assets for mining and plantation agriculture. In South Asia, revenue settlements and property codifications crystallized hierarchies of ownership that still shape rural power. In Latin America, haciendas and latifundia entrenched unequal access to land while commodity booms knitted national economies to volatile world markets. Across each region, these structures concentrated wealth and externalized vulnerability.

SAMPLE COPY

The core processes examined here—land dispossession, labor regimes, and trade policies—operated together. Expropriated land not only supplied plantations and mines; it also dismantled subsistence buffers, pushing people into coerced or precarious work. Labor controls—ranging from indenture and pass laws to criminalization of mobility—lowered bargaining power and wages, while tax systems converted obligations in kind into cash payments that could only be met through market participation on unfavorable terms. Trade and tariff policies then locked colonies into roles as exporters of raw materials and importers of manufactures, suppressing local industry and shaping infrastructures—railways, ports, telegraphs—around extraction rather than broad-based development. The result was an economy optimized for imperial needs and fragile for everyone else.

This book’s claims are evidence-based. It draws on archival records, colonial budgets, customs registers, labor ordinances, and corporate reports; on quantitative series for wages, prices, and trade flows; and on recent research in economic history, development economics, geography, and law. It also incorporates community histories and oral testimony that reveal how policies were lived and resisted. Throughout, the goal is to connect the measurable with the meaningful: to show how the movements

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

of silver, the routes of railways, or the calibration of a tax can explain the spread of hunger, the growth of slums, or the persistence of informal work.

Continuity matters as much as rupture. Political independence brought possibilities, but it did not dissolve inherited constraints. States entered the postcolonial era with asset maps and liability sheets written under empire: concentrated landholding, export enclaves, external debts, and institutional cultures oriented toward extraction. Later waves of austerity and structural adjustment deepened some of these patterns, re-privatizing public goods, shrinking social protections, and recommitting economies to primary commodity exports. At the same time, new actors—multinationals, development banks, and, more recently, South–South financiers—reproduced old dependencies in new forms, often through legal and financial architectures that remain opaque to the citizens they bind.

The human consequences of these structures are neither incidental nor purely material. Extraction reorganized social life—who could own, move, or learn; whose knowledge counted; who bore the risks of illness, injury, and climate shock. It gendered burdens of care and made households into hidden sites of subsidy for low-wage production. It redefined criminality, turning survival strategies into offenses against property and order. And it reshaped ecologies, from soil exhaustion and deforestation to water diversion and disease environments, leaving today’s communities to manage accelerating climate risks with diminished commons.

Readers will also find a story of contestation. Empire’s designs were never uncontested or total. Peasants reclaimed land, workers struck, and intellectuals reimagined the terms of prosperity and dignity. These struggles mattered: they won wages, schools, clinics, and rights; they changed laws and set limits on what extraction could take. They also supplied alternative ideas about development rooted in reciprocity, stewardship, and public investment—ideas that continue to inform contemporary movements for land reform, debt justice, climate reparations, and democratic control over resources.

The chapters that follow proceed from foundations to frontiers. Early chapters track how empires converted land into property and people into labor. Subsequent chapters examine trade architecture, infrastructure, corporate power, and the knowledge systems that justified it all. Later chapters trace the legacies of decolonization, debt, and “new extractivism,” including urban informality and climate vulnerability. The final chapters look ahead, outlining policy pathways—legal, fiscal, ecological—that can unwind inherited constraints and expand the space for equitable development.

Empires of Need is written for readers who want arguments that travel with evidence. It invites economists, historians, policymakers, and activists to a common table where data and lived experience are read together. If the making of poverty was institutional, then so too must be its unmaking. By reconstructing how deprivation was organized,

SAMPLE COPY

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

we can better see how to organize its end.

SAMPLE COPY

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

CHAPTER ONE: The Idea of Empire and the Political Economy of Need

Empire is not just a map of territories and borders, but a blueprint for organizing scarcity and abundance. It is a political economy of need, designed to identify resources, secure labor, and move value from places of extraction to places of consumption. Long before the term “development” entered official vocabulary, empires were already practicing a kind of development—selective, uneven, and built to serve particular interests. This chapter introduces the central argument of the book: that poverty in Africa, South Asia, and Latin America was not an accident of history or a cultural lag, but a manufactured outcome of imperial strategies. These strategies were systematic, repeatable, and embedded in institutions that long outlasted formal colonial rule. They revolved around three pillars: taking land, organizing labor, and controlling trade. Each pillar supported the others, creating an architecture of extraction that was as durable as it was damaging.

At the heart of empire is a simple calculation: how to turn other people’s places and other people’s work into wealth for the metropole. The calculation appears in the budgets of colonial administrations, in the charters of chartered companies, and in the shipping manifests leaving ports in Mombasa, Madras, and Mazatlán. It appears, too, in the tax ledgers that demanded cash payments from peasants who now had to sell crops for rupees, francs, or pesos. The metropole did not need to legislate poverty directly; it simply created a set of incentives and penalties that made poverty a likely outcome for those on the receiving end of imperial rule. Hunger, displacement, and precarious labor were not always the explicit aims of policy, but they were predictable by-products of policies designed to maximize surplus and minimize costs for empire.

SAMPLE COPY

The “idea of empire” was, at its core, an economic argument dressed in the language of mission and order. Statesmen and investors spoke of civilization, trade, and security, yet the books they kept told another story: profit margins on copper, sugar, and tea; costs of labor per unit of output; returns on railway bonds; and guarantees on land concessions. These were not sentimental projects; they were audited ones. When colonial governors wrote home about “pacification,” they also wrote about tax yields. When company agents negotiated treaties, they also negotiated mining rights. The language could be lofty, but the objectives were usually pragmatic and numerical. The empire of need required precision: how many laborers per acre, how many tons per mile of track, how many taxes per household. It was an empire measured, surveyed, and accounted.

The political economy of need also relied on a social technology: hierarchy. To make

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

extraction efficient, empires differentiated populations by race, caste, ethnicity, and legal status. These categories were not merely descriptive; they were operational. They determined who could own land, who could travel without passes, who could be taxed at higher rates, and who could be punished more harshly. The hierarchies made it easier to assign risk: risk of hunger to subsistence farmers pushed into cash crops, risk of injury to miners excluded from compensation, risk of unemployment to informal workers without rights. Inequality was not an incidental by-product; it was a tool of governance. It kept labor cheap, land available, and markets predictable for exporters. By codifying difference, empires created durable lines of privilege and deprivation that would shape political life for generations.

A common misconception is that empire was primarily about conquest and military control. While force mattered, the deeper work of empire was administrative: defining property, counting populations, setting prices, and engineering transport. These quiet technologies—cadastres, census forms, tax assessments, tariff schedules—did much of the heavy lifting. They turned complex societies into legible units that could be managed from afar. In practice, this meant translating communal land tenure into individual titles, customary dues into cash taxes, and seasonal mobility into “vagrancy” offenses. Each translation had a price: someone gained control and profit, and someone lost autonomy and security. The violence of conquest was real, but the grinding work of paperwork was what made extraction repeatable.

SAMPLE COPY

Land dispossession was often the opening move. Emires found that controlling territory was less useful than controlling the economic potential of that territory. This required redefining land as property that could be owned, traded, and mortgaged, and then redistributing it to settlers, companies, or compliant elites. In Africa, colonial authorities used surveys and treaties to draw new maps that replaced communal stewardship with concessions and titles. In South Asia, revenue settlements created classes of landlords and tenants who owed payments to the state, not just to each other. In Latin America, colonial and postcolonial regimes expanded latifundia at the expense of indigenous and peasant communities. Dispossession was more than a one-time seizure; it was an ongoing process that tied households to markets on terms that made their survival dependent on selling labor or crops under unfavorable conditions.

Once land was secured, labor regimes followed. The point was not simply to recruit workers but to ensure a steady, predictable supply of cheap labor. Empires experimented with many methods: indenture, forced labor, pass systems, military conscription, and debt peonage. Each method targeted different populations, but the effect was similar: workers were disciplined to move where needed and to accept wages and conditions dictated by employers and the state. The legal architecture often criminalized the refusal to work under prescribed terms. Vagrancy laws, tax penalties, and contract enforcement turned mobility and autonomy into liabilities. In mines and plantations, safety was sacrificed to output; in mills and ports, long hours were normalized. The cheapness of labor was not a market accident; it was a political

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

project.

Trade policies completed the circle. Land and labor produced commodities, but the value of those commodities was realized in global markets structured to favor the metropole. Tariffs protected metropolitan manufacturers while colonial exports faced few barriers. Currency regimes fixed exchange rates to facilitate imperial accounting, often at the cost of local inflation or deflation. Monopolies on purchase and transport ensured that producers in the colonies received prices set far away, while consumers paid for imported goods. The infrastructure built to serve these trades—railways linking mines to ports, roads moving timber from forest to ship—was oriented to the demands of exporters. Local needs were secondary, and industrialization was discouraged. Colonies were cast as primary producers, and their economies were prevented from diversifying.

These structures were supported by institutions with long memories and durable mandates. Chartered companies, often hybrid public-private entities, acted as de facto governments in many regions. They issued passes, levied taxes, and raised militias. When companies were wound up or nationalized, their practices often migrated to colonial bureaucracies. Banks and trading houses extended credit tied to the shipment of specific commodities. Shipping lines set timetables that dictated planting and harvest cycles. Insurance underwriters priced risk in ways that influenced where investment flowed. Each institution had its own rules, but together they formed an ecosystem. An economy could no more choose to opt out of this ecosystem than a river could choose not to flow downhill.

SAMPLE COPY

The economic logic of empire had a cultural and epistemic dimension. Metropole officials and local elites often justified these arrangements by claiming that colonized peoples were “backward,” “unproductive,” or “in need of guidance.” Such claims were not neutral observations; they were tools of policy. They rationalized the seizure of land as “improvement,” the restriction of mobility as “order,” and the channeling of resources outward as “trade.” They also shaped what counted as knowledge. Written records, cadastral maps, and corporate accounts were taken as authoritative, while oral histories, ecological knowledge, and subsistence practices were dismissed. This epistemic bias made it harder to see the costs of extraction and easier to see the benefits for empire. It created a worldview in which poverty looked natural and empire looked necessary.

The relationship between metropole and colony was not static. It evolved with technology, politics, and markets. Steamships and telegraphs shrank distances and tightened control. New financial instruments—bonds, syndicates, currency boards—expanded the reach of investors. Political movements at home forced adjustments: inquiries into abuses, reforms to labor laws, and shifts in tariff policy. Yet the core architecture remained intact. Even when policies changed, the underlying incentives—cheap raw materials, secure markets, low-cost labor—did not. Reforms

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

often redistributed costs rather than eliminated them. For example, banning outright forced labor might lead to new systems of debt and taxation that still compelled people to work. The elasticity of empire was part of its resilience; it could bend without breaking.

It is tempting to think of empire as something that ended abruptly with independence flags and ceremonial speeches. In reality, the dismantling of formal empire was often the opening of a new chapter in the same story. Many postcolonial states inherited extractive institutions and external debts. Their borders—drawn by colonial administrators—grouped and separated communities in ways that complicated nation-building. Their economies—shaped by plantation monocultures and mining enclaves—were vulnerable to global price swings. Their civil services—trained in the logics of revenue collection and export promotion—often continued the same practices. Independence brought sovereignty, but sovereignty over assets and liabilities written by someone else. The result was a set of constraints that made equitable development difficult and poverty persistent.

Recent research in economic history has sharpened our understanding of these constraints. Scholars have reconstructed wage series, trade balances, and fiscal accounts to show how surplus moved from colonies to metropoles. Geographers have mapped railways and ports to demonstrate how infrastructure served extraction rather than local integration. Legal historians have traced the diffusion of property codes and labor ordinances across empires. Anthropologists have documented how households absorbed shocks from policies designed far away. Together, these studies provide an evidence base that challenges older narratives of "backwardness" and "culture." They show that the playing field was tilted, and that the tilt was not accidental but engineered. The data, read carefully, tell a story of design.

SAMPLE COPY

A recurring theme in this book is the interplay of coercion and consent. Empires did not rule by force alone. They relied on collaboration from local elites—landlords, chiefs, traders—who benefited from the new order. These intermediaries were crucial: they collected taxes, enforced contracts, and mediated disputes. Their participation lent a veneer of legitimacy to the system and reduced the need for direct metropolitan force. Yet collaboration was conditional. Elites had to deliver labor, land, and commodities on schedule. When they failed, sanctions followed. For many ordinary people, this meant living under a double pressure: from above, the demands of the state and employers; from below, the expectations of local patrons. The space for autonomy narrowed, and poverty became a default for those without access to these networks.

Another theme is the role of infrastructure as an instrument of policy. Railways, ports, and roads are often described as neutral investments that connect markets. In colonial contexts, they were selective connectors. Railways ran from mines to coasts, not between inland cities. Ports were deepened for ocean-going freighters, not for local

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

fishing fleets. Telegraph lines linked administrative centers, not villages. These choices had long-term effects. They shaped urbanization, making some cities hubs of export and others backwaters. They influenced which regions received investment and which were left isolated. They determined how quickly goods and people could move, and in what direction. The legacy is visible today in maps of economic activity and poverty that often trace the contours of colonial transport networks.

Taxation was another key instrument. Colonial governments needed revenue to fund administration, security, and infrastructure. They often chose taxes that were easy to collect but burdensome for the poor: hut taxes, poll taxes, and levies on basic goods. These taxes forced households to earn cash, which in turn pushed them into wage labor or cash cropping. Sometimes taxes were levied in ways that deliberately disrupted subsistence cycles, compelling people to work during planting or harvest seasons for planters and mines. The design of tax systems reveals priorities: maximizing state revenue and private profit over household resilience. The burden fell heaviest on those least able to pay, deepening inequality and locking families into cycles of debt.

Monopolies were a blunt tool for controlling prices and profits. Colonial regimes and chartered companies often granted exclusive rights to purchase commodities, sell imports, or transport goods. Producers who wanted to sell had to go through licensed traders who set prices. Consumers who wanted to buy faced limited choices and inflated costs. These monopolies were defended as necessary for quality control, revenue collection, or “order,” but they functioned primarily to reduce risk for merchants and increase returns for investors. They also stifled competition and innovation. Local artisans and traders were shut out of markets, and the economies remained dependent on a narrow range of exports. When monopolies were broken or restructured, the patterns they created—low domestic linkages, reliance on foreign markets—endured.

SAMPLE COPY

Currency and credit systems were less visible but equally powerful. Colonial currencies were often pegged to the metropole’s money, facilitating imperial accounting but limiting local monetary policy. In times of global deflation, colonies faced severe contraction; in times of inflation, import prices spiked. Credit flowed to export sectors—mines, plantations, railways—while local agriculture and small enterprise were underserved. Banks served traders and officials, not farmers. When crises hit, households had few buffers and often had to sell assets or labor under distress conditions. The financial architecture, though technical in appearance, allocated security and vulnerability in ways that reinforced the logic of extraction. It made the economies “safe” for investors and “risky” for everyone else.

The corporate form was central to empire. Chartered companies were not merely commercial entities; they were geopolitical actors with powers of taxation, treaty-making, and even warfare. The British East India Company, the Dutch East India

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

Company (VOC), and the French Compagnie des Indes blended public authority and private profit. Their charters specified monopolies and obligations, and their shareholders expected returns. When companies faltered or abuses became public, governments often stepped in, but the corporate model persisted. In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, concessions were granted to private firms in mining, plantations, and utilities. These companies shaped policy, lobbied for favorable laws, and influenced infrastructure planning. Their interests were not identical to the interests of the metropole or the colony; they were specific, profit-driven, and often longer-lasting than the imperial flag.

Knowledge production was a subtle but essential part of the imperial toolkit. To manage economies from afar, administrators required data: who lived where, what they produced, how much they paid, what they consumed. This led to censuses, surveys, and statistical agencies. The production of numbers created an image of the colony as legible and manageable. It also legitimized certain interventions—land reforms, tax changes, labor laws—by claiming they were based on objective facts. Yet the categories used were often arbitrary and politically charged. “Idle” land might be fallow land crucial to soil fertility. “Unproductive” labor might be care work that sustained families. By privileging quantitative metrics, colonial knowledge systems obscured the full costs of extraction and the contributions of local economies.

Law was another instrument, especially in the colonial encounter. Property law defined who could own and on what terms; contract law enforced agreements that were often asymmetrical; criminal law penalized behaviors that threatened extraction, such as trespass or vagrancy. Courts operated under different standards for different groups. Indigenous legal systems were marginalized or co-opted. Legal codes became vehicles for dispossession and control, giving a veneer of impartiality to policies that were fundamentally biased. The persistence of these legal frameworks after independence has complicated reforms, as they continue to shape land tenure, labor relations, and corporate rights. Law, in this sense, is not just a set of rules; it is a material infrastructure for allocation and exclusion.

Health policy, too, was folded into the political economy of need. Colonial regimes invested in public health primarily where it served economic interests: protecting labor in mines and plantations, maintaining port cities as trade nodes, and preventing epidemics that could disrupt production. Where populations were not economically vital, health infrastructure was minimal. The result was an uneven map of disease burden and mortality. Medical interventions were often experimental or coercive, designed to maximize productivity rather than wellbeing. Nutrition policies were similarly conditional: caloric needs were calculated in relation to labor output, not household health. These choices left long-term scars on population health and human capital.

Gender dynamics were integral to the system. Colonial economies relied on

SAMPLE COPY

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

households to reproduce labor, often without paying for that reproductive work. Women's labor in fields, homes, and markets subsidized low wages in mines and plantations. Legal codes frequently denied women property rights or restricted their mobility, making them economically dependent. The gendered division of labor was not a static cultural feature; it was actively shaped by policies that assigned men to wage work and women to subsistence and care. When crises hit—droughts, price shocks, pandemics—women bore disproportionate burdens. The unpaid work of reproduction allowed the empire of need to function at low cost, masking the true price of extraction.

Resistance and negotiation were constant features. Peasants evaded taxes, reclaimed land, and altered crop choices. Workers organized strikes, slowdowns, and boycotts. Communities negotiated terms with chiefs, planters, and officials. These actions were not always successful, but they set limits on what could be extracted. They also produced ideas—about fairness, reciprocity, and dignity—that challenged the logic of empire. Sometimes resistance led to concessions: better wages, land rights, or political representation. Sometimes it provoked repression. In all cases, it demonstrated that empire was not a one-way street. The political economy of need was shaped by pushback, and the contours of poverty were influenced by the victories and defeats of ordinary people.

SAMPLE COPY

Today's development challenges are legible through this history. Land inequality in Latin America, export dependence in Africa, and agrarian distress in South Asia all have roots in colonial structures. Informal economies, urban slums, and climate vulnerability are not merely contemporary phenomena; they are the outcomes of long arcs of policy and investment. Attempts to reform these patterns often run into institutional inertia. Land reform stalls because property laws favor concentrated holdings. Industrial policy struggles because trade agreements and financial systems privilege exports. Social protection is weak because tax bases are narrow and regressive. The solutions are not purely technical; they involve confronting historical legacies that were designed to produce and manage scarcity.

This book's chapters trace these legacies across regions and sectors. They follow the logic of extraction from land to labor to trade, showing how each piece reinforced the others. They look at the institutions—companies, banks, bureaucracies—that operationalized the logic. They examine the knowledge and law that justified and enforced it. They consider the crises—famines, depressions, pandemics—that revealed the system's fragility. They document resistance that challenged it. And they trace the afterlives of empire in debt, austerity, and new forms of extraction. The aim is not to assign blame, but to explain mechanisms. By understanding how poverty was organized, we can better understand how to disorganize it.

The political economy of need is not a relic of the past. It has been updated and adapted to new realities. Supply chains now span continents; financial instruments are

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

more complex; climate change adds new pressures. Yet the core questions remain: who pays the costs of growth, who captures the benefits, and how are risks distributed? The answers, today as in the past, are shaped by institutions and incentives first forged in the crucible of empire. The idea of empire persists not only in the geography of power but in the design of economies—how they allocate land, how they value labor, how they structure markets. It is this design, more than any single policy or event, that explains the persistence of poverty alongside plenty.

Understanding empire as a political economy of need also clarifies what development must do. It must be more than projects and plans; it must be an institutional redesign. It must reorient infrastructure to serve local integration, not just export corridors. It must rewrite tax systems to be progressive and protective, not extractive and punitive. It must reform property law to recognize communal stewardship and equitable access. It must restructure financial systems to support broad-based enterprise, not just commodity pipelines. It must invest in knowledge that counts all forms of work and risk. And it must do so with an eye to history, acknowledging that the present is built on layers of policy that have long favored some over others.

Empire, then, is both a historical formation and an organizing principle. It is a way of seeing the world as a storehouse of needs to be met elsewhere. The political economy of need is the method by which those needs are satisfied, often at the expense of those who live where resources are found. This chapter has laid out the basic architecture: land, labor, and trade, supported by institutions, knowledge, and law. The chapters that follow will bring this architecture to life across Africa, South Asia, and Latin America. They will show how specific policies, decisions, and infrastructures created particular patterns of deprivation. They will also show how people responded, adapted, and imagined alternatives. The story is not only one of loss; it is also one of resilience and imagination in the face of systems built to limit both.

By the end of the book, the connections between empire and contemporary poverty should be clear—not as abstract claims but as documented histories. Readers will see how today's policy debates over land rights, labor standards, and trade rules echo the debates of earlier eras, and why certain solutions are harder to implement than others. They will see how global supply chains replicate colonial patterns of specialization and risk. They will see how climate change intersects with long-standing inequalities in land and infrastructure. And they will see why the making of poverty was, and remains, a political and institutional project. The idea of empire lives on not only in textbooks but in the everyday design of economies. Understanding it is the first step toward designing something different.

SAMPLE COPY

Sample from MixCache.com - The Online eBook Marketplace

SHARING STRICTLY PROHIBITED - For personal use of the licensed account only - See MixCache.com Terms of Use.

This is a sample preview. Purchase the book to read the full content.

Visit MixCache.com to purchase the complete book.

SAMPLE COPY